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DEAR READERS

Understanding the duties and responsibilities of being a citizen do not come at the age of 18 but need to be introduced and fostered throughout adolescence. In this issue of the Generator we take a closer look at how service-learning supports the implementation of civic learning for our youngest citizens by building their communication and critical thinking skills and by engaging them in making meaningful change now. As former Senator John Glenn said, “By its very definition, civic responsibility means taking a healthy role in the life of one’s community. That means that classroom lessons should be complemented by work outside the classroom. Service-learning does just that, tying community service to academic learning.” We couldn’t have said it any better ourselves.

In Service,
Amy

AMY MEUERS
Chief Executive Officer

An informed, involved citizenry is key to the vitality of democratic societies.

Introduction

Democracies depend on citizens with civic knowledge, such as knowledge of history and government, and skills, such as the ability to investigate, analyze, and deliberate about public issues as well as the ability to work with other citizens to address them. Democracies rely as well on citizens with democratic virtues, such as a commitment to equality, tolerance, and the value of the common good.

“Schools, along with their teachers and curricula, have long been identified as the critical link between education and citizenship, the locus from which democratic citizens emerge.” (Niemi & Junn, 1998, p. 3). Yet, the evidence suggests that schools are falling short of successfully fulfilling this role. For example, only 59% of voting-age Americans turned out for the recent 2016 Presidential election, while the voting rate for young citizens was even lower (50%) (McDonald, 2016; CIRCLE, 2016). Although historically, Americans have volunteered at higher rates than other nations’ citizens, volunteerism in the U.S. has declined. In 2015, only 25% of Americans participated in volunteerism, such as fundraising for a social cause or collecting and distributing food, and the rate of volunteering among those ages 16-24 was lower than for any other age group except those 65 and older (Corporation for National and Community Service, 2015). Finally, other forms of civic involvement among Americans have dropped to historic lows. Adolescents’ involvement in both conventional and alternative forms of civic participation (voting, writing to public officials, boycotting) has declined over a 30-year period (Syvertsen, Flanagan, Wray-Lake, Osgood & Briddell (2011). In 2015, only 15% of Americans were members of a social or community service organization, while a mere 5% belonged to a civic, political, professional, or international organization and among young people, the rates of membership in these two types of organization were lower (Corporation for National and Community Service, 2015).

In 2015...

• 25% of Americans participated in volunteerism
• 15% of Americans were members of a social or community service organization
• 5% of Americans belonged to a civic, political, professional, or international organization.

In the face of declining civic engagement and numerous challenges to the health of U.S. democracy, such as income and education inequality, low voter turn-out, and shrinking...
volunteerism the need for high-quality, sustained social studies education is more urgent than ever. Studies show that social studies instruction, specifically civics, has significant positive effects on civic knowledge, skills, and attitudes, as well as political participation (Galston, 2007; Niemi & Junn, 1998; Torney-Purta, 2002; Lopez & Kirby, 2007). Furthermore, students whose civic education coursework includes high-quality practices, such as opportunities to discuss current issues or to apply their civic competencies, have higher levels of civic engagement and confidence in their ability to speak publicly and communicate with elected officials (Gould, Jameson, Levine, McConnell & Smith, 2011).

Despite these benefits, “civic learning and democratic engagement are often treated as adds-on rather than essential parts of the core academic mission in too many schools…today” (U.S. Department of Education, 2012, p. 1). Until 1970, most school districts required three citizenship education courses at the high school level: civics, democracy, and government, while at present, the average requirement is a one-semester course taken in the senior year (Carnegie Corporation of New York and CIRCLE, 2003). Since the passage of No Child Left Behind, officials from most school districts in the U.S. report that they have increased the amount of time devoted to reading, mathematics, and science at the elementary school level and reduced the time allocated to social studies, the arts, and foreign language.

Even when social studies receives instructional time, research suggests that common methods for imparting it fail to prepare students for the responsibilities of active informed citizenship. As Rubin points out, “Students in most social studies classrooms study historychronologically, learn passively, and encounter the story of the United States as one that is already written, in which citizens are witnesses to history rather than active participants in the narrative.” (Rubin, 2012). There is widespread agreement that schools must “change how civic learning is taught from the dry facts of history and the structure of government to an emphasis on how citizens can and must participate in civic life” (Gould et al., 2011, p. 7).

**Civic Impacts of Service-Learning**

The Civic Mission of Schools report (Gibson & Levine, 2003) identifies service-learning, in which students receive opportunities “to apply what they learn through performing community service that is linked to the…. curriculum and… instruction,” as one of six promising approaches to civic education. A number of studies confirm this recommendation, showing that service-learning participation can enhance the development of student civic competencies and engagement.

For example:

Kahne and Sporte (2008) studied the effects of family, neighborhood, and school characteristics, as well as exposure to best practices in civic education and service-learning on the development of commitment to civic participation among Chicago high school students, the majority of whom were low-income and minority students. Results showed that service-learning and exposure to effective strategies for civic education were the strongest predictors of commitment to civic participation, having markedely stronger effects than school, neighborhood, or family factors.

Billig and colleagues (2008) investigated the effects of service-learning programs with a character education focus on middle and high school students in Philadelphia. Students who participated in service-learning that significant higher gains in citizenship, civic engagement, social responsibility, caring, and valuing school.

Hart and colleagues (2007) analyzed data from the NELS 88 study to determine the effects of community service (required or voluntary), participation in extracurricular activities, and civic knowledge on voting and volunteering in early adulthood. Regardless of whether it was required or voluntary, service participation significantly predicted voting and volunteering in adulthood.

