



World Vision U.S. Programs
Resources & Relief

FY13 Missions Survey Report

SEPTEMBER 2013

Joyce Lowery
DME Technical Specialist

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements 3

List of Acronyms..... 3

Background..... 3

 Introduction.....4

 Goal of the evaluation.....4

 Key objectives.....4

Surveys..... 5

 What questions did we ask?5

 Who participated in the evaluation?.....5

Results..... 6

 Recruiting Communications6

 Mission Curriculum7

 Mission Trip Elements7

 Children’s Outreach9

 Construction / Service Projects9

 Safety Training 11

 Project Preparation, Resources, Training & Satisfaction 11

 What worked? What needs improving? 12

 Transformative Experiences..... 13

 Return and Recommend?..... 14

Conclusions & Recommendations 14

 Progress toward Objectives 15

 Key objectives 15

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank Nate Youngblood, USP Service Engagement Director, and Kris Wamsley, USP Mission Site Program Manager, for their critical and responsive input and feedback to this process from start to finish. I could not do this without them. I'd also like to thank the various mission trip facilitators who made sure to distribute and collect the surveys. Because of their hard work, our response rate is high and we can have faith in the accuracy of the outcomes. I am grateful to the many men, women, and young people who gave unselfishly of their time and talent to serve on the mission trips and then took additional time to provide the insights recorded here that will allow us to continue to improve the missions experience for future teams and communities. And we are all grateful to the communities and families who opened their homes and churches to us so that the mission teams could all serve alongside them.

Joyce Lowery
USP DME Technical Specialist

List of Acronyms

DME	Design, Monitoring, and Evaluation for programs and projects
R & R	Resources & Relief
USP	U.S. Programs: World Vision's domestic work in the United States
VBS	Vacation Bible School

"I think these projects not only brought our group together, but also helped us interact with other teams better. Even though some jobs were difficult, we had great support from the community."

Mission Participant

Background

Introduction

This report covers the surveys completed as part of the mission trips that took place in the summer of 2013. The survey was designed to measure the satisfaction on the part of mission participants with various elements of the trip and to determine whether the mission experience impacted people's understanding of U.S. poverty and knowledge about World Vision. A 90-day follow up survey is proposed for this fall that will measure how this increased understanding and knowledge impacts people's actions once they return to their own communities. The information in this report will be compared to the results of similar questions in 2012 where available.

Goal of the evaluation

The overall goal of this evaluation is to review the *process* of the USP Missions strategy through feedback from mission team participants and measure the *impact* of the missions experience on those same participants.

Key objectives

The Service Engagement team had four main objectives for the Missions strategy:

1. Positively impact the well-being of children and youth through improved community structures and housing;
2. Increase meaningful opportunities for adults, youth, and children to serve others;
3. Provide a safe and impactful experience for mission participants; and
4. Challenge perceptions regarding poverty in the U.S. in a way which encourages participants to become more active in addressing poverty in their own community.



Surveys

In 2012, we used surveys customized for leaders, other adult participants, and youth. This was difficult for the team facilitators and did not necessarily provide an additional level of information for analysis. This year we used the same survey for all participants which streamlined the process. A full copy of the survey is available upon request.

What questions did we ask?

Evaluation Tool

Instrument	Question Content
Survey, hard copy, completed at end of mission trip	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Communication of mission trip opportunity ▪ Preparation for mission trip ▪ Satisfaction with speakers and activities outside of service project ▪ Quality of service project experience including training, resources, and safety ▪ Overall experience satisfaction and willingness to return / recommend ▪ Change in knowledge / understanding of poverty in the U.S. and World Vision

Who participated in the evaluation?

There were seven (7) summer mission trips this year with a total of 529 participants. The survey was completed by 404 people which is 76.4% of overall participants. In 2012, 707 people participated in summer missions, a decline of 25.2%. Surprisingly, the overall response rate remained steady at 76.4% (540 responses from 707 participants in 2012). The surveys were completed at the end of the mission trip prior to people returning home. In at least one case, participants were asked to complete the survey prior to the end of the trip. It is unclear why this was done and further information will be needed. This is not ideal and in the future trip facilitators will be requested to make sure this does not take place.

People were asked to indicate whether they were adult (defined as 18 years and older) or youth (defined as 17 years and under) on the survey, however the check boxes were too close together and confused the respondents. Many youth checked the box for “adult” in error so the number of youth and adults is not available for 2013.

Summer mission trip participants worked in the following communities: Flemington, Grafton, Lewis County, Philippi, Preston County, South Barbour County, and Wallace. Completed surveys were received from all seven (7) mission sites. The following chart shows the breakdown of responses.

