

Brendan Miller  
November 29, 2004

**DRAFT Taxonomy and description of AC program types:**

**Simple version: A prototype classification scheme:**

- Youth development corps (YouthBuild)
- Welfare to work (Civic Works)
- Rebuilding social professions / internships (TFA, JVC)
- Higher education and service learning (UC Berkeley, U.S. Miss.)
- Capacity building: organizational or community (most VISTA)
- Citizenship development (City Year, Public Allies)
- Extra hands / Helping out (Most poorly designed programs)

-----  
The rest of the document contains a number of factors that can be used to distinguish AmeriCorps programs. The hypothesis is that a great deal can be explained about a program by just the “primary factors.” The secondary factors are supposed to be implied by the primary factors or of lesser or more particular interest (e.g. more narrow research questions). Note also that the categories and variables listed here should not be thought of as black/white distinctions, but instead points along a continuum.

***Primary factors:***

*Mission:*

**1. Service type**

- Health
- Education: tutoring, teaching, service-learning. Children or adult.
- Mentoring, safe spaces and positive alternatives (includes non-academic after school programs)
- Environment
- Public safety, disaster preparedness/relief and homeland security
- Advocacy and legal aid/services (for disadvantaged/marginalized groups)
- Community and economic development
- Housing and homelessness
- Technology and the digital divide
- Human services (means what? be more specific)

**2. Level of focus**

- Individual (personal development or citizenship development)
- Organizational (capacity building or innovation/new ideas)
- Societal/professional/community (social capital or getting things done)

*Service structure:*

**3. Direct service to capacity building**

**4. Group to individual service**

- Service corps (YouthBuild)
- Individual placements / internships (TFA)

DRAFT – Do not cite without permission

[brendan@brendanmiller.com](mailto:brendan@brendanmiller.com)

## 5. *Secondary factors?*

### *Organizational structure:*

6. **In-placement to out-placement** (e.g. Red Cross vs. JVC)
  - Note: usually follows the continuum structure found in the nonprofit sector from organization to formalized association to loose network to adhoc partnerships
7. **Standalone to add on** (e.g. City Year vs. Red Cross)
  - Question: is there any correlation with program maturity? e.g. Programs start internally as pilots and then are eventually spun off if successful?
8. **Reach: narrow to wide** (# of placement sites)
9. **Small to medium to large programs** (# of members)
10. **Urban to suburban to rural**
11. **State, National or VISTA**

### *Members:*

12. **Youth focus to intergenerational to elder focused**
13. **Local members to mixed to mostly nationally recruited members**
14. **Privileged to mixed to underprivileged members**
15. **Homogenous to diverse to representative members**

### *Management capacity and program complexity:*

16. **Program budget per member (all sources)**
17. **Oversight: number of members per staff person**
18. **Tenure of director**
19. **Turnover: Average tenure of staff person**
20. **Satisfaction with CNS program officer or parent organization grant manager**
21. **Maturity: pilot to several year to many years national service experience**
22. **Focused to diffuse (# of placements per member)**
23. **Part time to full time to residential**

Note: Develop a measure of program complexity? Combine some of these measures

### *Context and other data:*

- **Organization name**
- **Program name**
- **EIN**
- **Organization that provides funding AC funding**
- **Primary sources of funding (individuals, foundations, government, fee for service)**
- **Other “streams of service”?**
- **Primary partner organizations**