



# CSL COMMUNITY PARTNERS EVALUATION REPORT

2013-2019

RAZAK ODURO

## **Community Partner Survey Evaluation Report**

### **Introduction**

This brief evaluation report provides insight into community partners' end of term surveys over the past seven years (from 2013-2019). In particular, we were concerned to highlight the place at which the students provided their service or completed their projects, as well to learn more about the organizational roles held by the mentors and co-educators of our students in CSL. We report here data on the categories of populations served by community partners, the sector categories for our community partners, and the underlying sub-field of community-based agency receiving students. The findings from this evaluation reveal the diversity of settings engaged by CSL students and give indications to the community identified needs that inform CSL students' projects. Additionally, the evaluation provides more data on the kinds of people within organizations doing mentoring for and co-education of our CSL students.

### **Method of Evaluation**

The CSL Evaluation Coordinator used SPSS version 24 to analyze the quantitative data. The analysis included calculating and comparing frequencies over the past seven years. Although these results are to be viewed as exploratory, they may aid community partnership coordinators to: 1) know the extent of community organizations providing mentoring to CSL students; 2) the categories of population served by CSL students; 3) assist in identifying future community sectors that are not currently involve in CSL and; 4) continue to tailor develop effective training resources.

### **Results:**

#### **Populations served by and settings for community partner work**

Table 1 shows the category that best represents the populations served by our community partners. Respondents selected the type of population their organization served. They had the opportunity to choose more than one category.

Table 1. *Category that best represents population served by organizations*

Category of population served	Frequency	Percentage
Children	98	16%
Youth	119	20%
Women	98	16%
Men	80	13%
Seniors	63	10%
General Public	86	14%
Families	18	3%
2SLGBTQ+	4	1%
Other (e.g. newcomers, people with disabilities, homeless etc.)	43	7%
<b>Total</b>	<b>609</b>	<b>100%</b>

### Sector for community partner organizations

Table 2 shows the field or sector of our community partner organizations that best describes the priority areas for community partner organizations.

Table 2. *Sector for community partner organizations*

Sector of community partner	Frequency	Percentage
Hospital/other health settings	32	9%
School	83	24%
Government	29	8%
Community based agency	115	33%
International development agency	5	1%
Other (e.g. seniors day program, private business etc.)	84	25%
<b>Total</b>	<b>348</b>	<b>100%</b>

### Sub-field sector categories of community partner organizations

If they chose community based agency, respondents were also asked to select the sub-field category that best represents the main work of their community based agency.

Table 3. *Sub-field category of the main work of community partner organization*

Sub-field category of organization	Frequency	Percentage
Addictions/Mental Health	31	6%
Arts	16	3%
Child/Youth/Family	56	11%
Criminal Justice	17	3%
Culture and Heritage	24	5%
Disabilities	24	5%
Education – Literacy	36	7%
Education – Skill	41	8%
Employment	15	3%
2SLGBTQ+	15	3%
Public Interest	27	6%
Poverty	40	8%
Religion	9	2%
Seniors	26	5%
Housing	26	5%
Immigrants	33	7%
Environmental	6	1%
Sports and Recreational	3	1%
<b>Other</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>9%</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>487</b>	<b>100%</b>

### Community partner staff providing mentoring

Table 4 shows the roles from which community partner staff provide mentorship to CSL students. This adds data for CSL to have a clearer picture on the positions within organizations actively co-educating and mentoring our students as they complete their community projects.

Table 4. *Role in organization*

Role in organization	Frequency	Percentage
Board Member	7	3%
Executive Officer	30	14%
Program Staff	88	41%
Volunteer	9	4%
Other (e.g. administrator, community engagement coordinator, event organizer etc.)	83	38%
<b>Total</b>	<b>217</b>	<b>100%</b>