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Executive Summary

Policymakers, educators, and nonprofit leaders have noted a critical need for empowering young people to understand philanthropy and create pathways to action. However, in understanding the terminology of philanthropy education, identifying key components, and enhancing the quality and consistency of existing curricula, many questions are still left unanswered. What types of philanthropy education programs are currently offered at K-12 schools across the country? What are the similarities and differences among these programs? What are the core curriculum elements of philanthropy education? In what ways do practitioners in philanthropy education programs define associated terminology? What are the similarities and differences in the way these terms are used and understood? This study provides insights into these questions by: 1) analyzing prior research and existing programs to identify important components of philanthropy education; 2) analyzing data obtained from telephone interviews with teachers and administrators at K-12 schools offering philanthropy education programs; 3) analyzing data obtained from a web-based survey of a random sample of independent schools; and 4) developing a typology of philanthropy education programs. A total of ten K-12 schools took part in interviews and 128 independent schools responded to the survey, representing schools by region, instruction level, and school enrollment size.¹

This study focused primarily on the following core components of philanthropy education at the K-12 level: Civic Engagement, Community/Voluntary Service, Philanthropy Education Courses, Service Clubs, Service Learning Projects or Classes, Youth Fundraising, and Youth Grantmaking. Findings reveal that philanthropy education programs are an integral part of students’ learning experience.

Schools surveyed indicated philanthropy education programs were most frequently (69 percent) established because school administrators believed these programs were important to student growth and development. The vast majority of schools (89 percent) indicated that students in their schools were involved in

¹ The exact number of responding schools varies for each survey question. Please refer to specific sections in the report.
philanthropy education during the 2013-2014 school year, with more than half of schools from the Southwest (56 percent), Midwest (54 percent), Mid-Atlantic (60 percent), and East (63 percent) reporting that all students were engaged in philanthropy education programs. Elementary schools reported the lowest level of engagement with nearly a quarter (24 percent) indicating that few to no students were involved in philanthropy education programs.

Currently, the two most frequently offered core components of philanthropy education are community service (97 percent) and youth fundraising (84 percent), while philanthropy education courses were the least frequently offered component (18 percent). However, the study also finds that once programs are offered, they appear to remain. Among schools offering philanthropy education programs (n=113), more than half of the schools (52 percent) reported no program discontinuation; and currently, no more than 10 percent of schools reported any component being inactive or terminated.

When programs were terminated, it was most frequently (39 percent) a result of students’ lack of interest. Engagement in individual core components did differ by grade level and school location, with the exception of community service, the core component that nearly every respondent (98 percent) indicated was a part of its philanthropy education program. Over two thirds (70 percent) of schools indicated community service activities were extracurricular.

Youth fundraising activities, once offered by nearly all (95 percent) programs, saw the greatest reduction (23 percent) in offerings in Midwest schools, whereas only 77 percent of schools are currently providing these activities for students. Likewise, civic engagement activities, although provided by nearly three-quarters (74 percent) of schools, were only offered by 59 percent of schools in the West. Nearly two-thirds (65 percent) of schools indicated these activities were extracurricular.

Not surprisingly, service clubs have been offered largely by high schools (87 percent) and currently are most frequently offered by middle schools and high schools (94 percent). While 74 percent of responding schools indicated they had offered service clubs, lower percentages were reported in West (59 percent) and Mid-Atlantic (60 percent) schools. The majority of schools (79 percent) reported these clubs were extracurricular.

Nearly three quarters of schools (72 percent) reported providing opportunities for service learning; however, schools in the Southeast reported a much lower percentage
(48 percent) than any other region. The majority of schools (74 percent) reported these activities were most frequently curriculum based.

**Youth grantmaking** components of philanthropy education has only been offered by 39 percent of schools, with even fewer (37 percent) continuing to offer these activities. The West and Southwest schools reported the highest percentages (55 percent and 50 percent, respectively) of providing these opportunities. Nearly two thirds (67 percent) of schools indicated these were co-curricular activities.

Only a fifth (20 percent) of schools reported ever offering **philanthropy education courses**, which is the least offered component of the core philanthropy education components. These courses were most frequently offered in the Southeast and Mid-Atlantic schools (33 percent), although each of these regions also saw the greatest reductions in current course offerings (14 percent and 20 percent, respectively). Nearly three quarters of schools (71 percent) reported these courses to be provided either as curriculum-based or co-curricular activities.

Academic credit was not offered for these program components in more than half (61 percent) of surveyed schools, and less than half of schools (46 percent) surveyed reported any of these core components were not needed to satisfy graduation requirements. Assessment and evaluation of student outcomes were realized by 92 percent of schools, indicating youth philanthropy core components did incorporate student reflection. Only 71 percent of schools surveyed reported assessing student learning; and, the highest percentage (41 percent) of schools did so through student-led presentations.

Benefits to students are important pieces to consider in the evaluation of philanthropy education programs. Over two-thirds (70 percent) of schools indicated that students realized an increased interest and/or involvement in social and community issues as a result of their participation in philanthropy education programs or courses.

Lastly, nearly two-thirds (64 percent) of schools surveyed indicated philanthropy education programs were funded primarily through student fundraisers with the largest source of program funding derived from designated school funds, as reported by 40 percent of schools.

Schools providing philanthropy education programs exhibited similarities in program components offered, funding sources that supported programs, and student learning assessment techniques.
Differences, however, were present in the contexts within which schools provided philanthropy education programs and activities.
Background

Philanthropy is an important force present in cultures throughout the world harnessing resources in order to improve communities, provide public goods, and create social change. Individuals of all ages, genders, and ethnicities can engage in philanthropy over their life to generously contribute their financial resources, time and talents.

Schools at the K-12 level have implemented unique philanthropy education programs that introduce students to giving and volunteering at an early age. Their philanthropy programs emphasize short-term service-learning activities and also deliver a robust curriculum exploring philanthropy's history, purpose, and ability to improve the world.

However, as interest in philanthropy education at the K-12 level grows, there is a need to better understand the typology of philanthropy education. Curricula under different names, such as community service, civic education, or civic engagement, may all include some elements of philanthropic education. These programs are varied in the extent to which they integrate curricular elements, teaching methods (e.g., service learning, structured reflection), and co-curricular experiences (e.g., club activities, service organizations). This research aims to develop a typology for philanthropy education programs nationally, which will identify specific attributes, characteristics, and curriculum elements of K-12 philanthropy education, and offer a better understanding of the terminology used in philanthropy-related education programs and specific components of programs offered at the K-12 level.

Beginning in November 2012, this study involved three phases to develop a typology of philanthropy education: 1) an extensive review of prior research and existing programs in order to identify important components of philanthropy education; 2) telephone interviews with teachers and administrators at K-12 schools offering philanthropy education programs; and 3) a web-based survey of a random sample of independent schools. Key findings from these three research phases are organized into four sections in this report: Introduction, Methodology, Terminology, Typology, and Conclusions.
We sincerely appreciate the valuable insights provided by all teachers and administrators from K-12 schools in the United States who participated in this study and hope this report will provide both public and independent schools a useful tool for facilitating current and future discussions on K-12 philanthropy education at a national level.
Introduction

Philanthropy has played a critical role in American society, and as a result, nonprofit organizations have become essential partners in the delivery of basic services. Sustained by the work of leaders, volunteers, and donors, the nonprofit sector relies upon the vitality of future generations to continue philanthropic behaviors through giving their time, talent, and treasure (Payton, 1995). Traditions of philanthropy are strongly rooted in societies, but individual actions are the backbone of philanthropy in practice. Research has shown that philanthropy is both an altruistic impulse and a learned behavior (Falco et al., 1998; Schervish, 1997).

In a recent study, Ottoni-Wilhelm et al. (2014) found that young people are more likely to give and volunteer if they have been exposed to both conversations about philanthropy and role-modeling of philanthropic behaviors. Policymakers, educators, and nonprofit leaders have also noted a critical need for empowering young people to understand philanthropy and create pathways to action. Further, more systematic and intentional efforts have been made to expose students to service learning, philanthropy education, and broader civic participation programs (Bjorhovde, 2002a). For example, local and national youth organizations, schools, and community foundations have developed programs designed to instill values and promote civic participation. Additionally, requirements have been instituted in some high schools, colleges, and universities in the form of full courses or extracurricular activities that include philanthropic education (Bringle & Hatcher, 2009).

Philanthropy Education in the U.S.

Though philanthropy in a broad sense seems to have a long history, it was not officially integrated into the K-12 education system until the 1950s when community service and character building were taught in schools (Falk & Nissan, 2007). Pedagogic research in experiential learning and youth development also contributed to the growth of philanthropy education by providing support for youth service, preparing the content of programs in youth organizations, and advocating public policy and federal funding related to youth.
Many youth philanthropy programs have been established since education reform initiatives resurged in the United States in the 1980s and 1990s (Falk & Nissan 2007). Among these programs were Independent Sector (1980), Youth Service America (1986), Youth Leadership Institute (1991), and the Center on Philanthropy at Indiana University (1987). President George H.W. Bush established the Office of National Service in the White House in 1989, and signed the National and Community Service Act in 1990. This law authorized grants to support service learning programs in schools and other national service programs in youth corps, nonprofits, and educational institutions. The Corporation for National and Community Service (CNCS) was created by President Bill Clinton in 1993 to advance President Bush’s previous initiatives in youth service. This organization was composed of Learn and Serve America (LSA) and AmeriCorps. Primarily targeting young people under 18 years of age, LSA provided grants to K-12 schools to encourage students’ participation in volunteer service, conducted research on service learning, and organized training for teachers and administrators (Since beginning this research, LSA has ended due to federal budget cuts.). AmeriCorps provides financial support for young adults to participate in community service.

At the state level, in 1993, Maryland became the first state to require service learning components in schools which included “preparation, action, and reflection components” (Maryland State Department of Education, 2003). These requirements were instituted in elementary, middle, and high schools. Specifically, high school students in Maryland must perform 75 hours of community service to graduate (Smith, 2006). At the regional level, the Chicago Public Schools, around 1997, began requiring students to complete a minimum of 40 service learning hours that can be completed individually or as a part of classroom-based projects. To ensure students are on pace to complete the required hours, sophomores must complete 20 service learning hours before moving on to their junior year (Chicago Public Schools, 2013). Similarly, the Los Angeles Unified School District (LAUSD) has also created a service learning requirement for graduation beginning with the Class of 2007 (Los Angeles Unified School District, n.d.). This requirement, however, does not require a specific number of hours, but instead, students must complete “one high quality service-learning experience” that is either coordinated by the teacher or student, approved by the principal, and must include student reflection. As of 2011, 19 states allowed course credit to be awarded for volunteering or service learning, up from just seven states in 2001 (Sparks, 2013).
Philanthropy education has made great progress since its resurgence in the 1980s. According to the CNCS, in 1984, less than one million students volunteered in the United States. This number increased to 6.1 million in 1997 and 10.6 million in 2004, a figure comparable to approximately 38 percent of school-aged youth (CNCS, 2006; Smith, 2006). Between 1999 and 2008, the percentage of all schools offering community service activities increased from 64 percent to 68 percent, however the percentage of all schools offering service learning decreased from 32 percent to 24 percent during the same time period (CNCS, 2008). Students are exposed to more school-based service as they get older, and those attending private schools are more likely to participate in school-based service than students attending public schools (CNCS, 2006).

With respect to the scope of philanthropy education, programs exist at all school levels, from post-secondary institutions down to primary schools. Other programs are community-based and community-driven. At the university level, service learning and civic engagement are the focus areas of philanthropy education. Since the 1960s, the early pioneers of the service learning movement have explored the basic approach of integrating service with the core educational curriculum. By 2008, more than 1,000 degree-granting institutions offered relevant service learning programs or courses. Moreover, according to one definition of philanthropy education, or “student philanthropy,” Millisor and Olberding (2009) found that 43 colleges and universities provided discipline-specific service learning programs or courses in the United States in areas such as public administration, business and communication, social work, English, sociology, leadership, art, criminal justice, education, philosophy, and theatre. Most of these initiatives began after 2000.

Philanthropy education research has been much more focused on postsecondary institutions and their implementation of community service and service learning initiatives, rather than the philanthropy education activities or programs of K-12 schools. The word “philanthropy” first appeared in an English literary work in the early 17th century and referred to “the habit of doing good” (Sulek, 2010); however, the meaning of this concept has changed within diverse social contexts. A widely used definition of philanthropy in modern times was first referenced as “voluntary action for public good” (Payton, 1988). In educational settings, however, to better facilitate students’ learning, the conceptualization of philanthropy varies according to students’

---

2 According to Olberding (2009, p. 11), student philanthropy is “an experiential learning approach that provides students with the opportunity to study social problems and nonprofit organizations, and then make decisions about investing funds in them.”
grade levels (Agard, 2002). For example, at the middle and high school levels, philanthropy is often defined as “giving, serving, and private citizen action intended for the common good,” and for younger students, it is often defined as “giving time, talent, and treasure, and taking action for common good” (Agard, 2002, p.45). Another recent study Bjorhovde (2002b) found that 11 identified existing philanthropy education curricula were developed independently, and reported “there is little consistency in what is being taught, how it is being presented, and who is doing the teaching” (p 12).

**Terminology of Philanthropy Education**

While Bjorhovde (2002b) identified and assessed curricula used for teaching the subject of philanthropy, the terminology used within this growing field does not appear to be consistent among educators or program providers. Common concepts and definitions within K-12 Philanthropy Education, include:

- **Youth philanthropy**, which according to Nissan (2007), “is the engagement of young people in voluntary giving, service, and association that serves an intended public good.”
- **Philanthropy Education**, which as described by the Learning to Give curriculum, teaches youth about the nonprofit sector and the importance of giving time, talent, and treasure for the common good.
- **Youth Development/Empowerment**, described as “the ongoing growth process in which all youth are engaged in attempting to (a) meet their basic personal and social needs to be safe, feel cared for, be valued, be useful, and be spiritually grounded; and (b) to build skills and competencies that allow them to function and contribute in their daily lives” (Pittman, 2003, p.8).
- **Civic Engagement**, which has been defined as “individual and collective actions designed to identify and address issues of public concern” (American Psychological Association, n.d.).
- **Civic Education**, which has been described as, “the cultivation of the virtues, knowledge, and skills necessary for political participation” (Gutmann, 1987, p. 287).

