

#231

COMPLETE

Collector: Gimbel Foundat...nd Evaluation (Web Link)
Started: Monday, December 09, 2019 12:56:09 PM
Last Modified: Saturday, December 14, 2019 8:45:08 PM
Time Spent: Over a day
IP Address: 104.230.117.93

Page 1

Q1 Name of your organization.

Conservancy for Cuyahoga Valley National Park

Q2 Grant #

20180877

Q3 Grant Period

December 1, 2018 - November 30, 2019

Q4 Location of your organization

City	Peninsula
State	OH

Q5 Name and Title of person completing evaluation.

Dianne Ketler, Manager of Institutional Giving

Q6 Phone Number:

330-657-2909 x160

Q7 Email address.

dketler@forcvnp.org

Page 2: Key Outcomes and Results

Q8 Total number of clients served through this grant funding:

743

Q9 Describe the project's key outcomes and results based on the goals and objectives. Use the following format: State the Goal: State Objective 1: Describe the Activities, Results and Outcomes for Objective 1: State Objective 2 (if applicable): Describe the Activities, Results and Outcomes for Objective 2: State Objective 3 (if applicable): Describe the Activities, Results and Outcomes for Objective 3:

Our project goal was that students who participate in Cuyahoga Valley Environmental Education Center's (CVEEC) All the Rivers Run service-learning program will become the next generation of environmental stewards. Our objective was that 500 students participating in pilot of new All the Rivers Run curriculum will develop deeper knowledge of watersheds and human impact through a service-learning component focused on restoring habitat in prioritized areas within Cuyahoga Valley National Park.

To address this goal and objective, CVEEC developed a new curriculum and evaluation for All the Rivers Run and pilot with 500 students. Students participated in the four-day, three-night All the Rivers Run program, with a service-learning component as the final capstone experience for the week (e.g., planting trees, removing invasive species, collecting native seeds). At the conclusion of the program, our main outcome was to help students demonstrate knowledge and awareness of human impact on the environment, water quality, and watershed health, as well as ways to be a good environmental steward.

CVEEC developed evaluation tools (i.e., pre- and post-visit student/teacher evaluation surveys) to measure students' academic understanding of program material, as well as their sense of place and connection with the natural world.

In the pilot year, 743 students participated in the service-learning component of All the Rivers Run. We completed a teacher satisfaction survey at the conclusion of the program, the results of which demonstrate that we did, indeed, address our program goal and objective in a meaningful way. We asked teachers to use a scale of 1 to 5 (1 being poor, 5 being excellent) to give us feedback on the experience. Fourteen teachers responded. The evaluation statements and results were as follows:

- (1) "Our school was adequately prepared to participate in the service-learning experience." Thirteen teachers responded with 5, while one responded with 4.
- (2) "The CVEEC/CVNP staff was clear in delivery of instructions and safety expectations." All respondents answered with 5.
- (3) "The CVEEC/CVNP staff engaged the students in active participation." Thirteen teachers responded with 5, while one responded with 4.
- (4) "As a result of the experience, our students better understood the connection from service learning to stewardship of the watershed." Ten teachers responded with 5; four teachers responded with 4.
- (5) "After our service-learning experience, students were more motivated to care for nature than before the experience." Nine teachers responded with 5; five teachers responded with 4.
- (6) "Based on our experience, if service learning were offered in the future, our school would be interested in participating." Thirteen teachers responded with 5; one responded with 3.

We are pleased with these evaluation results for the pilot year of the program, and were especially grateful to be able to provide the program to more than 200 students more than our goal of 500.

S.L. Gimbel Foundation Fund

Q10 Please describe any challenges/obstacles the organization encountered (if any) in attaining goals & objectives.

We had minor challenges but all in all, this program was very successful and natural fit into CVEEC's programming. Below are the minor logistical challenges we did encounter:

- The timing of the service learning experience and how it would fit into the final morning of the resident program, given that final day is already packed with "extras," such as moving luggage out of dorms, writing a reflective letter to self, having a closing ceremony, and doing student evaluations.
- Facilitating the experience with large numbers of kids and small numbers of experienced staff.
- Ordering, storage and staging of trees. We had to order the trees well in advance to make sure that there were enough for the students to plant, but they then had to be watered and maintained, which is a staffing time and cost consideration.
- Rate of planting. We had theorized that each student would be able to plant two trees, but each only ended up planting one.