Mission Site	# Participants	# Respondents	%
Flemington	105	80	76.2%
Grafton	133	97	72.9%
Lewis County	42	37	88.1%
Philippi	19	11	57.9%
Preston County	32	30	93.8%
South Barbour County	108	85	78.7%
Wallace	90	64	71.1%
TOTALS	529	404	76.4%

Disaggregated information has been provided to the Service Engagement team and will be shared with others as needed at the discretion of the USP Service Engagement Director. It is not included in this report.

The percentage of returned surveys from Philippi is too low to use disaggregated information about that trip, but the information is included in the overall scoring. For the other six trips and for the overall survey scoring, we can have confidence that the results reflect what would have been shared with a 100% response rate. However, changes will be made to next year’s survey process in an attempt to raise the response rate for all mission trips.

Results

The following sections reflect the scoring for both the close-ended, multiple-choice questions and the open-ended questions and comments for each of the categories included in the survey. When presented in table format, the most common response for each question is in **bold**.

NOTE: It is important to recognize that the overall responses are very positive. Satisfaction levels, for the most part, ranged from about 85% to 99% with only a few exceptions. When looking at these percentages, it is very clear that in every area the mission trips were a successful and rewarding experience for the majority of the participants. However, many of the people who added clarifying comments to their scoring were people who were dissatisfied in some way with what had taken place. When reading this report, please pay equal attention to the numbers and to the narrative for the true overall picture.

Recruiting Communications

Q: Where did you first hear about WV’s mission trips?

Response	Number	%
Church announcement / bulletin	263	65.6%
WV website	24	6.0%
Friend / family / colleague	75	18.7%
WV newsletter	7	1.7%
Previous trip	9	2.2%
Pastor / leader	13	3.2%
Organization / group	1	0.2%
30-Hour Famine	3	0.7%
Other	6	1.5%
TOTAL	401	100.0%

Two-thirds of the people who participate in USP mission trips first become aware of the opportunity from an announcement either in their church bulletin or in their church service. This is an indicator that our church partners are a strong recruiting mechanism which may allow for some shift of energy and focus to other areas for future growth such as the USP website and field site newsletters as well as corporate engagement.

Mission Curriculum

Q: Did your team use WV's curriculum for training prior to the trip?

Response	Number	%
Yes	201	50.3%
No	79	19.8%
I'm not sure	120	30.0%
TOTAL	400	100.0%

Just over fifty percent of the participants completed the curriculum prior to participating in the mission trip. This remains an area for concern. The curriculum is designed to prepare the participants for the trip emotionally and spiritually. It is one piece of the transformative process and is designed to help facilitate team-building, dispel some of the erroneous thinking participants may have about people living in poverty, and unify the mission team as champions of child well-being.

Q: If your team used the WV curriculum, how would you rate its effectiveness in preparing you for the trip?

Response	Number	%
Very effective, I was well prepared for what I experienced on the trip	62	31.6%
Effective, I felt most things were well covered	117	59.7%
Minimally effective, there were a few things on the trip I wasn't prepared for	15	7.7%
Not effective, very little was covered that was helpful once I was on the trip	2	1.0%
TOTAL	196	100.0%

For those participants who did complete the curriculum, the satisfaction level was very high. Ninety-one percent rated the curriculum as effective or very effective in preparing them for what they experienced on the mission trip. Unfortunately, the survey did not ask the participants directly if completing the curriculum provided new insights about poverty in the U.S. or inspired them towards action around child well-being in their own community or their mission site. These questions were tied more broadly to the mission trip and not the curriculum. In the future, we may need to look at including a link to an on-line survey option that is offered at the end of the training sessions in order to measure the impact of the curriculum itself.

"[The curriculum] talked about most of the things people deal with and live like and it was helpful."

Mission Participant

Mission Trip Elements

Q: Please rate your experience with the following elements of the mission trip:

Element	Great	Good	Just OK	Poor
Mission Trip Speaker	52.1% (207)	34.8% (138)	11.1% (44)	2.0% (8)
Day Off Activity	52.4% (175)	34.4% (115)	9.6% (32)	3.6% (12)
Mid-week / Bible Study	47.1% (188)	40.9% (163)	10.5% (42)	1.5% (6)
Daily Devotion	38.1% (141)	46.2% (171)	13.5% (50)	2.2% (8)
Sharing / Reflection Time	53.4% (210)	38.2% (150)	7.6% (30)	0.8% (3)
Information Skits	14.2% (54)	31.2% (119)	36.5% (139)	18.1% (69)
Cookout	66.1% (248)	29.3% (110)	4.5% (17)	0.0% (0)
Interaction w/Community	71.5% (284)	22.7% (90)	4.8% (19)	1.0% (4)