---

3 Comprehensive definitions of each term provided in full environmental scan that is attached as an appendix.
**Key Types of Philanthropy Education**

As indicated earlier, philanthropy education initiatives were previously designed for and offered to students within postsecondary institutions. However, over time modifications have been made to include K-12 students, and are predicated on the following types of philanthropy education:

- **Character Building**, which has been explained by Falk and Nissan (2007) in terms of prosocial behavior, “The character education and character building programs of schools and youth organizations often involved service to the community, encouraged individual kindness toward and caring for fellow members, and taught personal responsibility” (p. 19).

- **Community Service**, which has been defined by Learning to Give, as “volunteering to improve upon aspects of a community.”

- **Service Learning** that has been defined as a “teaching and learning strategy that integrates meaningful community service with instruction and reflection to enrich the learning experience, teach civic responsibility, and strengthen communities,” (The National Service-Learning Clearinghouse, 2005). A frequent assumption within the field of philanthropy is that service learning exclusively references scholarly contexts and that activities are based in academic coursework (Keen & Hall, 2009).

- **Student Philanthropy**, which according to Olberding (2009, p. 463), is “an experiential learning approach that provides students with the opportunity to study social problems and nonprofit organizations, and then make decisions about investing funds in them.”

- **Youth Grantmaking**, although a relatively new approach of youth philanthropy, has been described as an activity that empowers students to both learn and practice the process of charitable giving through financial grants.

- **Youth Fundraising**, which is described by Learning to Give as engaging youth in “soliciting money to benefit a cause or organization.”

Very few studies have reviewed and evaluated philanthropy education programs nationally, and with the growth of education programs in philanthropy, there is an increasing need to conduct a

---

4, 5 http://www.learningtogive.org
comprehensive review of existing programs and develop a typology for philanthropy education at the K-12 level. More specifically, previous findings necessitate further examination of the terminology used in philanthropy education, the identification of key components of philanthropy education curricula, and the evaluation used to measure quality and consistency of existing curricula. More importantly, these efforts will help facilitate the nationwide discussion on expanding philanthropy education in schools across the United States. Therefore, this study investigated the terminology used in K-12 philanthropy education and the specific attributes, characteristics, and curriculum elements of K-12 philanthropy education.
Methodology

The two main purposes of this research were to develop a typology for philanthropy education programs nationally, and to provide a better understanding of the terminology used in philanthropy-related education programs offered at the K-12 level. The research sought to identify specific attributes, characteristics, and curriculum elements of K-12 philanthropy education and to investigate the vernacular used for philanthropic concepts and core curriculum components at the K-12 level. These aims were addressed by conducting: 1) an extensive environmental scan of prior research and existing programs in order to identify important components of philanthropy education; 2) telephone interviews with teachers and administrators at K-12 schools offering philanthropy education programs; and 3) a web-based survey of a random sample of independent schools.

Environmental Scan

In the first phase, the study reviewed academic research and field-specific reports dedicated to research in the areas of youth philanthropy in the United States. This review identified literature to assist in understanding the history and current state of philanthropy education programs. Specifically, this scan identified the sources of philanthropy education programs derived; who created, initiated, delivered, and financially funded; the content and context of the program; to what grade levels of students programs have been offered; by what means programs have been evaluated; and in what areas of the country have philanthropy education programs existed. An additional focus of the literature review was to investigate how terminology associated with philanthropy education has been both understood and used within the field.

Information contained within the environmental scan was collected from multiple sources, including the following: EBSCOhost databases, Education Resource Information Center (ERIC), Academic Search Premiere, and psycARTICLES. The study also conducted multiple Google Scholar
online searches focused on youth philanthropy programs, concepts, and funding sources. Lastly, information was also obtained from nonprofit organization websites and government agency websites, as well as K-12 and post-secondary school websites that detailed youth philanthropy and philanthropy education information. In the full literature review, presented in the Appendix of this report, more comprehensive program information and additional resources provided by these organizations are detailed.

**Telephone Interviews**

In the second phase, the study conducted semi-structured, open-ended telephone interviews with select philanthropy education K-12 educators and program administrators. The interviews sought to obtain in-depth knowledge about schools' philanthropy education programs, and inquired primarily about which core components of philanthropy education schools offered, how participants defined or understood each core component, how programs were initiated, delivered and maintained, how student outcomes of programs were assessed and how program success was evaluated, as well as what funding sources were available and used to support program components. A total of 10 teachers/program administrators participated in the interviews, representing two public schools and eight private (five secular and three non-secular) from eight different states in the U.S. (two from Kentucky, two from Indiana, and one from each of the following states: Tennessee, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Michigan, New York, and California).

**Web-based Survey**

For the third phase, the study conducted a web-based survey with member schools from the National Association of Independent Schools (NAIS). The NAIS serves member schools in the East, Middle Atlantic, Midwest, New England, Southeast, Southwest, and West regions of the United States. The survey targeted philanthropy education K-12 teachers and program administrators. It sought information about schools' terminology of philanthropy education core components; student engagement in each of the core components; which core components were offered; how and by whom core components were initiated, supported, and maintained; how student outcomes of programs were reflected upon and assessed; how program success was evaluated; and what funding sources were used to support program components. The survey also inquired about the context(s) in which programs were offered, as well as the discontinuation of programs. Content analysis was conducted within the terminology section of the survey. Fisher’s
exact tests were employed to identify significant associations between variables. During February and March of 2014, a total of 128 schools participated in the survey, representing various sizes, locations, and grade levels served. A profile of survey participants is presented below.

**Statistical Significance**

Statistical significance is a term used to describe results that are unlikely to have occurred by chance. Significance is a statistical term that states the level of certainty that a difference or relationship exists.

In this report, *Understanding Philanthropy Education in K-12 Schools*, results are described as statistically significant if there was less than 5 percent probability that the result obtained was due to chance. For this study, if a result is statistically significant, there are two possible explanations. First, the populations really are different, so the conclusion is correct. The difference may be large enough to be scientifically interesting, or it may be small and trivial. Second, the populations are identical. By chance, larger values were obtained in one group and smaller values in the other.

In this study results that are described as not statistically significant are those that do not have less than 5 percent probability that they are due to chance. However, we can still gain valuable information and insight from a result even if it is deemed not statistically significant. An important point to note is that lack of statistical significance does not imply that the results obtained are purely due to chance or due to the nature of the sample that was used; a result may not be statistically meaningful if the number of observations used to obtain the result is a small fraction of the overall sample used in the study.

A result that is not statistically meaningful is still useful, as it conveys information about the sample, but caution should be taken when making inferences about the general population from that result, due to the possibility that the small number of observations may not be representative of the population.
Participating School Profiles in Web-based Survey

The sample in this study was fairly well-distributed by location, with the exception of the Eastern region schools that represented less than 10 percent of the sample. Most schools (62 percent) surveyed were located within suburban locales and enrolled between 501-700 students (26 percent). The sample also included high percentage (85 percent) if day schools and very few (2 percent) boarding schools. Students’ grade levels were also equally represented, however more schools surveyed enrolled middle school students (81 percent) than any other grade level.

---

6 East includes New Jersey, New York
Middle Atlantic includes Delaware, District of Columbia, Maryland, Pennsylvania, Virginia
Midwest includes Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kentucky, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, Ohio, South Dakota, West Virginia, Wisconsin
New England includes Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, Vermont
Southeast includes Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee
Southwest includes Arizona, Arkansas, Colorado, Kansas, Louisiana, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Texas
West includes Alaska, California, Hawaii, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, Oregon, Utah, Washington, Wyoming
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School Local Environment?

- Rural: 18%
- Urban: 33%
- Suburban: 62%

Full-time Student Enrollment

- Under 201: 26%
- 201-300: 19%
- 301-500: 18%
- 501-700: 16%
- More than 700: 22%
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### Type of School

- **Boarding School**: 2%
- **Boarding-Day School**: 10%
- **Day School**: 85%
- **Day-Boarding School**: 4%

### Grade Levels School Supports

- **Grades 9-12**: 68%
- **Grades 6-8**: 81%
- **Grades 1-5**: 69%
- **PreK-K**: 72%
Terminology Used to Describe Core Components of K-12 Philanthropy Education in the U.S.

Terminology used to define core components is an important aspect to understanding philanthropy education at the K-12 level. Previously, attention has neither been paid to the vernacular used to discuss and describe important philanthropy education terms, nor to the similarities and differences of how these terms are understood. The following section provides insight into how K-12 philanthropy education teachers and program administrators define (and often implement) core program components including civic engagement, community service, philanthropy education courses, service clubs, service learning, youth fundraising, and youth grantmaking.

Civic Engagement

Nearly all schools provided a definition of “Civic Engagement.” In addition, many responses described students’ service club participation in their schools, while only a few schools offered no definition of “Civic Engagement.” Definitions of “Civic Engagement” commonly included the following elements: community participation, community service, political participation, citizenship, leadership, and community.

Definition

Community Participation

Community participation is seen as a primary element in civic engagement. For example, one school defined civic engagement as “considering oneself part of a community and thus learning about the community and participating in the work of building and nurturing community over time.” Another
definition claimed that civic engagement necessitates students to be “engaged in the needs and issues facing a community.”

Many schools indicated governance to be at the center of civic engagement. One school argued, “[Civic engagement] is activity to promote quality of life in the community, can have an emphasis on governance, involving political and non-political processes.” Additionally, some definitions suggested specific approaches for civic engagement to influence governance. One school stated individuals should initiate “active participation in the issues important to a community through discourse, service, activism, or other level of involvement.” Another response indicated students should be “participating or attending public local events, including voting, and staying connected to the news in your community,” while another suggestion was to use civic engagement for “building community partnerships through service, education, philanthropy, and outreach.” Lastly, definitions intimated that “being involved in the decision-making of your community” was also critical the governance process.

**Community Service**

The second element in the provided definitions of civic engagement involves community service. For some schools, civic engagement is “participating in activities and organizations that benefit all members of a city, village, or area.” However, in comparison to community service as its own unique term, definitions of civic engagement stressed personal involvement in the longer term. For example, one school defined it as “generally longer term investment of time and resources by an individual to improve her community and her understanding of the complexities of her community.” Another clarification made between definitions of civic engagement and community service lies in that civic engagement is concentrated on long-term problem-solving. The following response accentuated this distinction defining civic engagement as, “community service that extends into the realms of public policy, government service (in office), advocacy and broader communication regarding topics that affect those in need, whose needs we’ve become aware of.
through our personal involvement in lending a hand. It's the beginning of problem solving rather than just working to alleviate the apparent symptoms of an issue/community.”

Naturally, some schools also implied that civic engagement involves service learning because “Students learn about their communities and how they operate. [It] ideally would include an experiential component and reflection.” For this school, civic engagement also “studies a problem and offer solutions.”

Volunteerism was also noted as an element of civic engagement. For example, one school defined civic engagement as “having a developmentally appropriate level of engagement within one’s community whether through volunteerism or community organization.” However, another response emphasized the purpose of civic engagement in providing public good but questioned its voluntariness, “[It] works with an intentional common/social good element. [It] may or may not be voluntary.”

**Political Participation**

The third element included in schools’ definitions of civic engagement was political participation. For example, one school defined civic engagement as “being involved in one’s community, particularly in political matters.” Another school described it as “involvement as a U.S. citizen in government on a small and large scale.”

Schools further discussed how to initiate political participation. One response advised to take “active interest and participation in the political and governance process.” Additionally, several approaches were suggested to practice such participation. The first approach shared was “staying on top of and informed about social and political changes or issues in our community... becoming involved directly where appropriate.” The second approach to initiate political participation encouraged “active attendance at GOs and NGOs associated with local government or service.”
Engaging in service, “service that speaks directly to social change and democracy such as voter registration efforts, youth advocacy, etc.” was suggested as the third approach to initiate political participation. Finally, meaningful participation predicated on direct political action was suggested, “... involvement in local government and their efforts. This could be working with a political party or organization or being involved in youth government organization (e.g., the Mayor's Student Advisory Committee).”

**Citizenship**

The fourth element in civic engagement was citizenship. One school defined civic engagement as “a requirement of all community members. It means demonstrating one's rights and embracing one's personal responsibility to be an active citizen in our democracy.” One response suggested that to perform appropriate citizenship, individuals need “involvement in activities and programs that promote citizenship,” including “interaction with local/national politicians, community leaders, international advocate groups, etc. to develop a better understanding and appreciation for responsibility, governance, citizenship, and individual responsibility” and “being informed, engaged, and advocating for the causes that [students] believe in through various on and off campus experiences.”

**Leadership**

Youth leadership was also regarded as useful in enhancing students’ civic engagement. One school stated, “[it is] important for our youth to learn and apply leadership skills and be empowered to make decisions.” Another response echoed, “[It takes] emphasis on leadership. Empower girls for a global world.” When elements of leadership were incorporated into the definition of civic engagement, its focus was to “make a difference in the civic life of our communities. This difference may be political or non-political.”

**Community**

Finally, many schools surveyed appeared to purposely use the word “community” in a broad sense when including it as an element in defining civic engagement. For example, one respondent described civic engagement as “engaging locally, nationally, or internationally with organizations that focus on community betterment through not-for-profits or political organizations.” Another school emphasized the expanse of community when it described civic engagement as “involvement in civic activities that are local, state, federal and international.”
Students’ Civic Engagement Activity Participation

Schools also included information about their students’ civic engagement participation, which offered a wide range of engagement. One school, with high engagement shared, “Our school is engaging with programs that are run by our township or state.” Other schools indicated civic engagement was important for students and was supported on campus, while another school commented that “[It is] addressed but not as part of a deliberate curriculum.” Finally, other schools reported no civic engagement program at their schools.
Community/Voluntary Service

The majority of schools shared their understanding of the term, “Community/Voluntary Services.” A few schools discussed community service activities at their school, and some schools did not provide their understanding of community service.

Schools defined Community/Voluntary Services (CVS) using a wide-array of concepts, including: unpaid work, voluntary behaviors, benefits to others/community, community engagement and citizenship, and youth development.

Definition

Unpaid Work

Some schools defined CVS as unpaid work. For them, CVS is “doing unpaid work which impacts the community in a positive way,” or “participating in existing programs that benefit others without compensation.” Other schools, although acknowledging the unpaid aspect of CVS, primarily stressed the more altruistic motivations by defining it as “performing actions that would benefit the community at large with no expectation of anything in return.” Some schools even claimed that CVS is “participating in needed service without any expectation of recompense or even acknowledgement just because the service is needed and you are capable of doing it.”