Q11 How did you overcome and/or address the challenges and obstacles?

Below is how we addressed the challenges listed in the last question:

- The timing of the experience: We adjusted by having a slightly earlier end time to breakfast, arranging bussing to the work sites (so we didn't lose time by hiking the kids down), and having the National Park Service Rangers that were facilitating the service learning also facilitate our closing ceremony, and do that piece at the site. These are minor adjustments that nonetheless made a huge difference to how smoothly the program ran, and are a testament to all collaborators (NPS and Conservancy team) working together to create a schedule that worked for all.
- Facilitating the experience with large numbers of participants: We overcame this by setting aside a training session wherein the NPS staff trained all the CVEEC Field Instructors on safety and technique in tree planting. This empowered anyone that was scheduled to be with kids during the experience to help run it safely and efficiently.
- Ordering and staging of trees: We were lucky that we had a wet spring and early summer, so our trees could be stored outdoors, any place, and watered naturally. If that were not the case, we would not be able to stage the trees at the work site until the day of (they would need to be stored where someone could water them all the time), which makes for a huge amount of set up work for a small crew on the morning of the experience. This is something we will need to continue to work on, as we cannot always rely on the weather to provide adequate rain.
- Rate of planting: We learned that, given the amount of walking and slightly strenuous terrain leading to the sites that need restoration, students planted trees at a rate of one per student. We still had over our projected number of students (743) and therefore planted that many trees, but it will be good data for the future.

Q12 Describe any unintended positive outcomes as a result of the efforts supported by this grant.

We did not intend to serve more than our goal of 500 students, and the final number of 743 participants was an unintended but very positive outcome of our project this year.

S.L. Gimbel Foundation Fund

Q13 Briefly describe the impact this grant has had on the organization and community served.

The service-learning component of CVEEC's popular and successful All the Rivers Run program has had an important impact on both our student participants and on the Conservancy's efforts to develop the next generation of environmental stewards. The service-learning component enhances the learning available to All the Rivers Run participants, putting the lessons they learn during their program stay into action with real-world work in the field. The national park benefits, in turn, as trees are planted, invasive species are removed, etc.

The program also as a longer-term impact, as part of the grant funds provided participating schools with classroom kits for continuing students learning back in the classroom. The teachers were given the option of a few different classroom kits: a tower garden/hydroponic growing system, a turn-handle composter and composting start up kit for their school, or individual tree kits for independent planting for the students. Teachers selected the item they preferred, and the Conservancy supplied that choice to the classroom, thereby extending student learning beyond the duration of the All the Rivers Run.

Page 3: Budget

Q14 Please provide a budget expenditure report. Also, provide a budget narrative that explains how the funds were utilized, what was purchased, what were the expensed items based upon the budget that was submitted.

Teaching Staff: \$17,355.50

Curriculum & Evaluation Development: \$3,585.47

Program Management: \$5,597.53

Classroom Kits: \$1,717.75

Bus Transportation: \$4,425.00

Tree Planting Supplies: \$25,857.25

TOTAL: \$58,538.50

Page 4: Success Stories

Q15 Please relate a success story:

We are so pleased to report that we served more students than we expected, planted more trees in the ground than we expected, and completely restored one site (Everett Covered Bridge) and made headway on two others! The pilot year of the All the Rivers Run service-learning project was a success upon which we hope to build in the coming years.

Q16 Please relate a success story here:

Respondent skipped this question

Q17 Please relate a success story here:

Respondent skipped this question

Page 5: Organizational Information

Q18 Which category best describes the organization.
Please choose only one.

Environmental

S.L. Gimbel Foundation Fund

Q19 What is the organization's primary program area of interest?

Environment/Environmental

Q20 Percentage of clients served through grant in each ethnic group category. Total must equal 100%

Respondent skipped this question

Q21 Approximate percentage of clients served from grant funds in each age category.

Respondent skipped this question

Q22 Approximate percentage of clients served with disabilities from grant funds.

Respondent skipped this question

Q23 Approximate percentage of clients served in each economic group.

Respondent skipped this question

Q24 Approximate percentage of clients served from grant funds in each population category.

Respondent skipped this question