All of the elements of the mission trip week meant to engage the participants spiritually were a success. The speakers, mid-week worship sessions, bible studies, daily devotions, sharing and reflections times all received high marks. In addition, the recreational activities – various day-off activities such as canoe trips, the cookouts, and the interaction with the communities – were also ranked very highly. The only element that received relatively low marking was the informational skits. The comments indicated that this had to do with the fact that many participants could not hear the actors and this comment carried across all seven mission trips. Since the skits were provided to share information that the mission participants needed, either microphones or a new method of sharing that information will be needed in the future.

In all cases, low scores (just okay, poor) were sprinkled across the various mission trips and not grouped heavily in one or two trips. Comments indicate that the scores have more to do with personal preferences in things such as preaching or worship style or activity (“I don’t like canoeing”) rather than any indication that something needs to be corrected or addressed. Again, with the exception of the skits, the various elements of the mission trip are very successful.

As always, the interaction with the community received some of the highest scores. Mission participants enjoy the opportunity of getting to know the families. One person shared, “Overall it was a wonderful experience. The people in the community were extremely friendly and the family we helped was wonderful.” Another said, “Our relationships with our family and [our host] church have been beyond our imagination. I can’t imagine a better experience.”

In one or two cases, the distance that teams need to travel to reach their work sites impacts their ability to participate in daily devotion or Bible study. Comments indicate that they do miss this opportunity. It is unclear if it would be possible to add a lunchtime devotion or Bible study at the job site for those who might desire to do so.

“Great first experience with World Vision! More than I expected in physical, emotional, and spiritual matters!”

Mission Participant

Children's Outreach

Q: Please indicate how you rate the following:

Element	Great	Good	Just OK	Poor
Children's Outreach Overall	67.6% (200)	30.1% (89)	2.4% (7)	0.0% (0)
Value of Children's Outreach to your team	75.4% (227)	22.6% (68)	2.0% (6)	0.0% (0)
Value of Children's Outreach to the community	73.9% (221)	23.7% (71)	2.0% (6)	0.3% (1)

Each year, some of the mission trip participants spend all or a portion of their mission week providing a children's ministry outreach such as a sports camp or vacation bible school (VBS) experience in the community. For some of the younger mission participants, this provides an excellent way to enter into what will hopefully be a lifetime of mission service. This year's children's outreach was rated very high ... 97.7% positive rating overall, 98.0% felt it had value for the mission team, 98.6% felt it had value for the community served.

The children's outreach is an aspect of mission trip where participants clearly articulate the impact they feel. One participant said, *"The girls involved in BCS had tremendous experiences and learned a great deal while gaining confidence."* Another shared, *"The children were amazing and I know they touched the lives of all the VBS leaders."* Lastly, one person stated, *"The relationships we have formed have been life changing for our team."*



"The relationships we have formed have been life changing for our team."
Mission Participant

Construction / Service Projects

Q: Please indicate how you rate the following:

Element	Great	Good	Just OK	Poor
Construction / Service Project Overall	67.1% (265)	31.1% (123)	1.8% (7)	0.0% (0)
Value of Construction / Service Project to your team	70.0% (275)	28.8% (113)	1.3% (5)	0.0% (0)
Value of Construction / Service Project to the community	73.8% (285)	23.3% (90)	2.6% (10)	0.3% (1)
Support to project team during project	55.5% (212)	33.8% (129)	9.4% (36)	1.3% (5)

The constructions projects are the main focus of the mission trips. Working with community church partners to provide housing for families that is warm, safe and dry is a shared community goal around the well-being of children and their families. Participants rated their overall satisfaction with the construction projects at 98.2%. In addition, 98.8% of them felt that the projects were of value to the mission teams and 97.1% of them felt that the projects were of value to the community.

Support to the project team had a positive rating of 89.3%. One construction participant said, *“Kyle was tremendous! He was an asset in skill as well as demeanor. Great with the kids!”*



“I learned some new skills. I loved that we got permission to do additional projects at the house that we saw need for.”