Voluntary Behaviors

Voluntariness is another identified characteristic of CVS. Some schools asserted that CVS must be voluntary. In other words, the activity is performed fully out of one’s own will.

For them, CVS is committing “one's time to charitable causes willingly for the common good, rather than being forced to do so by an authority.” Other schools purported CVS involves “activities in which people voluntarily engage their time to help others.” However, some agreed that CVS sometimes involves involuntary actions. For example, one school denoted CVS as a “service in the community that is done on a voluntary basis that can be mandated by the school or initiated by the student or

Community service is “participating in needed service without any expectation of recompense or even acknowledgement just because the service is needed and you are capable of doing it.”
the student’s family, church, etc.” Although some schools explained that CVS is both unpaid and voluntary, the compensation aspect of the activity emerged as the more important indicator in this concept. For example, one school defined CVS as “Service without pay. [It] can be required or self-directed.”

**Benefits to Others/Community**

Some schools claimed that CVS aims to benefit other people. For instance, one school defined it as “giving time and efforts in service to others.” Similarly, another school defined it as “time and energy and awareness that contributes to programs, events, and/or the enhancement of quality of life for others.” However, importantly, “others” is not restricted to individuals. “Others” might also denote organizations, as one respondent recounted, “individuals, groups, places, and organizations in need.” Many schools incorporated the word “community” in a general sense while other schools expanded community to the broader concept of “environment.” One school defined CVS as “activity in which one's time (not money) is used to meet a need in the community.” For another school, CVS is “helping one’s whole community, those in need (in one's community or outside it), or the environment.”

Definitions denoting service often gave priority to service for people in need. For example, one definition claimed that CVS is “initiating or becoming involved with projects that serve the unmet or under-met needs of people in our community and beyond.” Another school defined it as “active engagement to fulfill a community need and serve an underserve population.” CVS terminology also indicated the concept of “giving back.” For example, one response stated CVS to be “an intrinsic desire to give back to one’s community in service to others or the environment.”

Finally, it is also noteworthy that some responses included the importance of reflection in CVS. For example, “Rather than simply encouraging students to go out and help others, schools should offer an integrated program that highlights the need to act and to reflect on the experience of serving others.”
Community Engagement and Citizenship

CVS is seen as an important channel to students’ participation and engagement in community and society. Schools described it as “an opportunity for students to use their talents and energy in aiding the local and/or larger human populace,” or “activities that engage the student outside of normal classes, often in the community, either school community or larger community, in which the school is located.” For some schools, CVS also involves citizenship beyond the community level, as it was regarded as “a fundamental responsibility for all persons living in a democracy and for all students and adults in our school community;” and therefore, “essential as a member of a democracy.”

Youth Development

CVS is thought of as critical for youth development. It helps build character, develop leadership, and enhance social networks. One respondent agreed that CVS teaches the participant about “putting others before yourself.” Another claimed that “Doing good in the world for others (serves) as a vital part of character development.” CVS is “important for our youth to learn and apply leadership skills and be empowered to make decisions.” Also, CVS “connects our students to local, national, or international communities in need through sustained, meaningful relationships. This work broadens student horizons and makes the world a better place.” For these reasons, one school enthusiastically argued that CVS is “a program that assumes that serving the poor and improving the world is a critical part of a student’s development into a man or woman for others.”

Schools’ Community Service Activities

Among schools who discussed their schools’ community service activities, only one indicated that CVS is not required in his/her school, although offered, “We feel it should (be) personal and inspiring.” The other schools claimed that CVS is integrated into their schools’ curriculum and plays an important role in the community. For example, one school said that CVS is “an integral part of our core curriculum, part of our mission statement, and a priority of our Board of Trustees and Administration.” Another school shared that it is “a part of our curriculum where all students participate in a variety of civic and community service.”
Philanthropy Education Courses

Most schools directly defined the concept “Philanthropy Education Course;” some schools commented about how philanthropy education courses were practiced in their schools; and only a few schools expressed skepticism or criticism of the term.

Definitions provided by schools focused on target participants, course content, teaching methods, and beneficiaries. These characteristics are presented below.

Definition

Target Participants

Most schools noted that students are targeted participants in philanthropic education courses. For example, one school surveyed defined a philanthropy education course as “classes whose focus is on teaching students about philanthropy, i.e. fundraising and volunteering, or otherwise helping with the welfare of others.” However, some other schools extended targeted participants to other groups like nonprofit professionals, donors, and volunteers. For example, one school surveyed defined philanthropy education courses as “learning opportunities for professional fundraisers, organization leaders, and philanthropists,” while another claimed that such education is “for professionals or volunteers seeking greater understanding in philanthropy.”

Course Content

Some schools stressed the importance of charitable giving in philanthropic education by defining it as “formal or informal courses that explain the importance and role of philanthropic giving in our society.” Moreover, another school emphasized its importance in the teaching about charitable giving, “[If] done before attitudes and opinions are calcified, this education can help our students to develop lifelong habits of giving.” But more schools agreed that the term should cover a broader range of philanthropic behaviors. For them, a philanthropy education course is a place “where students learn about giving of their time, talents and resources for the good of the community, without a direct return expected.” Others argued that philanthropy education involves fundraising and even organization development. For one school,
courses are “designed to teach about giving, that includes nonprofit fundraising, and teach how relationships, reputation, and resources for an organization are leveraged.”

Schools surveyed also included key concepts like youth development, service learning, civic engagement, and the nonprofit sector within their definitions of philanthropy education. Some argued that it is “good for our youth because it strengthens the humanitarian part in them and core values . . . and is valuable in teaching children about servant leadership.” Very often, such courses are also seen as a form of service learning, in that these courses were reportedly “aimed at broadening positive engagement and participation by the school community in service learning that may result in significant contributions by students and parents to the school or the great civic community.” Naturally, civic engagement was also a frequently included concept, “[Philanthropy education courses] are new to the scene and critically important as we begin to understand community partnerships and engagement,” because these courses “teach students about the importance and ‘necessity’ of civic engagement.” Finally, the nonprofit sector was also included in the definition of philanthropy education when some schools reported courses “teach students about civil society and the nonprofit sector.”

**Teaching Methods**

Imparting knowledge about philanthropy is regarded as fundamental in philanthropy education classes. For example, some schools simply defined philanthropy education courses as “classes to increase knowledge of giving practices and trends.” Moral and ethical values were also emphasized. Some schools argued that philanthropy education courses provide “a means to ensure intentional, secular instruction of values [that are] often formerly only imparted by families and religious institutions.” These courses, further, “teach people about empathy, giving, ethics, and responsibility and broaden the student’s understanding of the moral and ethical needs of others.”

With respect to skill development, philanthropy education courses teach “how to give money to organizations that matter to you.” Students also are taught to “learn and/or practice the art and craft of philanthropy.” Lastly, philanthropy education courses are often viewed as opportunities to develop skills by engaging participants in philanthropic efforts because they “define and promote philanthropic participation,” and “prepare students to engage in charitable efforts.”
**Beneficiaries**

Participants, other individuals, and community were reported as the beneficiaries of philanthropy education courses. First, participants were reported to be beneficiaries of these courses because they “intended to strengthen one’s ability to make strategic investments of time and resources in the community.” Schools also indicated philanthropy education courses were beneficial for other individuals (recipients) in two respects: “[Philanthropy education courses] encourage students to provide assistance to those less fortunate” and “help others by providing what would be needed for them to succeed and flourish in life.” However, most schools agreed that philanthropy education courses ultimately promote community development—including both schools and the larger not-for-profit sector—as they “educate about the history of the private sector in supporting organizations and responding to community need.”

**Schools’ Practice of Philanthropy Education Courses**

Eight schools noted that they neither offered individual philanthropy education courses nor courses as a part of the curricula; however, five schools reported that philanthropy education courses were involved in other major programs/classes. For example, one school surveyed provided, “We do emphasize leadership education and include lessons on philanthropy.” But most schools reported philanthropy education was being woven into other core courses. One school indicated, “All grades have a seminar in giving back.” In addition, another school commented, “All students are taught about saving, sharing and spending. Philanthropic activities are part of the school culture and help students understand that no matter how young, they can help others with their time, their energy and their resources.”

**Skepticism/Criticism**

A few schools expressed skepticism and even criticism about philanthropy education courses. One school, for example, claimed that these courses are “useless without a vehicle for the real expression of philanthropic urges.” Another school believed that courses dedicated to philanthropy education were “not as effective as the ‘doing’ of philanthropy.”
Service Clubs

Most responses included a consistent definition of “Service Clubs.” Many schools shared the purpose of service clubs. A few responses described students’ service club participation in their schools and a few responses provided skepticism and offered suggestions.

The definition of “Service Clubs” included the following elements: voluntary association, benefits to others/community, youth development and empowerment.

Definition

Voluntary Association

Generally, service clubs were understood as a type of voluntary association; although, there is controversy regarding the role of students in such an organization. Most schools indicated service clubs are organizations fully composed of and led by students. For example, one response stated service clubs to be, “an organized student group focused on providing community service opportunities.” However, other responses intimated that some clubs include both students and faculty. For example, one school defined service clubs as “student driven, faculty supported, all-inclusive groups that serve both the internal and external communities.” Another response described service clubs as “started by students and mentored by teachers.” But, participants are not limited to students; some definitions seemed to suggest participants might also be adults outside of the school using service clubs as “convenient mechanisms for busy people to do community service by organizing projects and facilitating involvement.”

Accordingly, there is disagreement about the context in which service clubs implement activities. Some responses argued that service clubs are “after school and out-of-school time clubs that organize for one-off service events and perhaps have a target or theme for service work.” But some other responses refuted this belief by stating service clubs are “voluntary community service organizations based in schools or other organizations (i.e. Rotary, Lions, Optimists).”
Benefits to Others/Community

Most service clubs were described as community-oriented. For example, one school defined them as “groups of students organized and committed to serving the community and sharing experiences.” But the concept of community may not refer only to the school or local community—people in other places are also included, as noted in the following definition, “clubs whose main focus is serving a community, internal/external, for general/specific populations.” However, not all clubs are specifically community-oriented. For example, one school identified service clubs as “groups of students that gather around a specific cause, social need, mission to work together to make to contribute in a positive way.”

While most responses referred to service in a general sense, some answers specified the types of service, such as activities that deal with hunger, healthcare, and elderly. One school even argued for a benevolent trait in service clubs by defining them as “voluntary nonprofit organizations that meet on a regular basis to perform charitable acts of kindness.”

Youth Development & Empowerment

Service clubs assist in facilitating youth participation in the community. One response described them as “groups of students with a common focus that opens up doors for student involvement. This involvement is not always available to the individual student.” In particular, they can help students to “identify and research issues, concerns and needs of local and global communities - students then share findings with school community and propose a call to action,” as another school shared. Very often, as purported in this response, service clubs “provide members with opportunities to participate in community service.”

While engaging individuals in the community, service clubs remain conducive to youth development and empowerment. They have been realized as “opportunities for students to explore
Understanding Philanthropy Education in K-12 Schools: A Typology

their interests and passions with others in the community,” and are “central to the ongoing development of student willingness to serve the common and great good/need of others.” Further, as another school defined, service clubs “provide leadership opportunities for students,” and “shape their personalities.” Finally, service clubs empower youth and help them initiate real change, as one respondent explains:

[They are] able to provide safe-havens for students as they find their places in the social scheme of the high school experience AND are also places where students are able to learn about how their efforts, small and large, can make a difference in the lives of those in need. With creativity and dedicated adult guidance, these clubs can be effective in exposing students to the topics of current needs, empowering students to choose their areas engagement. For many students, the service club is the first introduction to the powerful learning opportunity that lending a hand can provide, benefitting the care/service recipient but also benefitting the care/service provider. At all levels, it's imperative to keep in mind the philosophy of mutual benefit of both parties, those serving and those being served. One must be cautious to not reinforce stereotypes.

Purpose of Service Clubs

Providing direct service is regarded as the primary purpose of service clubs, as evidenced by one definition, “clubs in which the primary objective is providing service to others.” But some schools argued that service clubs may also play an intermediary role in assisting other organizations. This notion, for example, is realized by the following definition of service clubs, “donating time to assist other charity organizations or participate/create projects that help the community.”

In addition to direct service, service clubs may also focus on fundraising or advocacy activities. One school responded that a service club, “raises awareness, and often funds, for charities, causes and organizations in need of support.” Sometimes, service clubs address the needs of other organizations “such as Rotary, Lions Club, etc. . . where members work together to raise money for identified charitable organizations or perform good works for those organizations.”

Other times, service clubs were described as a vehicle promoting open dialogue and collective decision-making. For example, one response indicated that service clubs “allow participants to discuss and agree on how the group would like to invest their time and resources in the community. This could lead to better understanding of the issues.” Another school echoed a non-direct service approach of service clubs, stating them to be “discussion-based groups on different social issues.”
Students’ Service Club Participation

Many schools also shared some examples and described the practice of service clubs in their schools. Examples included Roots and Shoots; Team Change; Gay, Straight Alliance (GSA); National Charity League (NCL); Girl Scouts; and Boy Scouts. With respect to schools’ involvement with service clubs, more responses indicated satisfaction with students’ service club participation, while a few schools noted that their students are not sufficiently engaged in service clubs. For example, one school commented, “[A service club] is a significant component of our program. Of the 40 plus student organizations in the upper school alone, over half of them are focused on service. Examples include Key Club, Girls Scouts, Amnesty International, and many, many more. Throughout our 108 years, service clubs have been an important aspect of school life.” Another response indicated that service clubs were, “very active and important to the life of our school.”

Skepticism/Suggestions

Some schools, presented their skepticism about and suggestions for improved service club participation. One school, specifically noted its skepticism and disappointment with the lifecycle of service clubs “Sadly, in many cases, [they are] aging out and not replacing membership with younger participants.” Another school offered a suggestion for increasing the effectiveness of service clubs, “[Service clubs] are most useful when they lead to service and not resume-building or an excuse for socializing.”
Service Learning

Most responses included specific definitions of “Service Learning.” A few responses described students’ service learning participation in their schools while some schools offered no definition of “Service Learning.”

The definition of “Service Learning” included the following elements: learning through service, community service, philanthropy education, civic engagement, youth empowerment, and reflection.

Definition

Learning through Service

For most schools, service learning is primarily an educational approach to enhance student learning. One school defined it as “education that is conducted or enhanced through participation in a form of service to others.” More specifically, service learning is seen as an experiential approach through which students’ learning is improved as a result of their direct participation in actual life encounters. For example, another response described service learning as “a highly effective teaching/learning tool that allows students to make real-world connections between their classroom/textbook learning and community needs. This experiential education methodology empowers & inspires students to utilize the skills & content learned within the walls of their classrooms in a setting that truly requires their efforts to meet critical needs.”

Some schools indicated that learning was coupled with volunteer work as service learning provides “the opportunity to volunteer for an organization or on a project which helps the community and in turn, provides important skill training or other education for the volunteer.” Others also argued that it “goes beyond merely "volunteering" and must also provide an educational component as well.”
Specific approaches to service learning were also discussed in schools’ responses. One response suggested that service learning involves “framing out an issue in class, going to the field to address the issue, returning to the class and responding by sharing the lessons learned and how they relate to the academic work.” Another response included the consideration of “learning through giving, taking part and cultivating something bigger than yourself through hands on activities.”

Finally, service learning was often defined as involving a deliberately constructed curriculum. For example, one school affirmed that service learning serves as “a component of a curriculum which is designed to teach students how become active in their communities in a specific way.” Another school defined it as “curriculum that embeds the concept of contributing, giving back, helping those in greater need than the student, in the day to day life of the school.” These definitions illustrated the importance of a prescribed curriculum, as course work was repeatedly identified as an important component of service learning, which provides “hands-on volunteer experiences combined with academic course work.”

Community Service

Another element noted within service learning is community service. For example, one school indicated service learning is “community service with an educational component involving planning, action, and reflection.” Naturally, the community service perspective understands service learning as more service-oriented, for example, “participation in programs designed to benefit certain segments of the community.” Moreover, such community service is not limited to the local community, as another response stated, “[Service learning] provides a hands-on service, whether it be in the local community or overseas, while being exposed to the cultural needs, obstacles, trends, etc. of a specific cause.” Some responses also emphasized a specific context in which service learning should occur and indicated that it may be mandated of students rather than volitional, “[Service Learning is another name for community service, typically in a school setting and coupled with a mandatory requirement for certificate or diploma.”
For some schools, service learning has community improvement as its ultimate goal. In this way, service learning was described as “learning with a focus on how we can serve a community--either through theme, or problem solving.” Further, another school explained the term as “the combination of intellectual and professional development to learn specific academic content in the context of addressing social issues,” because service learning “engages problem solving and critical thinking skills through relevant experiences that contribute to the greater community.” Moreover, service learning helps participants acquire greater understanding of the community by “not only performing service, but learning the whys and hows and values of doing so.” However, in this sense, some responses emphatically disentangled service learning from community service by concluding that “[Service learning] is better than community service in that the activities are not one way so that students’ biases and prejudices can be challenged by more real interactions with people different from them.”

One final understanding of service learning considered a combination of learning and service in which both elements are equally valued and important. One response explained service learning to be “a method of teaching or approach to service that emphasizes both the service and the learning that occurs from the experience.” Another school echoed this notion stating service learning is “a combination of specific learning outcomes tied to important social or civic activities.” Finally, another school revealed how this symbiotic relationship between learning and service was manifest, when it was described simply as the “integration of community service and the curriculum such that the community service component reinforces, deepens, or broadens learning and meets a community need.”

**Philanthropy Education**

The third element schools included in their explanation of service learning is philanthropy education. In addition to service and academic learning within any course, many schools indicated that service learning was most impactful when it was incorporated within philanthropy education course. For example, one response defined service learning as “a more comprehensive approach to educating students about philanthropy. This might include understanding budgets, boards, laws, volunteer engagement, etc. Ideally it would culminate with the students developing a meaningful and sustainable program to support an existing non-profit or to support an underserved
group/need.” Other ways in which service learning was aligned with philanthropy education courses included the mention of specific philanthropic outcomes like providing a means to “understand their responsibility to give some of their time to others,” and “learn how to care enough for others to serve them unselfishly,” as well as to realize “the power of giving.”

**Civic Engagement**

The fourth component identified as an element in service learning is civic engagement. One school succinctly described it as “a form of learning that encourages civic engagement as well as personal reflection and a sense of responsibility in devoting time to community service.” Another response stated that service learning serves as “designed educational experiences that integrate student learning into their place and community.” Service learning also involves “building the notion of community service into the curriculum. The goal is to make community service more meaningful through enhanced engagement.” Student engagement can be achieved as a part of service learning “through generating ideas, researching what is needed, and deciding how to help and educate others about the need.”

**Youth Empowerment**

Many schools described service learning as another context through which youth empowerment is achieved, because it serves as “a method of educating people about the challenges in their communities and empowering them to overcome them.” Another response indicated how service learning has the power to empower youth by explaining that it “identifies a problem and offers significant solutions” and provides “knowledge of how to work as a civic and service leader.” Some schools argued that service learning provides many opportunities for youth empowerment in that “[Service learning] engages our students, enhances our curriculum, affirms character values, and builds relationships in the community, locally and globally.”

**Reflection**

Not surprisingly, many schools mentioned reflection when defining service learning. One response claimed, “There should be time for reflection built into service learning.” Some other schools defined it as “learning through doing and reflecting on what was done,” or “service that incorporates learning through connection, debriefing and reflection.” Other responses were thoughtful about what kind of reflection was necessary and commented, “reflection on given
service in order to learn more about oneself as well as the effects the service has on the school and the broader community, because learning is mutual and collaborative, not limited to our own girls learning, but learning with the people with whom we work.”

**Students’ Service Learning Participation**

Schools also shared how and why their schools’ students participated in service learning. One school shared the pervasiveness of service learning, stating, “[It is] taught and is integral to our school and all classes participate in service learning through Religion. Service is integrated into other classes continuously as a high value we hold.” Another school noted that service learning is “required for graduation (50 hours). The majority of that time must be actively spent in direct contact with the people in the community served.” Finally, one school elaborated about how service learning operates across many contexts:

Service learning has been part of our program for many years but has become a priority over the past five years. Our Science Department has taken the lead, particularly the environmental science program through school-wide and community recycling and through organic gardening (produce taken regularly to the Food Bank). There are many other examples within our Community Service Council and Winter Break experiences when students are working in area agencies and organizations. Faculty are encouraged to seek out opportunities within their academic courses, as well as the clubs that they sponsor.
Youth Fundraising

Most responses included a distinct definition of "Youth Fundraising." A few responses described students' youth fundraising participation in their schools and other responses expressed skepticism or criticism of the term, while some schools offered no definition of “Youth Fundraising.”

The definition of “Youth Fundraising” included the following elements: method of raising funds, youth raising funds, service learning, youth engagement, and youth empowerment.

Definition

Method of Raising Funds

Many schools defined youth fundraising simply as a fundraising method, or as “intentional activity seeking tangible donations.” Responses indicated that youth fundraising also can be leveraged to provide “an opportunity for youth to market goods and services within their peer group as well as the community in order to raise funds for an interest group.” It is noteworthy that often these activities were understood to be guided in that they engage “children raising funds but not by asking their parents for money. Rather with them doing work or other challenges to raise funds.”

Further, schools stated that youth fundraising is realized “through various vehicles including bake sales, charitable walks, free dress days, the annual trade fair.” One school’s definition asserted a specific context in that the activities occur. “Often for youth this fundraising is event-focused.”

Youth Raising Funds

As a part of youth fundraising activities, students often initiate and manage fundraising activities. One school directly described youth fundraising as “fundraising by kids and young adults in which youth take ownership of collecting funds for a particular cause, group or individual, for a positive benefit.” However, there were discrepancies about who benefited from the fundraising. Some schools assumed it as “fundraising that benefits youth” in which young people “raise money for something they want to do and cannot afford” such as “a trip or new uniforms.” In this case, youth fundraising may prove to be “more often an opportunity for kids to reach into their parent’s
Youth fundraising is “fundraising by kids and young adults in which youth take ownership of collecting funds for a particular cause, group or individual, for a positive benefit.” But other responses revealed that youth fundraising either empowers students to raise funds “for a charitable cause” or “for other non-profit social service organizations.”

**Service Learning**

Youth fundraising was identified as an opportunity for service learning in that it engages students in “learning about and participating in direct solicitations and allocation.” For example, the experience of youth fundraising was understood to serve as “a way to ensure skilled and experienced adult fundraisers, when done correctly.” Lastly, youth fundraising events were explained as opportunities to promote both experiential and directed learning, “grassroots initiatives that will not only raise funds, but educate a greater audience about the specific cause.”

**Youth Engagement**

Youth engagement was also an identified element of youth fundraising. One school argued that fundraising is “a good act of civic engagement if it leads to interactions with those being helped as in service learning/philanthropy efforts that seek to engage young people or are led by them.” Moreover, youth fundraising was reported to support causes and institutions of interest to students by mobilizing “commitment from young people to put financial resources to use in a social cause” and “raising funds for an identified need for the institution they attend or in support for other charitable organizations both locally or nationally.”

**Youth Empowerment**

Youth fundraising activities were also believed to encourage empowerment for young people by giving them a voice in choosing causes to donate money both individually and collectively. Some definitions stated that fundraising assists them with “developing ideas to raise money for needs they identify” and/or enables them to “raise support for issues about which they care deeply” or “support events and organizations of their choice.” During this process youth are able to learn “specific principles” and “entrepreneurial skills” while they are involved in “identifying causes that
matter and designing campaigns to raise funds to make an impact.” Schools also explained that students learn to “motivate others to join them in order to make a difference.” Moreover, fundraising entails an “important aspect in the youth life as it helps them view the world and give and take. They build other’s futures as theirs were built by others. [Youth fundraising] is a great opportunity to give back and see the growth of the investments.”

**Students’ Youth Fundraising Participation**

Responses indicated that fundraising “is conducted by students.” One school shared, “In the past we have raised money for hurricane victims, cancer research, etc.” Another school reported that “[Youth fundraising] has a long history at our school. Examples include raising $62,000 in one week (2007) for girls’ education in Afghanistan and raising $25,000 in March 2014 with our brother school for cancer (Mission Remission). We have quarterly events through our Community Service program (called Robin Hood) that generate significant funds for the community.” In addition to these positive youth fundraising experiences, other schools provided meaningful and thoughtful responses about both the challenges and opportunities of student participation in youth fundraising:

Support for student initiative is vital, within the framework of the individual institution. There is much to be learned from problem-solving, planning, and carrying out of a particular fund-raising activity, especially if correlated with learning/teaching goals and program. One-shot deals may provide some immediate funding to benefit a community need but a school must be aware of potential donor-fatigue vs the value of the actual dollars. At our school, we reserve some simple fund-raising activities for our immediate response to national and international crisis situations. Yet, even those occurrences provide the opportunity to learn how best to respond to major events, well beyond the days when the needs are high on the world’s radar-screen. Response later on, when the news spotlight is far removed, is also very important. Fund-raising as part of a philanthropy education course provides the opportunity to frame the experience of asking for money in a broader, more sustainable learning context. . .

**Skepticism & Criticism**

Many of the schools expressed their concerns and even criticisms of youth fundraising; and, although these critiques do not provide solutions to expressed concerns, they might assist practitioners in maneuvering the barriers that prevent effective youth fundraising.
Some typical critiques included that youth fundraising was:

- “difficult to sustain in an environment where much is already asked of the families in attendance at a school;”
- “an easy way to encourage slacktivism (raising money, but not connecting emotionally and ethically to a cause).”
- “an oxymoron. [Young people] have no money of their own;”
- “an empty gesture unless students are invested in and knowledgeable about a cause;”
- “a challenge within the environment of an independent school, given the institutional development plans/goals that must be followed. If not well done, families can be lost to the ‘greater cause.’ When well done, the families can develop a strong buy-in to the fund-raising opportunities as a learning opportunity for their students.”
Youth Grantmaking

Most responses included a concrete definition of “Youth Grantmaking.” A few responses described students’ youth grantmaking participation in their schools, while some schools offered no definition of “Youth Grantmaking.”

The definition of “Youth Grantmaking” included the following elements: financial allocations, service learning, and youth empowerment.

Definition

Financial Allocations

Youth grantmaking was defined as a form of grantmaking implemented by young people. For example, one school defined the term as “Young people making choices of where philanthropic dollars are invested.” Some schools indicated it is organized philanthropy. For example, one definition stated it is “youth organizations making decisions about allocations of grant funds.”

Youth grantmaking is “an effort of organized philanthropy by which a youth club, etc. designates funds for a specific purpose, organization, etc.”

However, there was disagreement about whether youth are the granters of funds or the recipients of funds. Most schools agreed that the grant is designated for the benefit of another organization/individual, indicating it is “an effort of organized philanthropy by which a youth club, etc. designates funds for a specific purpose, organization, etc.” However, some responses argued that youth are the recipients of such grantmaking activities. For example, one response stated that “[Youth grantmaking] is students researching and identifying needs and resources to solve a problem and then submitting a proposal for consideration and children writing grants and proposals in order to be awarded money for various projects.”

Moreover, while this term does not directly suggest that there are target beneficiaries of grantmaking, most schools reported that nonprofit organizations or “the community” are likely the grant recipients, as provided in the following definitions: “Students giving money to others for a purpose” or “students giving money to a cause or nonprofit.” However, some schools revealed
youth to be the predominant beneficiaries. For these schools, grantmaking represents “foundation grants that support youth entities” or “grants by adult philanthropic organizations directly to youth for projects of the youth’s own design.”

Another element of this term to be considered is the source of the designated grant. Most schools assumed that such funding comes from a third party like a foundation; although many responses indicated the belief that youth are responsible for raising and distributing the funds. For example, one response described youth grantmaking as “Students soliciting, reviewing and awarding grants to organizations that propose projects that need to be underwritten.” Other schools ignored the difference in the two approaches by identifying youth grantmaking as “Young people either raising their own dollars or being given dollars to then put out RFPs, evaluate proposals, and make decisions about how the money should be donated.”

**Service Learning**

Youth grantmaking was also described as an important approach for service learning. For example, one school stated, “The process allows for creative engagement with local non-profit agencies, other educational institutions, and governmental bodies. It’s an effective method of service-learning, developing real-world skills and knowledge in the student (and adult) participants.” Further, it was explained as an activity to encourage students to “understand the deeper issues surrounding a problem and determining if instrumental support can be helpful.”