Mission Participant

Safety Training

Q: Please indicate how you rate the following:

Element	Great	Good	Just OK	Poor
Quality of safety training prior to project	36.7% (124)	41.7% (141)	17.5% (59)	4.1% (14)
Adherence to safety standards during project	50.9% (192)	39.3% (148)	8.5% (32)	1.3% (5)

The issue of safety training was a key focus for the Service Engagement team this year and was listed as one of the four key objectives of the mission strategy (see page 4). While overall, the rating of the safety training is fairly high (78.4% rated the training received as “great” or “good”), three sites had a number of comments indicating that people didn’t remember getting any safety training or had a fairly large number scoring the safety training as “just okay” or “poor”. The quality of the training should be consistent at every job site and for every individual, so this aspect will need further examination.

Adherence to safety standards did better with 90.2% of respondents giving a positive score.

Project Preparation, Resources, Training & Satisfaction

Q: Please indicate your level of agreement with statements below:

Statement	Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
Preparation for our service project was well done.	41.6% (165)	54.9% (218)	3.0% (12)	0.5% (2)
I had all the resources needed to complete my project.	42.5% (168)	48.6% (192)	8.4% (33)	0.5% (2)
I received the training I needed to complete my task.	36.5% (143)	52.4% (205)	9.5% (37)	1.5% (6)
I was satisfied with the outcome of our work.	71.6% (278)	27.6% (107)	0.5% (2)	0.3% (1)

Overall there is a very high level of satisfaction in all four areas. Preparation for the service project scored positively 96.5% of the time, having necessary resources 91.1%, having necessary training 88.9%, and satisfaction with outcome, 99.2%. Participants gained satisfaction from different aspects of their project: *“We completed all our projects which was rewarding.” “My team got the job done fast and it turned out amazing.” “The family was thrilled with what we accomplished.” “My family loved it and seeing them smile and be happy made me happy.” “We got our project finished and I learned some great tool skills.”*

Flexibility on the part of staff, volunteers, and community was an element that led to success. One participant said, *“Our project was changed from windows to flooring when we arrived on Sunday, but this was no problem and was actually a better choice for both the family and our team.”*

The major complaint voiced about the service projects was not receiving the needed supplies in a timely manner at the individual job sites. As this does not seem to occur at every project, it may have to do with set up at individual job sites, a lack of communication, or the distance

between the work site and the Storehouse location. The cause is difficult to determine from the surveys alone. The Service Engagement team will have looked at this aspect in their debrief meeting and review of the disaggregated information.

Another issue that causes frustration for mission participants is the inability to finish some projects by the end of the week. While it may not always be possible, choosing projects that can be completed within the mission timeframe or breaking down large jobs into smaller tasks seems important. As an example, one team may not be able to remove and replace an entire roof in four days, but if they knew their assignment was only to remove the old roof and lay the tar paper for the new roof, they could have the sense of “mission accomplished” rather than “I wish we could have finished the job” as several of them stated in the comments section.¹

What worked? What needs improving?

This section of the survey has turned out to be less than helpful. First, because the wording of the question is poorly done so that brief responses can be taken as either something that worked or something that needs improving, there is a lack of clarity. Secondly, most of the issues raised in this section have already been covered in other areas of the survey.

A piece that seems to be a highlight for many people is the relationships. Whether it is relationships between teammates, relationships with families in the homes they are working on, relationships with the children in the outreach programs, relationships with World Vision staff, or relationships with the host church or other community members, building relationships is a key factor of a successful, enjoyable mission experience for many people responding to the survey. *“The people that I worked with were awesome.” “We had a great experience with the family we assisted.” “Something that worked well was spending time with the kids.” “The thing that worked best was that I got along really well with the families.” “Everyone cooperating well with each other [worked well].” “Working as a team to accomplish our tasks and bonding with the family [worked well].”*



“The way we had so many opportunities to connect and form relationships with the community and the people on this trip worked well.”

Mission Participant

¹ It should be noted that this may, in fact, be exactly what the Service Engagement team strives to do and that, in a few cases, either a task was unable to be completed as scheduled or the participants were unaware that they were not meant to complete the entire project.

One issue that has not been addressed previously in this report is the difficulty that small groups and individual families sometimes have in connecting with other groups on the larger mission trips. While they have a good time bonding and team building within their own mission team, the larger trips don't seem to provide much opportunity for teams from the various churches, families, or other organizations to mingle and get to know one another. Several participants expressed the desire for activities that would facilitate that kind of relationship building. One family suggested that being paired with another family at the end of the day for debriefing rather than being asked to debrief by themselves would be helpful and would allow them to better connect.

Another issue that appeared in this section for the first time was a small group of participants feeling they had unsafe living conditions at one of the mission sites. The issues were very specific – no exit signs, unlit stairwells, lack of emergency lighting, and sanitation issues including non-working toilets. However, these issues appeared on only four surveys on a mission trip that had 105 participants. It is unclear if these issues were as difficult / dangerous as perceived by the four, but should be addressed by the Service Engagement team.