In most definitions of the term, responses illustrated that students learn “the skills of evaluating the metrics of a particular non-profit or group and making decisions based on that analysis.” Schools believed that such experience helps students “understand some of the behind-the-scenes aspects of philanthropy.” Grantmaking, therefore, is “a way to ensure skilled and experienced adult grantmakers when done correctly” because youth are engaged in “researching, presenting, and assessing the charitable NPO’s, effectively nominating organizations to receive grants, then deliberating and reaching conclusions on distribution of philanthropic funds.” While a majority of
responses identified youth grantmaking as youth granting funds to others, other definitions revealed some schools understood the term to mean that youth were recipients of grant funding. This notion is explicated by one of the schools stating that students learn “how to write grants and appeal to foundations and others to gain those funds necessary to carry out philanthropic goals or community service objectives” while participating in youth grantmaking.

**Youth Empowerment**

Youth grantmaking was also reported to influence youth empowerment in creating valued social change or specifically, “empowering young people to give grants to others for the purpose of bettering the world;” and “teaching our youth to make a difference.” In particular, youth grantmaking afforded students the opportunity to award “valuable and significant grants designed to develop philanthropy skills in young people.” These activities were also noted to encourage youth to “come together to gain leadership skills and voice their opinions that address community issues,” while providing them “the opportunity to examine issues and impacting these issues through grants.”

**Students’ Youth Grantmaking Participation**

While only a few definitions provided information about student participation in individual schools’ youth grantmaking programs, one school’s response enthusiastically presented the youth grantmaking activities available to its students:

[Youth grantmaking] is an important part of our Community Service Program (called Robin Hood) that has been in existence for over 60 years and issues annual grants and our students run a mini "united way" review process to grant the funds that they raise to community organizations. On an individual basis, three of our students (over the past two years) have initiated their own foundations for specific causes (cancer and education) and grants are made through those organizations.

Another definition shared information about the widespread youth grantmaking activities offered at one school, “All grades have seminars in giving back and grant proposals.” While infrequently, some responses indicated that youth grantmaking has been incorporated into schools’ curricula or launched on campus through special programs. However, other schools reported they did not offer any kind of youth grantmaking activities or programs to their students.
Conclusion

This analysis of terminology attempted to illustrate the similarities and differences in how K-12 schools understood and implemented core components of philanthropy education. While responses were sometimes diverse in schools’ attempts to define the core components of philanthropy education, this analysis revealed that there are many common elements identified within many of these terms. Additionally, when schools were not able to offer concise or succinct definitions of terms, many of the common elements were elucidated through schools’ explanations of how students participated in core component activities or events. Two recurring themes were present in schools’ understanding of philanthropy education core components. First, many of the terms contained elements of other philanthropy education core components, as demonstrated in schools’ definitions of service learning, for example, which often included elements of community service. The second area of consistency was that irrespective of what term was being defined, student empowerment and engagement in community were often key elements included in the schools’ explanation of each core component, suggesting that even if the approach is different, there are commonly identified outcomes. Two important areas where consistency was not noted, however, was the context in which schools delivered each of the components. While many schools offered programs, courses, and/or activities during the school day, others indicated they disseminated similar content after the school day had concluded. Moreover, the recipients of philanthropy education activities were often inconsistent, as demonstrated within schools’ definitions of youth grantmaking. While individual responses did sometimes contain variation in the more minute descriptives used to define core philanthropy education components, schools generally used common terminology when sharing their understanding of philanthropy education components.
Typology of K-12 Philanthropy Education in the U.S.

Philanthropy education, or “the engagement of young people in voluntary giving, service, and association that serves an intended public good”\(^7\) is expanding in schools across the country. With the growth of education programs in philanthropy, there has also been an increasing need to conduct a comprehensive review of existing programs and to develop a typology for philanthropy education at the K-12 level. One main purpose of this study was to investigate the types of philanthropy education programs that are currently offered at K-12 schools across the country and identify the similarities and differences of these programs. During the first quarter of 2014, 128 independent schools representing elementary, middle, and high school – level students from the East, Middle Atlantic, Midwest, New England, Southeast, Southwest, and West regions of the United States reported on the *Who, What, Where, Why,* and *How* of their philanthropy education programs. This section provides a typology with regional (location) and grade-level differences presented where warranted.

---

\(^7\) Nissan (2007)
Exposure to Philanthropy Education Programs

This first section focuses on who is participating in philanthropy education programs, with regional and grade-level participation examined.

Participating Students

Schools were asked how many students participated in philanthropy education activities during the past year. Nearly three quarters (72 percent) of schools reported that at least half of their student population was engaged in philanthropy activities, while nearly a quarter of schools (23 percent) indicated 25 percent or fewer students were involved.
Participation remained fairly stable during at the time schools completed the survey, with just slightly fewer schools (70 percent) indicating that at least half of their student population was currently engaged in philanthropy education activities and a quarter of students (25 percent) reported 25 percent or fewer students were involved.
Student participation in philanthropy education programs did not differ significantly within the sample, either by location or grade level. However, variation was seen in schools from the West, who most frequently (37 percent) indicated a lot of their students were engaged in philanthropy education programs and in the Southeastern schools, who equally reported (43 percent) either a lot of students or all students were engaged in philanthropy education programs. By contrast, the Mid-Atlantic region had the highest percentage of schools (13 percent) reporting no students were involved in philanthropy education, while the Southwest, New England, and East region schools had no reports of students who were not engaged.
Participation by grade level showed the least variation of responses, although interestingly, elementary schools most frequently reported that no students (7 percent) were engaged in philanthropy education programs.
Content of Philanthropy Education Programs

In this section, the core curriculum components of philanthropy education at the K-12 level and which schools offer them will be explored. Student reflection methods and student learning assessments are also discussed.

Core Components

Nearly all schools (89 percent) surveyed reported offering some component of philanthropy education to students. Community service was the most commonly provided activity (97 percent), although only a little over a third (37 percent) of schools surveyed have provided opportunities for youth grantmaking and less than a fifth (18 percent) of surveyed schools have ever offered philanthropy education courses. However, once philanthropy education components were provided, they tended to remain, with no program experiencing more than a 10 percent attrition rate.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Philanthropy Education Courses</th>
<th>Currently Active</th>
<th>Inactive or Terminated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community Service</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic Engagement</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Clubs</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Learning Projects</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Fundraising</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Grantmaking</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Of the schools reporting ever offering philanthropy education core components, at least three-fourths (75 percent) are currently providing the same components, and in many regions, 100 percent of schools that ever offered specific core components are currently offering the same components.

**Community Service**

Community service was the most common (98 percent) philanthropy education core component ever offered among schools, and a majority of schools (97 percent) are currently offering opportunities in each location and at each grade level. Community service opportunities did not vary by grade level; however, there appear to be regional differences in its offering with fewer East (88 percent) and Southwest (94 percent) schools providing opportunities. Schools (n=112) varied in whether the opportunity was offered in a co-curricular or extracurricular context, however.

**Youth Fundraising**

Nearly all (95 percent) schools (n=115) indicated they had ever offered youth fundraising opportunities to their students and 84 percent are currently providing youth fundraising experiences. As the table below illustrates, the greatest reduction in youth fundraising opportunities was seen in the Midwest, where 100 percent of schools reported ever offering youth fundraising experiences, and currently only about three-fourths (77 percent) of schools in that location offer youth fundraising opportunities. Additionally, schools were varied in whether the youth fundraising components were offered in co-curricular or extracurricular contexts.

**Civic Engagement**

Nearly three-quarters (74 percent) of schools (n=116) indicated they had ever offered civic engagement activities to their students and 64 percent are currently providing civic engagement activities. These figures hold constant across grade levels, although differences were noted by location. A much lower percentage of schools in the West reported either ever offering (59 percent) or currently offering (85 percent) civic engagement opportunities than any other location, while the Mid-Atlantic schools most frequently (93 percent) reported ever offering this component. Additionally, the context in which they are offered is widely disparate.
Service Clubs

Almost three-quarters (73 percent) of schools (n=116) indicated they had ever offered service clubs to their students and 68 percent are currently providing service clubs. While there did not appear to be much variation across location, with the exception of schools in the West and the Middle Atlantic regions who reported lower percentages (59 percent and 60 percent, respectively) of service club offerings. The data also revealed a slightly higher percentage (94 percent) of middle schools and high schools offered service clubs than did elementary schools (86 percent). These activities were mostly reported to be offered in an extracurricular context.

Service Learning

Close to three-quarters (72 percent) of schools (n=115) indicated they had ever offered service learning projects or classes to their students and nearly two-thirds (66 percent) are currently providing service learning projects or classes. The Southeast reported both the lowest percentage (48 percent) of ever offering service learning projects or classes and the lowest percentage (80 percent) of currently offering service learning projects or classes. Schools reported offering these activities and classes either as a part of or in tandem with course curricula.

Youth Grantmaking

A little over a third (39 percent) of schools (n=115) indicated they had ever offered youth grantmaking activities to their students and only little more than a third (37 percent) are currently providing youth grantmaking activities. While a majority of schools do not offer this core component, findings indicated that if schools do offer youth grantmaking, no less than three-quarters (75 percent) continue to provide these activities. Although the context within which youth grantmaking was offered did not vary by grade level, differences were reported across location.

Philanthropy Education Courses

One-fifth (20 percent) of schools (n=116) indicated they had ever offered philanthropy education courses to their students and a little less than one-fifth (18 percent) are currently providing youth philanthropy courses. A higher percentage of schools in both the Mid-Atlantic and Southeast region (33 percent) had ever offered philanthropy education courses, although these two
regions also indicated the lowest percentages (80 percent and 86 percent, respectively) of courses currently being offered. The context within which youth philanthropy courses were offered was predominantly reported as curricular across grade levels, however among schools’ locations responses varied with curricular, co-curricular, and extracurricular contexts being reported.

The survey asked which philanthropy education content areas were taught as a part of schools’ philanthropy education courses. Nearly three-quarters (71 percent) of schools (n=21) indicated their schools focused on the scope, practice, and value of the nonprofit sector; although, results also revealed that the percentage of high schools dedicated to examining the history and traditions of philanthropy significantly differed from middle schools and elementary schools.

The survey also inquired about what concepts philanthropy education courses taught students and in what activities these courses engaged students. Eighty-one percent of schools reported that courses educated students about raising money for charitable causes, while 85 percent engaged students in researching nonprofit organizations. There was little variation in these results across grade level.

**Content Focus of Philanthropy Education Courses**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Elementary Schools</th>
<th>Middle Schools</th>
<th>High Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>History and traditions of philanthropy in the local community and/or in the U.S. (including the language, behaviors, and people)</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>80%*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The scope, practice, and value of the nonprofit sector</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth engagement in/contribution to community and society</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* High school results are statistically different from middle schools and elementary schools.
The survey asked who most often initiated each of the philanthropy education core components, as well as who had primary responsibility for organizing and delivering these core components. Most schools surveyed indicated faculty were the primary initiators of all programs, with the exception of two components. Seventy percent of respondents indicated students initiated youth fundraising activities and nearly half (49 percent) of surveyed schools reported students began service clubs.

Similarly, faculty, as a part of their teaching course load, were responsible for the delivery of philanthropy education core components. Again, exception was noted with youth fundraising, where nearly half (45 percent) of schools reported students were responsible for implementing activities.
Evaluation of Student Reflection

Reflection is often an important characteristic in philanthropy education, as it is a pathway through which students are able to thoughtfully and meaningfully consider the activities and/or courses in which they've participated. While 92 percent of schools surveyed (n=114) indicated they asked students to reflect on their philanthropy education-related activities, only about one-third (32 percent) allowed students to creatively reflect on their experiences, while over half of schools reported the use of linguistic techniques as a means of student reflection. More specifically, schools reported structured dialogue with others (61 percent) and unstructured dialogue with others (52 percent) and written activities (54 percent) as the three most frequently used reflection techniques; however, results also showed that the percentage of middle schools using written activities as a form of reflection significantly differed from elementary schools or high schools.

*Middle school results are statistically different from elementary schools and high schools.*
Assessment of Student Learning

Understanding whether philanthropy education influenced students’ learning and understanding about particular topics is an area of interest for educators. Surveyed schools (n=114) were asked to identify all the ways in which they assessed the learning outcomes of service and academic initiatives contained within philanthropy education courses and/or activities. Nearly one-third (29 percent) of schools indicated they did not assess student outcomes, and 41 percent of schools indicated they assessed outcomes via student-led presentations. Fewer than a quarter of schools used student surveys (23 percent), course evaluations (10 percent), or tests (2 percent) to evaluate student outcomes. Generally, overall findings did not vary by grade level; however, significant differences were noted both in the use of student surveys by elementary schools and student logs used by middle schools. Regionally, the Mid-Atlantic schools surveyed varied significantly from other regions in their use of student-led presentations as a form of assessment.

*Elementary school results are statistically different from middle schools and high schools.
**Middle school results are statistically different from elementary schools and high schools.

*Mid-Atlantic results are statistically different from other regions.
Interviews with K-12 teachers revealed that assessment of student learning derived from philanthropy education programs can be difficult to measure:

- “Administrators want to know how we keep kids in the school. Well, I think service learning is a great opportunity for that. But that’s not the language teachers use. Teachers don’t use the language of we want kids to stay in the district, we want to keep kids to have decent scores. They use the language of, ‘Hey, my kids are really engaged and they connect to the standards.’”
- “The practice of measuring the outcomes is so fuzzy that administrators don’t always see [the value of philanthropy education].”
Scope of Philanthropy Education Programs

This section examines why these programs were established and discontinued, as well as student outcomes resulting from their participation in philanthropy education programs. Why students might participate in philanthropy education programs—to earn academic credit or to fulfill requirements for graduation—is also explored.

Established Programs

Among surveyed schools (n=114), most reported internal agents as the champions establishing philanthropy education programs, with administrators being the most frequently identified (69 percent). By contrast, external constituents provided neither significant funding nor governmental regulations that facilitated the initiation of philanthropy education programs. Nearly a quarter of schools (24 percent) indicated other reasons for establishing philanthropy education programs; overwhelmingly, “other” represented the mission of the school, which included philanthropic components.

It is not surprising that so many philanthropy education programs were initiated by school administrators, since approximately 25 percent of schools surveyed cited philanthropy as a part of their school’s mission.

- For one school, philanthropy was a deep-rooted tradition. “Our school motto is: Citizen. Scholar. Steward.”
- For another school, philanthropy was a part of its inception. “The school was founded with a philanthropy mission in place.”
- One respondent spoke of how philanthropy education supports her school’s mission to empower students. “[Philanthropy education programs] are in line with our mission, which is to offer a transformative education that imparts a sense of agency to our students.”
Discontinued Programs

Among schools offering philanthropy education programs (n=113), more than half of the schools (52 percent) reported no program discontinuation. In other words, no component within their philanthropy education program had ever been terminated. Nevertheless, when the 23 percent of youth philanthropy programs were not sustainable, what was the cause? The answer appears to be determined by students’ lack of time and interest in the programs offered (70 percent) and not by the unavailability or inaccessibility of philanthropy education lesson plans. These results should be considered judiciously as a quarter (25 percent) of schools did not know whether programs had been previously discontinued or not.

An analysis of data provided by K-12 teachers involved with their school’s philanthropy education program echoed similar reasons for discontinued or unsuccessful program implementation:

“The program has hit some snags this year. It’s not going as well as it has in the past, and our numbers are way down. Well, because this year was the first year we didn’t ask what the kids wanted to do. And, we’ve had to cancel four programs because of that.”
Student Outcomes

When asked to report observed student outcomes resulting from their participation in philanthropy education programs, schools (n=114) mostly (69 percent) indicated increases in students participation in social and community causes, and with more than a third (34 percent) reporting that students had increased their social impact or were behaving in increasingly prosocial ways. Although nearly a quarter of schools indicated “other” observed student outcomes, analyses on these data reveal that leadership skills, increased participation in specific community organizations, and the celebration and appreciation for diversity are among the noted student outcomes. In culmination, these findings indicate both increased engagement in social issues and increased prosocial behaviors are prominent outcomes cultivated through philanthropy education programs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increased interest/involvement in...</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased positive social impact/prosocial...</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased student participation in class</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There were no noticeable changes observed</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased student academic performance</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There has been an increase in student attendance</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data also show that interviewed teachers support these findings, with service to community and behaving prosocially to be among the most important outcomes:

- “This program teaches students more than academics; it teaches empathy and awareness of others.”
- “Service is a tangible piece to character.”
- “Parents love this program. Parents rarely care about [standardized test] scores. They want their kids to be good people. You start to see these intangibles. Those are some of the most important things for parents. ‘Hey, my kid is starting to care about the community. My kid taught his little sister something because he taught these other little kids about bullying.’ The feedback from parents is always very positive; these are the metrics they care about. ‘Is my kid developing into a good person... a good well-rounded person?’”
Academic Credit

Some schools offer academic credit for student participation in philanthropy education programs. However, nearly two-thirds (61 percent) of schools (n=110) reported that students did not receive academic credit for their participation in philanthropy education classes, activities, or events. Among schools offering academic credit for students, service learning activities were most frequently (16 percent) cited as the component for which students received academic credit, followed by both community service and philanthropy education courses (12 percent). Further analysis indicated that surveyed schools in the Southwest (n=18) significantly differed with schools in other regions in not permitting students to earn academic credit for any philanthropy education component.

*Southwest results are statistically different from schools in other regions.
While these overall trends illustrate the landscape of philanthropy education nationally, there were regional distinctions in the activities for which schools offered academic credit. For example, many more New England schools (n=16) offered credit for service learning (36 percent) than philanthropy education classes (7 percent), while surveyed schools from the Southeast (n= 20) and East (n=8) offered academic credit equally (10 percent and 13 percent, respectively) for community service, philanthropy education courses, and service learning activities. Additionally, the schools (11 percent) from the Southwest region also only offered academic credit for students’ completion of philanthropy education courses.
Graduation Requirements

The survey asked schools (n=118) if they had a graduation requirement that included philanthropy education activities. Nearly half of the schools surveyed (46 percent) indicated they required students to engage in anywhere from 10-60 hours per year of community service activities in partial fulfillment of graduation, while nearly as many (42 percent) indicated they did not require any participation in philanthropy education program activities to satisfy graduation prerequisites. Service learning was the second most frequently reported philanthropy education component required for graduation (17 percent). Although regional differences were minimal, as they mostly followed trends of the overall sample, the exception was surveyed schools in the West (n=22) reported a significantly different percentage of service learning activity requirements toward graduation (32 percent) than other regions.

* West results are statistically different from schools in other regions.
Funding of Philanthropy Education Programs

In this section, how philanthropy education programs are financially sustained is presented.

Funding Sources

With regard to funding of philanthropy education programs, student fundraisers play a primary role for more than half of the total schools surveyed (n=114). Nevertheless, designated school funds and parent donations are also predominant sources of funding for K-12 philanthropy education activities and courses; 60 percent and 54 percent of schools, respectively, indicated these sources provide funding for their programs. In contrast, grant funding provided very little financial assistance to surveyed K-12 schools. In fact, only 10 percent of surveyed schools indicated grants from foundations and nonprofit organizations supported philanthropy education programs, while 4 percent of schools reported receiving corporate grants, and no schools indicated they had received government grants.

Philanthropy Education Programs’ Funding Sources

- Student Fundraisers: 64%
- Designated school funds: 60%
- Parent donations: 54%
- Other individual/private donations: 28%
When examining funding source by region, individual regions predominantly follow trends of the overall sample; however, schools located in the East (88 percent), New England (71 percent), and Southeast (60 percent) regions of the United States indicated program funding was more frequently provided from designated school funds than student fundraisers. Moreover, schools in the Southwest (72 percent) and schools in the East (63 percent) indicated higher levels of support derived from parent donations than any of the other regions.
Further, 39 percent of surveyed schools (n=114) indicated the largest source of program funding was provided from designated school funds. Other primary sources of funding reported were parent donations (20 percent) and student fundraisers (18 percent).
Conclusions

The questions posed before the initiation of this study were critical in uncovering the intricacies of philanthropy education in the United States; and, the findings from this study elucidate a few key conclusions about the landscape of philanthropy education at the K-12 level. Schools providing philanthropy education programs exhibited similarities in program components offered, funding sources that supported programs, and student assessment techniques. Differences, however, were present in the contexts within which schools provided philanthropy education programs and activities.

Youth grantmaking and philanthropy education courses have generated a great deal of excitement in the philanthropy education field, recently. Unlike community service and youth fundraising, which nearly every school offered, the former core components necessitate ongoing rigorous academic learning opportunities coupled with “action-based” activities. These components, therefore, generally require a much longer term commitment from both program participants and program administrators. Schools may find it helpful to look beyond the historically offered philanthropy education core components and provide intensive youth grantmaking and philanthropy education courses. Although the potential commitment is greater, increased participation in these components would lay the groundwork for all other philanthropy education core components, and may assist in standardizing terminology as well as the context within which programs are provided.

Diversifying funding streams will be important to the long-term success of philanthropy education programs. Securing internal school resources (e.g., designated school funds, parent donations, and student fundraisers) is an important step in initiating programs; although, schools may be better able to increase the longevity and sustainability of programs by leveraging the support of external funders. In addition to internal funding resources, grants from private and public foundations as well as the government should be sought. In tandem, these heterogeneous sources of funding may also increase program breadth and depth by providing schools with pathways to increased experiential learning, based on the philanthropic activities of these funding sources.

Deepening evaluation methods and strengthening student learning assessments of philanthropy education programs are integral in determining the ongoing success of programs. Schools’ inclusion of objective measures of student academic performance (e.g., increased attendance, improved grade point average, etc.) can augment the richness contained within subjective student assessment and
reflection pieces currently used. Schools are data-driven institutions, and more than ever before they rely on short-term and long-term objective measures of student learning to secure funding and to develop curricula. Integrating academic outcome measures with student reflection and assessment data can help initiate new philanthropy education programs, create more robust programs, and sustain long-running programs by illustrating their value to the development of students.

Explaining their understanding of philanthropy education core components, many schools expressed divergent views in both terminology and the context within which core components are offered. A crucial step in creating consistency within philanthropy education is creating not only common definitions and consistent curricula, but also establishing best practices for how core components are delivered. To do this, it will be important for educators and program administrators to have opportunities to engage with leading field experts and to network with other philanthropy education professionals. Effectively uniting this field is critical to expanding and standardizing the field of philanthropy education.

With an increase in diverse funding streams and an increase in the measurement of academic outcomes, philanthropy education programs at the K-12 level will likely become increasingly common, more robust, and progressively consistent in which program components are delivered in what context.
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Introduction

Philanthropy has played a critical role in American society, and as a result, nonprofit sector organizations have become essential partners in the delivery of basic services. Sustained by the work of leaders, volunteers, and donors, the nonprofit sector relies upon the vitality of future generations to continue philanthropic behaviors through giving their time, talent, and treasure (Payton, 1995). Traditions of philanthropy are strongly rooted in societies, but individual actions are the backbone of philanthropy in practice. Research has shown that philanthropy is both an altruistic impulse and a learned behavior (Falco et al., 1998; Schervish, 1997).

In a recent study, Ottoni-Wilhelm et al. (2014) found that young people are more likely to give and volunteer if they have been exposed to both conversations about philanthropy and role-modeling of philanthropic behaviors. Policymakers, educators, and nonprofit leaders have also noted a critical need for empowering young people to understand philanthropy and create pathways to action. Further, more systematic and intentional efforts have been made to expose students to service learning, philanthropy education, and broader civic participation programs (Bjorhovde, 2002a). For example, local and national youth organizations, schools, and community foundations have developed programs designed to instill values and promote civic participation. Additionally, requirements have been instituted in some high schools, colleges, and universities in the form of full courses or extracurricular activities that include philanthropic education (Bringle & Hatcher, 2009).

Among others, several prominent initiatives of school-based youth philanthropy programs include the AFP-New Jersey Chapter Youth In Philanthropy (YIP) program, El Pomar Youth in Community Service (EPYCS), and Learning to Give (LTG) project (see Falk & Nissan, 2007 for an overview of youth philanthropy programs). EPYCS was created in 1991 with the goal to “[empower] high school students to directly impact their communities through involvement in service, philanthropy, and the nonprofit sector” (El Pomar Foundation, 2013). During the mid-2000s, EPYCS was accessible to over 50 percent of high school students in Colorado. (Since the beginning of this research, it appears the EPYCS program has been discontinued by the El Pomar Foundation. No explanation is available.)

Philanthropy education is not merely restricted to schools. Many programs engage young people in serving their communities. Examples of community-based programs include the Youth
Philanthropy Initiative of Indiana (YPII), AmeriCorps, the Kellogg Youth Initiative Partnerships, the Michigan Community Foundations’ Youth Program, Youth as Resources, the Girl Scouts of the USA, the Boy Scouts of America, the Youth Advocacy Council, 4-H, Future Farmers of America, and Youth and Philanthropy Initiative. YPII has created educational resources to promote philanthropy education among youth and families that are provided through partnerships with community foundations and nonprofit organizations in Indiana. Youth as Resources is also a community-based program focused on empowering youth to assert their voices on how philanthropy can improve their community (“Youth as Resources,” 2013). These initiatives have promoted youth involvement in philanthropy through the development of activities and projects created for K-12 students.

With the growth of education programs in philanthropy, there is a growing need to conduct a comprehensive review of existing programs and develop a typology for philanthropy education at the K-12 level. Very few studies have reviewed and evaluated philanthropy education programs nationally. A study conducted by Bjorhovde (2002b) identified and assessed curricula used for teaching the subject of philanthropy. The study found that the 11 identified existing curricula were developed independently, and “there is little consistency in what is being taught, how it is being presented, and who is doing the teaching” (Bjorhovde, 2002b, 12). The findings from Bjorhovde’s review necessitate further examination of the terminology used in philanthropy education, the identification of key components of philanthropy education curricula, and the evaluation used to measure quality and consistency of existing curricula. More importantly, these efforts will help facilitate the nationwide discussion on expanding philanthropy education in schools across the United States.

**Philanthropy Education in the U.S.**

The word “philanthropy” first appeared in an English literary work in the early 17th century and referred to “the habit of doing good” (Sulek, 2010); however, the meaning of this concept has changed within diverse social contexts. A widely used definition of philanthropy in modern times was first referenced as “voluntary action for public good” (Payton, 1988). In educational settings, however, to better facilitate students’ learning, the conceptualization of philanthropy varies according to students’ grade levels (Agard, 2002). For example, at the middle and high school levels,
philanthropy is often defined as “giving, serving, and private citizen action intended for the common good,” and for younger students, it is often defined as “giving time, talent, and treasure, and taking action for common good” (Agard, 2002, p.45).

Though philanthropy in a broad sense seems to have a long history, it was not officially integrated into the K-12 education system until the 1950s when community service and character building were taught in schools (Falk & Nissan, 2007). Pedagogic research in experiential learning and youth development also contributed to the growth of philanthropy education by providing support for youth service, preparing the content of programs in youth organizations, and advocating public policy and federal funding related to youth.

Many youth philanthropy programs have been established since education reform initiatives resurfaced in the United States in the 1980s and 1990s (Falk & Nissan 2007). Among these programs were Independent Sector (1980), Youth Service America (1986), Youth Leadership Institute (1991), and the Center on Philanthropy at Indiana University (1987). President George H.W. Bush established the Office of National Service in the White House in 1989, and signed the National and Community Service Act in 1990.

This law authorized grants to support service learning programs in schools and other national service programs in youth corps, nonprofits, and educational institutions. The Corporation for National and Community Service (CNCS) was created by President Bill Clinton in 1993 to advance President Bush’s previous initiatives in youth service. This organization was composed of Learn and Serve America (LSA) and AmeriCorps. Primarily targeting young people under 18 years of age, LSA provided grants to K-12 schools to encourage students’ participation in volunteer service, conducted research on service learning, and organized training for teachers and administrators. (Since beginning this research, LSA has ended due to federal budget cuts.) AmeriCorps provides financial support for young adults to participate in community service.

At the state level, in 1993, Maryland became the first state to require service learning components in schools, which included “preparation, action, and reflection components” (Maryland State Department of Education, 2003). These requirements were instituted in elementary, middle, and high schools. Specifically, high school students in Maryland must perform 75 hours of community service to graduate (Smith, 2006). At the regional level, the Chicago Public Schools, around 1997, began requiring students to complete a minimum of 40 service learning hours that can be
completed individually or as a part of classroom-based projects. To ensure students are on pace to complete the required hours, sophomores must complete 20 service learning hours before moving on to their junior year (Chicago Public Schools, 2013). Similarly, the Los Angeles Unified School District (LAUSD) has also created a service learning requirement for graduation beginning with the Class of 2007 (Los Angeles Unified School District, n.d.). This requirement, however, does not require a specific number of hours, but instead, students must complete “one high quality service-learning experience” that is either coordinated by the teacher or student, approved by the principal, and must include student reflection. As of 2011, 19 states allowed course credit to be awarded for volunteering or service learning, up from just seven states in 2001 (Sparks, 2013).