Transformative Experiences

Question	Yes	No
Do you have a better understanding of World Vision's work because of your mission experience?	96.2% (376)	3.8% (15)
Do you have new insights into poverty in the U.S. because of your mission experience?	94.5% (376)	5.5% (22)
Do you feel you made an impact on child well-being in the community?	87.7% (342)	12.3% (48)
Do you feel you made a difference in the life of an individual child?	81.8% (310)	18.2% (69)

It is clear from the responses that the mission experience has the desired effect of both broadening people's understanding of World Vision's work and providing a new window into the realities of poverty in the United States. Our theory of change suggests that this can result in their increased involvement in actions leading to improved child well-being in their own communities and in the United States in general through support of World Vision's work. Our intention is to follow up with a portion of the survey respondents to see if this "better understanding" and "new insights" have led to new or increased actions.

The responses on impacting child well-being and making a difference in the life of an individual child are tied to whether or not people worked in the children's outreach project or in a construction project in a home where a child resided. If people worked on a church building or in the home of an elderly person, they were less likely to see the impact on child well-being or to see how an individual child's life may have been impacted.



There is still some work to be done around sharing and educating people in the definitions and impacts to child well-being at an individual and community level.

Return and Recommend?

Question	Yes	No
I would participate in another mission trip with World Vision	98.2% (385)	1.8% (7)
I would recommend participating in a World Vision mission trip to a friend	98.2% (375)	1.8% (7)

Overwhelmingly, the people who attend the mission trips have the type of experience that leaves them wanting to come back again and willing to say to a friend, “This is something that you should do.” That is a wonderful testimony to the work of the Service Engagement team and the mission experience that they are providing in a wide variety of settings.

Conclusions & Recommendations

Although not noted in this report, there were many comments in the survey about improvements returning participants noticed in areas such as organization and housing. The Service Engagement team has continually reviewed the trips each year, learned from what has taken place, and made course corrections where needed. The following recommendations are made with awareness that most or all of them have probably already been addressed by the team:

- Place a stronger emphasis on using pre-trip curriculum including use by returning teams. This should include some form of accountability follow up by Service Engagement staff via phone calls.
- Develop guidelines for use of the Mission Survey. Several comments from participants indicated that some of them took the survey perhaps mid-week rather than at the end. Participation should be closer to 95%.
- Explore an on-line survey option tied more closely to the curriculum and the time of completion.
- Develop guidelines for housing. If there is not already a set of guidelines for what minimum safety standards need to be in place for housing mission participants that should be completed prior to next year’s mission season.
- Provide pre-trip information about the mission communities and projects to the participants. If this information is being provided to the leaders and it is not filtering down to their teams, perhaps the Service Engagement staff can begin sharing with the team leaders that this is an important part of preparing the teams for the mission trip.
- Provide an FAQ handout on things like how the construction jobs are selected and what participants should expect as far as training, safety, housing, supplies, and systems. There seems to be a wide disparity between what individual teams know which may be due to what information is shared by their leaders or our facilitators. The handout could help close that gap.

Progress toward Objectives

Key objectives

As stated at the start of this report, the Service Engagement team had four main objectives for the Missions strategy. Results of the survey indicate that substantial progress was made towards each of these objectives.

1. Positively impact the well-being of children and youth through improved community structures and housing.

Multiple construction project participants talked about the positive results of their projects ... homes made warmer, safer, and dryer with new roofs, new porches, new floors, painted rooms, and cleared yards. Churches and community gathering places restored. Children, youth and families expressed their appreciation and their joy in these improved spaces. Future evaluation from the community perspective will measure the impact on child well-being more directly.

2. Increase meaningful opportunities for adults, youth, and children to serve others.

While the survey did not ask directly how many of the participants were on their first mission trip, the responses do seem to indicate that for many the mission trip was a new and meaningful service experience. Recruiting from new audiences and considering mission trips into new areas will continue to grow these opportunities.

3. Provide a safe and impactful experience for mission participants.

Both scoring and comments reflect that the vast majority of mission participants felt safe and cared for during their trip and were deeply impacted by the people they served and worked alongside. The relationships they forged in the short amount of time were deep and meaningful.

4. Challenge perceptions regarding poverty in the U.S. in a way which encourages participants to become more active in addressing poverty in their own community.

Mission participants indicated that participating in the mission trip did provide new insights into poverty in the United States. Further information will be gathered in a follow up survey to determine whether or not these new insights translate into action addressing poverty within their own communities.