Philanthropy education has made great progress since its resurgence in the 1980s. According to the CNCS, in 1984, fewer than one million students volunteered in the United States. This number increased to 6.1 million in 1997 and 10.6 million in 2004, a figure comparable to approximately 38 percent of school-aged youth (CNCS, 2006; Smith, 2006). Between 1999 and 2008, the percentage of all schools offering community service activities increased from 64 percent to 68 percent; however, the percentage of all schools offering service learning decreased from 32 percent to 24 percent during the same time period (CNCS, 2008). Students are exposed to more school-based service as they get older, and those attending private schools are more likely to participate in school-based service than students attending public schools (CNCS, 2006).

With respect to the scope of philanthropy education, programs exist at all school levels, from postsecondary institutions down to primary schools. Other programs are community-based and community-driven. At the university level, service learning and civic engagement are the focus areas of philanthropy education. Since the 1960s, the early pioneers of the service learning movement have explored the basic approach of integrating service with the core educational curriculum. By 2008, more than 1,000 degree-granting institutions offered relevant service learning programs or courses. Moreover, according to one definition of philanthropy education, or “student philanthropy,”1 Millisor and Olberding (2009) found that 43 colleges and universities provided discipline-specific service learning programs or courses in the United States in areas such as public administration, business and communication, social work, English, sociology, leadership, art, criminal justice, education, philosophy, and theatre. Most of these initiatives began
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1 According to Olberding (2009, p. 11), student philanthropy is “an experiential learning approach that provides students with the opportunity to study social problems and nonprofit organizations, and then make decisions about investing funds in them.”
after 2000. Philanthropy education research has been much more focused on postsecondary institutions and their implementation of community service and service learning initiatives, rather than the philanthropy education activities or programs of K-12 schools. However, past research has investigated other community organizations’ K-12 philanthropy education programs.

**Philanthropy Education Resources**

**Philanthropy Education Programs**

The Association of Fundraising Professionals (AFP) held a summit on youth philanthropy in November 2006 to develop common objectives and strategies to advance a national movement. Falk and Nissan (2007) cited a list of 70 nonprofit organizations as an initial comprehensive list of youth philanthropy organizations that were recommended by AFP's summit participants. The list of organizations to be incorporated in future developments included the American Red Cross, Association of Community Foundations, Boys and Girls Clubs (National), FFA, media outlets, National 4-H Council, NAACP, National ROTC, National Student Government, National Teachers’ Association, Points of Light Foundation, the Salvation Army, UNICEF, United Way, and the YMCA/YWCA. They also provided a brief introduction to 30 organizations invested in youth and collegiate programs promoting community involvement and service, that attended the 2006 AFP Youth In Philanthropy Summit. Among the participants were AFP chapters; AFP YIP program representatives; foundations; Girls, Inc.; Kiwanis International; and Common Cents, an organization linking individuals ages 4-24 years through activities and education to “strengthen their communities through philanthropy and service-learning” (Falk & Nissan, 2007).

**Curricula and Other Learning Materials**

Philanthropy education curricula for K-12 students are not only sparse, but they also are disparate in content. For example, Bjorhovde (2002b) studied 11 philanthropy curricula and found “the number of philanthropy curricula in existence is limited, and many of the organizations whose material is included in the study did not purport to create a comprehensive curriculum to teach philanthropy.” Three of the most robust programs previously examined include:

- Learning to Give (LTG): The K–12 Education in Philanthropy Project. The project was created by The Council of Michigan Foundations in collaboration with leaders from the
nonprofit, higher education, corporate, foundation, and government sectors in 1997. LTG was the initial philanthropy education framework available to educators, offering resources that included over 500 lessons, supporting materials, and publications for teachers’ use. LTG also provided resources for professional development as well as the evaluation, dissemination and replication of the program (Agard, 2002). Currently, LTG has evolved into a resource of over 1,700 philanthropy education curricula and materials that are aligned to Common Core State Standards for K-12 teachers in the United States, and that promote youth philanthropy within global communities like Korea and Japan.

- **Youth as Philanthropists: Developing Habits of Giving and Sharing.** This curriculum was created for 11- to 18-year-olds by Community Partnerships with Youth, Inc. (CPY). The curriculum is specifically created to teach the language and traditions of philanthropy and to promote habits of service in engaging and age-appropriate ways. A similar curriculum, “The Word for Me Is Philanthropy,” educating children about giving of themselves for the purpose of improving the community, was also developed for youth between six and eleven years old (Wakefield, 2002).

- **The AFP New Jersey chapter’s Youth in Philanthropy (YIP):** The New Jersey chapter utilizes two of AFP’s philanthropy models, the teaching program and career-based program. The teaching program utilizes AFP’s high school curriculum program, Making a World of Good©, which emphasizes philanthropy, fundraising, and service. The career-based program exposes high school juniors and seniors to fundraising as a career choice (AFP New Jersey, n.d.). The other two models include an awards program and a mentoring program.

Additionally, 4-H is another organization that has created curricula for philanthropy education. As an international youth organization, 4-H consists of multiple programs with a focus on youth development. According to Nancy Swanson (2002), Executive Director of the South Dakota 4-H Foundation, after the international organization began to struggle financially, a new initiative was created that not only taught youth about philanthropic fundraising but also assisted in easing the organization’s financial burden. This initiative, The Power of YOUth in Philanthropic Fund Raising, is a curriculum consisting of fundraising vocabulary, skill development, and organizational stewardship that educates youth about the “why” of philanthropic fundraising. The curriculum is reinforced by experiential learning, evaluation, and reflection with a five-step process that includes:
1. experiencing the activity (perform or do it);
2. sharing the results, reactions, and observations publicly;
3. processing the learning by discussing, analyzing, or reflecting;
4. generalizing the learning to connect the experience to real-world examples;
5. applying what was learned to a similar or different situation (that is, practice).

Among the many curriculum resources developed for 4-H youth and volunteers are materials dedicated to engaging in citizenship and service learning programs and projects; and, many of these resources have been primarily designed for middle and high school-aged youth.

Service learning and community service are two of the most common philanthropy education components present in K-12 schools, as indicated by the literature. As a result, most philanthropy education curricula are centered on these specific components. In 2008, the National Youth Leadership Council (NYLC) created the K-12 Service Learning Standards for Quality Practice. The eight evidence-based standards were developed to improve the practice of service learning at the K-12 level and include the following elements: meaningful service, links to curriculum, reflection, diversity, youth voice, partnerships, progress monitoring, and duration and intensity (National Youth Leadership Council, 2009). Finally, the most comprehensive service learning resource is provided by the National Service-Learning Clearinghouse, which presents myriad materials and tools to enhance educators’ knowledge and skills and to standardize service learning practice and curricula. The Clearinghouse also provides lists of host organizations and programs; a full list of resources is available on the organization’s website, http://gsn.nylc.org/clearinghouse.

Reflection has been found to be a very important element to the curriculum for philanthropy education. In the 2009 study by Conway, Amel and Gerwien, students showed greater positive personal, social, and citizenship outcomes when the service learning program included structured reflection. This difference is further enhanced when frequent feedback is available from students, staff, or those who have been served. In this way, reflection not only serves as a part of the curriculum, but also provides a means of evaluation.

**Evaluation of Philanthropy Education**

Bringle and Hatcher (2009) found the effects of service learning projects have been sparsely evaluated. Moreover, among the few evaluations, most studies examine the effects of service learning at the post-
secondary level. However, a few program evaluations have been conducted with foci on giving, civic engagement, and prosocial behaviors at the K-12 level. Major evaluation studies include the Michigan State University assessment of the Learning to Give (LTG) lesson plans 1997-2005 (Michigan State University, 2006). In addition, as a relatively early study on youth philanthropy, Bentley and Nissan (1996) reviewed literature on the scope and history of giving and serving behaviors among young people. The research on LTG by Michigan State University found that teachers using LTG lessons believed student behavior was positively affected; the study also revealed that students engaged in LTG curricula appear to be more involved in philanthropy than the national average (Michigan State University Evaluation Team, 2000). Zaff and Lerner (2010) found that service learning, whether voluntary or required, increased student participation in civic participation and service later in life. Further, Billig (2000) sought a broad examination of the effects of service learning. This research indicated service learning positively impacts youth development, civic responsibility, academic skills, career aspirations, and teacher-student interactions; however, the authors accentuated the need for improved research as the results were often predicated on studies of individual programs, of various sizes, that often neither tracked the effects over multiple years nor utilized control groups with a standard definition for service learning (Billig, 2000).

In a 2007 report, Davila and Mora utilized panel data from the National Education Longitudinal Study of 1988. The eighth-grade cohort was tracked through 2000, or beyond the point of possible college graduation. The researchers found that participation in community service as a requirement of a high school course increased a student’s likelihood of graduating college by 18 percent for females and 29 percent for males. Likewise, participation in student government increased a student’s likelihood of graduating college by 19 percent for females but only 11 percent for males. These results illustrate that community service may have a stronger impact on males while holding socioeconomic and demographic characteristics constant (Davila & Mora, 2007).

The effects of philanthropy education on students included two aspects: schoolwork performance and civic engagement. According to the CNCS (2006), students with higher grade point averages are more likely to participate in school-based service, though the causal association is not substantiated.

Understanding Philanthropy Education in K-12 Schools: A Typology
Also, student participation in school-based volunteer service is positively associated with civic engagement indicators such as the likelihood of future volunteering, the sense of personal efficacy, and the interests in current activities and politics. Further, Michigan State University (2005) found that students engaged in the LTG program improved their understanding of philanthropy, increased their volunteer service in schools and communities, and developed a commitment to future engagement. Allen (2002) argued that through participation in voluntary societies, youth can obtain experience in problem solving, learn how institutions function, improve communication skills, and develop confidence and networking skills.

**Major Sponsors and Grantmakers**

Generally, only a handful of public and private organizations support youth philanthropy. Falk and Nissan (2007) identified some of these supporters:

- The Federal Government: The Corporation for National and Community Service (CNCS)
- Private Foundations: the W.K. Kellogg Foundation, Lilly Endowment, the Ewing Marion Kauffman Foundation, PGE Foundation (Oregon), the El Pomar Foundation (Colorado), the Ford Foundation, and the Michigan Community Foundation.

Another prominent pioneer in funding philanthropy education is the Wilbur and Hilda Glenn Family Foundation, which has endowed The Wilbur and Hilda Glenn Institute for Philanthropy and Service Learning at the Westminster Schools. As described on the Westminster Schools webpage, The Glenn Institute “helps educate young people about the principles and practice of philanthropy, supports community service programs, and promotes the value of service learning as an important instructional methodology throughout the school’s curriculum.”

Another rich resource in identifying financial support for philanthropy education is the Foundation Center. The Foundation Center compiles a list of the Top 25 Foundations supporting education; currently, the top five supporters are: Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation, The Andrew W. Mellon Foundation, The William and Flora Hewlett Foundation, Walton Family Foundation, Inc., and the Lilly Endowment, Inc. To see the full list, please visit The Foundation Center website: http://foundationcenter.org/focus/gpf/education/pdf/F_Educ Dom_2007.pdf.

Finally, the Grantmakers for Education, the nation’s largest and most diverse network of
education grantmakers dedicated to improving educational outcomes and increasing opportunities for all learners, also provides information about approximately 280 member organizations that provide grants for education. To view the comprehensive list of organizations, please visit the Grantmakers for Education website: http://www.edfunders.org/our-community/member-directory.

**Terminology and Typology of Philanthropy Education at the K-12 Level**

**Key Concepts**

While Bjorhovde (2002b) identified and assessed curricula used for teaching the subject of philanthropy, the terminology used within this growing field does not appear to be consistent among educators or program providers. The following list provides identified key concepts of K-12 Philanthropy Education, accompanied with common definitions for each term.

**Youth Philanthropy.** According to Nissan (2007), “Youth philanthropy is the engagement of young people in voluntary giving, service, and association that serves an intended public good.” This conceptualization includes the beginnings of teaching philanthropy to children and youth through the demonstration of empathy, caring, helping, and the performance of other prosocial behaviors.

**Philanthropy Education.** As described by the Learning to Give curriculum, philanthropy education teaches youth about the nonprofit sector and the importance of giving time, talent, and treasure for the common good. Philanthropy education teaches principles of philanthropy to youth “by encouraging charitable behavior and empowers them to take voluntary citizen action for the common good in their classrooms, communities, and lives.”

**Youth Development/Empowerment.** Pittman (2003) defined youth development as “the ongoing growth process in which all youth are engaged in attempting to (a) meet their basic personal and social needs to be safe, feel cared for, be valued, be useful, and be spiritually grounded; and (b) to build skills and competencies that allow them to function and contribute in their daily lives” (p.8). A close concept to youth development is youth empowerment, “an attitudinal, structural, and cultural process whereby young people gain the ability, authority, and agency to make decisions and implement change in their own lives and the lives of
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2 http://www.learningtogive.org
Civic Engagement. Civic engagement has been defined as “individual and collective actions designed to identify and address issues of public concern” (American Psychological Association, n.d.). Civic engagement is manifested in many ways that can include individual and organizational volunteerism, as well as participation in elections. Civic engagement implies assembling individuals and communities to attend to an issue and/or to provide solutions to problems. Civic engagement also includes participation in democratic processes. Learning to Give defines civic engagement as “a person’s connections with the life of their communities.”

Civic Education. Civic education has been described as “the cultivation of the virtues, knowledge, and skills necessary for political participation” (Gutmann, 1987, p. 287). The primary aim of civic education is preparing youth to carry out their roles as citizens. Civic education is delivered both through formal instruction (schools) and by informal instruction (within families, communities, libraries, houses of worship, workplaces, civic organizations, unions, sports teams, campaigns and elections, mass media, etc.).

Key Types of Philanthropy Education

As indicated earlier, philanthropy education initiatives were previously designed for and offered to students within postsecondary institutions. However, over time, modifications have been made to include K-12 students, and are predicated on the following types of philanthropy education:

Character Building. Saks (1996, p.1) points out, “In 1918, the National Education Association’s Commission on the Reorganization of Secondary Education identified ‘ethical character’ and ‘citizenship’ among what came to be known as the seven cardinal principles of education.” Further, Falk and Nissan (2007) described character building in terms of prosocial behavior reporting, “The character education and character building programs of schools and youth organizations often involved service to the community, encouraged individual kindness toward and caring for fellow members, and taught personal responsibility” (p. 19).

Community Service. According to the Higher Education Act of 1965, community service includes “services identified by an institution of higher education, through formal or
informal consultation with local nonprofit, governmental, and community-based organizations, as designed to improve the quality of life for community residents, particularly low-income individuals, or to solve particular problems related to their needs.”

Learning to Give defines community service as “volunteering to improve upon aspects of a community,” a definition that is inclusive of K-12 students’ participation.

**Service Learning.** The National Service-Learning Clearinghouse (2005) defined service-learning as a “teaching and learning strategy that integrates meaningful community service with instruction and reflection to enrich the learning experience, teach civic responsibility, and strengthen communities.” A frequent assumption within the field of philanthropy is that service learning exclusively references scholarly contexts and that activities are based in academic coursework (Keen & Hall, 2009). The international youth organization, 4-H, defines service learning as a coordinated service experience between a community service program or school and the community that facilitates youth learning and development.

**Student Philanthropy.** According to Olberding (2009, p.463), student philanthropy is “an experiential learning approach that provides students with the opportunity to study social problems and nonprofit organizations, and then make decisions about investing funds in them.” It includes two models: the traditional direct giving model, in which students are provided a specified amount of money and they choose a cause or organization to donate the funds, and the indirect giving model, which is a competitive process where potential grant recipients must complete proposals and students must review applications, research recipient organizations, and make recommendations to the funding foundation about awarding of the funds.

**Youth Grantmaking.** Youth grantmaking is a relatively new approach of youth philanthropy in which youth are engaged in the indirect giving model of philanthropy. In this way, young people are charged with volunteering in community settings such as schools, faith-based organizations, and community-based organizations, to serve as grantmakers. Using the resources of community foundations, such as United Ways, and programs like Youth as Resources, students both learn and practice the process of charitable giving through financial grants.

---


4 [http://www.learningtogo.give.org](http://www.learningtogo.give.org)
Youth Fundraising. Youth fundraising engages youth in “soliciting money to benefit a cause or organization” (Learning to Give, nd).

Purpose and Approach of Philanthropy Education

The concepts associated with the typology of philanthropy education would seem to indicate the purpose of philanthropy education can generally be classified into three broad categories: civic engagement, youth development, and community prosperity. The goal of young people's learning of and participation in philanthropy has been established to prepare them to be good citizens and individuals, as well as to improve the public good in the community.

In teaching philanthropy, there are four basic approaches including: youth as students (through service learning and philanthropy education courses); youth as volunteers (through community service); youth as charitable donors (through student philanthropy and youth grantmaking); and youth as future citizens (through character building and civic engagement).

Characteristics of School-Based Philanthropy Education

The literature within this scan, in summary, indicates some philanthropy education programs are school- or class-based, meaning they are sponsored or organized by the school administration and teachers, partially or fully incorporated into the curriculum, and may even be associated with students’ earned academic credit. Whereas, community-based programs, in contrast, mainly coordinate and/or partner with community organizations such as churches, youth service organizations, and charitable nonprofits. These programs encourage young people to serve the public good in the community and strive to provide young people with pertinent life skills and the awareness and enthusiasm for community participation.

Generally, there are five groups of sponsors supporting youth philanthropy, which include governments (local, state, and federal); foundations (private and public); and corporations, parents, and teachers/school administrations. An important government sponsor is the Corporation for National and Community Service, which has programs for youth in every state. Foundations are also very influential in promoting philanthropy education, though few are

http://www.learningtogive.org
involved, to date. The third group of sponsors is corporations that establish awards and scholarships to encourage students’ participation (Nissan, 2007). Parents can be a financial sponsor and advocate of philanthropy education programs. Finally, teachers’/school administrations’ provisions may include designated school funds, teaching materials and facilities in support of philanthropy education programs.

**Context of Philanthropy Education**

Youth philanthropy is taught in a variety of ways, such as in-class learning, study groups, student organizations, youth networks, and support systems outside of school. Not all philanthropy education programs have a formal curriculum; as such, some are implemented as extracurricular activities; others are curriculum-based and students receive credit for participation. For curriculum-based programs, curricula have been specifically developed for students at different grade levels and ability levels (Agard, 2002). For example, the generationOn program, with a strong focus on service learning, has been developed integrating LTG lesson plans, and provides 1,600 classes suitable for students in grades K-12. The program encourages students to establish working groups as a means to participate in their programs. Many non-school youth philanthropy programs such as YPII and Michigan Community Foundation’s Youth Project provide knowledge, tools, and grants for students’ participation.

Based on Bjorhovde’s study (2002a), Table 1 compares the basic characteristics of six philanthropy education programs provided to K-12 and college students.

---


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program/Institution</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Knowledge</th>
<th>Skill</th>
<th>Behavior</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Religious philanthropy</td>
<td>Pre-K-12</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>Service learning</td>
<td>Religious philanthropic practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning to Give</td>
<td>K-12</td>
<td>Philanthropy, society, and individuals</td>
<td>Service learning</td>
<td>Giving and service, especially for older students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Association of Fundraising Professionals</td>
<td>Grades 3-5</td>
<td>Concept and importance of philanthropy, reasons to give, and nonprofit organizations</td>
<td>Volunteering and raising money</td>
<td>Volunteering and raising money for community promotion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Partnerships with Youth</td>
<td>K-12</td>
<td>The language, facts, and people of philanthropy; traditions and core values; youth’s responsibilities</td>
<td>Volunteering and giving</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Power of YOUth</td>
<td>K-12</td>
<td>Knowledge of fundraising</td>
<td>Advocating and stewardship; organizational change</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona State University</td>
<td>College</td>
<td>Nonprofit organizations; fundraising; volunteerism;</td>
<td>Nonprofit management</td>
<td>Interning</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Conclusion

Philanthropy education programs created for K-12 students have a long and rich, albeit disparate, history. As this environmental scan illustrates, the program providers, the program components, and the contexts through which these programs have been offered, are neither uniform nor consistent—and have not been standardized by age or grade level of students throughout the United States. Further, the vernacular used across and within program components is not consistent among program providers, making it difficult if not impossible to identify what initiatives are being delivered and to whom. In an attempt to unify the field of philanthropy education at the K-12 level, future research should examine the typology of programs currently being offered. This type of investigation will allow for increased understanding of the current state of philanthropy education, and will also potentially improve the overall health of the field by identifying and comparing programs and/or program components being offered in isolation across the country. Such an examination is the first step in establishing a more cohesive and integrated philanthropy education curriculum for K-12 students.
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## Appendix: Philanthropy Education Typology at a Glance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exposure</th>
<th>Sample of K-12 Independent Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Students Participating in the Last Year</td>
<td>All Students Participating 41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Students Participating Currently</td>
<td>All Students Participating 47%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Scope

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Why Were Activities Established</th>
<th>School's Administration Believed Programs Were Important for Overall Student Growth and Development 69%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Observed Student Outcome</td>
<td>Increase in Student Interest or Involvement in Social and Community Issues 69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Credit Offered</td>
<td>No 61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduation Requirement</td>
<td>Community/ Voluntary Service 46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discontinued Programs</td>
<td>No 52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reason Programs Have Been Discontinued</td>
<td>Lack of Student Interest 39%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Funding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Funding Source</th>
<th>Student Fundraisers 64%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Largest Program Funding Source</td>
<td>Designated School Funds 40%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Student Reflection Method Used</th>
<th>Structured Dialogue with Others 61%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type of Assessment Used to Measure Learning Outcomes</td>
<td>Student-led Presentations 41%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Program Content

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample of K-12 Independent Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Have Offered Community/ Voluntary Service Opportunities</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Currently Offering Community/ Voluntary Service Opportunities</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Context Community/ Voluntary Service Offered</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Who Most Often Initiated These Activities</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Primary Responsibility for Organizing and Delivering These Activities</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Have Offered Youth Fundraising Activities</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Currently Offering Youth Fundraising Activities</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Context Youth Fundraising Offered</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Who Most Often Initiated These Activities</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Primary Responsibility for Organizing and Delivering These Activities</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Have Offered Civic Engagement Activities</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Currently Offering Civic Engagement Activities</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Context Civic Engagement Activities Offered</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Who Most Often Initiated These Activities</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Primary Responsibility for Organizing and Delivering These Activities</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Typology elements represent the highest percentage responses, excluding cells with percentages provided.
## Appendix: Philanthropy Education Typology by Core Component
(Service Clubs, Service Learning, Youth Grantmaking, and Philanthropy Education Courses)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Content</th>
<th>Sample of K-12 Independent Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Have Offered Service Clubs</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Currently Offering Service Clubs</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Context Service Clubs Offered</td>
<td>Extra-curricular 79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who Most Often Initiated These Activities</td>
<td>Students 49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Responsibility for Organizing and Delivering These Activities</td>
<td>Faculty- As a Part of Their Courseload 39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have Offered Service Learning Projects/Classes</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Currently Offering Service Learning Projects/Classes</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Context Service Learning Offered</td>
<td>Curriculum-based 74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who Most Often Initiated These Projects/Classes</td>
<td>Faculty 71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Responsibility for Organizing and Delivering These Projects/Classes</td>
<td>Faculty- As a Part Of Their Courseload 74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have Offered Youth Grantmaking Program</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Currently Offering Youth Grantmaking Program</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Context youth Grantmaking Offered</td>
<td>Co-curricular 67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who Most Often Initiated These Activities</td>
<td>Faculty 40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Responsibility for Organizing and Delivering These Activities</td>
<td>Faculty- As a Part Of Their Courseload 33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have Offered Philanthropy Education Courses</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Currently Offering Philanthropy Education Courses</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Context Philanthropy Education Courses Offered</td>
<td>Curriculum-based and Co-curricular 71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who Most Often Initiated These Courses</td>
<td>Faculty 61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Responsibility for Organizing and Delivering These Courses</td>
<td>Faculty- As a Part Of Their Courseload 57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content Areas Taught in Courses</td>
<td>The Scope, Practice, and Value of Nonprofit Sector 57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concepts about which Students are EDUCATED</td>
<td>Raising Money for Charitable Causes and Donating Money 81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities in that Students ENGAGE</td>
<td>Researching nonprofits that Support Causes Important to Them 86%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Typology elements represent the highest percentage responses, excluding cells with percentages provided.
Appendix: Philanthropy Education Core Components By Grade Level and Region

The following tables detail findings about core components of philanthropy education being offered by both grade level and regional location of the surveyed schools. The tables also display the context within which each component is offered.

*Please note: charts provide the most frequently reported response within the context category.

### Community/Voluntary Service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Elementary</th>
<th>Middle School</th>
<th>High Schools</th>
<th>East</th>
<th>Middle Atlantic</th>
<th>Midwest</th>
<th>New England</th>
<th>Southeast</th>
<th>SouthWest</th>
<th>West</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Have Offered</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community/ Voluntary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Opportunities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Currently Offering</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community/ Voluntary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Opportunities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Voluntary Service      | 71%          | 73%            | 87%           | 100% | 64%             | 92%      | 69%          | 80%        | 71%       | 68% |
| Offered                |              |               |              |      |                 |         |             |           |           |     |

### Youth Fundraising

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Elementary</th>
<th>Middle School</th>
<th>High Schools</th>
<th>East</th>
<th>Middle Atlantic</th>
<th>Midwest</th>
<th>New England</th>
<th>Southeast</th>
<th>SouthWest</th>
<th>West</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Have Offered Youth</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fundraising Activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Currently Offering</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Fundraising</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Fundraising Offered    | 69%          | 69%            | 74%           | 71%  | 64%             | 90%      | 79%          | 78%        | 76%       | 65% |
### Civic Engagement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Elementary</th>
<th>Middle School</th>
<th>High Schools</th>
<th>East</th>
<th>Middle Atlantic</th>
<th>Midwest</th>
<th>New England</th>
<th>Southeast</th>
<th>SouthWest</th>
<th>West</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Have Offered Civic Engagement Activities</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Currently Offering Civic Engagement Activities</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Context Civic Engagement Activities Offered</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Service Clubs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Elementary</th>
<th>Middle School</th>
<th>High Schools</th>
<th>East</th>
<th>Middle Atlantic</th>
<th>Midwest</th>
<th>New England</th>
<th>Southeast</th>
<th>SouthWest</th>
<th>West</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Have Offered Service Clubs</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Currently Offering Service Clubs</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Context Service Clubs Offered</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Service Learning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Elementary</th>
<th>Middle School</th>
<th>High Schools</th>
<th>East</th>
<th>Middle Atlantic</th>
<th>Midwest</th>
<th>New England</th>
<th>Southeast</th>
<th>SouthWest</th>
<th>West</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Have Offered Service Learning Projects/ Classes</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Currently Offering Service Learning Projects/ Classes</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Context Service Learning Offered</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Youth Grantmaking

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Elementary</th>
<th>Middle School</th>
<th>High Schools</th>
<th>East</th>
<th>Middle Atlantic</th>
<th>Midwest</th>
<th>New England</th>
<th>Southeast</th>
<th>SouthWest</th>
<th>West</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Have Offered Youth Grantmaking Program</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Currently Offering Youth Grantmaking Program</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Context youth Grantmaking Offered

|                           | Co-curricular 75% | Co-curricular 68% | Co-curricular 66% | Co-curricular 100% | Co-curricular 80% | Co-curricular and Extra-curricular 67% | Co-curricular 71% | Co-curricular and Extra-curricular 56% | Extra-curricular 63% |

## Philanthropy Education Courses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Elementary</th>
<th>Middle School</th>
<th>High Schools</th>
<th>East</th>
<th>Middle Atlantic</th>
<th>Midwest</th>
<th>New England</th>
<th>Southeast</th>
<th>SouthWest</th>
<th>West</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Have Offered Philanthropy Education Courses</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Currently Offering Philanthropy Education Courses</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Context Philanthropy Education Courses Offered

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Curriculum-based 79%</th>
<th>Curriculum-based 73%</th>
<th>Curriculum-based and Co-curricular 80%</th>
<th>Co-curricular 100%</th>
<th>Curriculum-based and Co-curricular 50%</th>
<th>Curriculum-based and Co-curricular 83%</th>
<th>Curriculum-based and Co-curricular 50%</th>
<th>Extra-curricular 100%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>