A study by the Corporation for National and Community Service showed that disadvantaged students who participated in school-based service had more positive civic attitudes and behaviors including intent to volunteer in the future, efficacy in solving community problems, optimism about the future, interest in current events, and social trust than those who did not participate (Spring, Dietz, & Grimm, 2006).

In year two of a national study of service-learning programs, researchers at RMC Research Corporation found that service-learning students made significantly greater gains in civic knowledge and in their intention to vote than comparison students (Billig, Root, and Jesse, 2006). In both years of the study, service-learning students showed greater increases in the civic skills of knowing how to conduct a campaign to get someone elected to a position and knowing how to identify community needs.

A study by Furco (2002) compared high school students who participated in service-learning with students who performed community service, those who engaged in service-based internships, and those who performed no service. Results showed community service participants had significantly greater awareness of societal issues and willingness to take active roles in the community than non-participants.

Billig (2002) conducted an evaluation of the Freedom Schools Junior Leader program in Philadelphia in which high school students received intensive training, provided tutoring to elementary school students in the summer and engaged in a year-long service-learning project on issues directly affecting their community. Results showed statistically significant increases in participants’ feelings of connectedness to community and society, self-efficacy at making changes in their communities, and leadership skills including the ability to plan projects.
In a study of 1,153 students in grades 6 through 8, half of whom participated in service-learning, Scales, Blyth, Berkas, & Kielsmeier (2000) found that service-learning students made significantly greater gains than others in helping behaviors, concern for others’ welfare, academic motivation, and personal development.

In his national study of Learn and Serve programs, Melchior (1998) found significant overall gains in students’ service leadership (including awareness of community needs, perceived ability to address those needs, and commitment to working toward improving community) and acceptance of culture diversity.

In the study by Weiler et al. (1998) of California service-learning programs, students at 9 of 12 sites showed gains in civic and personal/social development, including civic and social attitudes, personal and social responsibility, work orientation, communication, voluntary service participation and community service leadership.

Yates and Youniss (1996) examined changes over time in the reflections of high school participants in a course on community justice that included a service component. They found that the reflections increasingly focused on the injustices faced by those served and the need for social change. The authors concluded that service-learning prompted adolescents to form a more “transcendent” interpretation of life circumstances (one that went beyond the immediate reality) and an expanded civic identity.

Despite the positive outcomes of these studies, other research shows negligible effects for student participation in service-learning on civic outcomes (Galston, 2007; Kahne & Westheimer, 2003). We believe that the sometime failure of service-learning to realize its civic promise is rooted in issues of instructional design, that is, in the traditional approaches that K-12 teachers have been trained to use in designing service-learning units.

Problems with Traditional Service-Learning Design

Professional development providers in service-learning have long sought to address the need to tie projects to academic and civic outcomes through guidelines such as the Link to Curriculum standard in the K-12 Service-Learning Standards for Quality Practice (NYLC, 2008). In spite of this and other efforts, however, there are few available professional development resources to help teachers intentionally integrate civic outcomes through service-learning. Typically, teachers are advised to have students first select a school or community problem (e.g. bullying, childhood obesity) and then brainstorm a community service solution to address it. Once the problem and project are determined, teachers are encouraged to “backfill” the broad outline of the project plan with standards and other learning goals that the unit is likely to meet.

We think that this prescription for planning service-learning units around a community problem and project limits teachers’ and students’ ability to access and explore abstract civics as well as subject area concepts and skills during service-learning. We believe that the likely result of implementing a plan that begins in project identifications is that students learn but their learning is likely to be local and specific. That is, they are likely to learn about the details of a specific school or community problem and local context, but have less opportunity to master abstract civic content and skills, such as the nature of democracy or the structure and functions of government.

In order to address this problem of missing the civic mark, the National Youth Leadership Council has embraced a backward planning process for service-learning in which teachers infuse rich opportunities to construct and apply subject area and civic understandings and rules for using these understandings throughout a public problem solving experience (Wiggins and McTighe, 2005). In backward planning of service-learning, teachers first identify the civic and academic goals of a service-learning unit. Then they determine how they will gather credible evidence of student progress and proficiency on the learning goals, and lastly, they design learning experiences that will propel students toward proficiency. The recently published College, Career, and Civic Life Framework (C3) (CCSSO, 2013) is a critical resource in our approach and we have incorporated elements of it at each step in the backward planning model to ensure continuous opportunities for civic learning.

The C3 Framework was developed by representatives of state education agencies and social studies disciplinary organizations with support from the Council for Chief State School Officers. It was not intended to be a mandated curriculum, but rather a guide to states in constructing social studies standards that provide rigorous preparation in the content and skills prerequisites for postsecondary social studies courses; “the higher-order thinking and collaboration skills required in the 21st Century workplace; and the fundamental civic knowledge and skills for constructive participation in democratic civic life (cit.)” (Maybe Social Education, Oct. 2013). The Framework is organized around an “Inquiry Arc,” with four “dimensions” that represent generic processes of inquiry and problem solving in the social studies. The Dimensions include: 1) Developing questions and planning inquiries, 2) Applying disciplinary concepts and tools, 3) Evaluating sources and using evidence, and 4) Communicating conclusions and taking informed civic action.

We incorporate the C3 Framework to enhance and build civic learning during service-learning at three points. In addition to introducing teachers to our view of that the aim of service-learning is to help students learn capacities for informed civic problem solving, we:

1) Encourage teachers in the first step of backward planning to identify desired results that include C3 as well as subject area goals, proficiency.

2) Promote the use of formative and summative assessments that target civic as well as subject area learning and developmental outcomes, and

3) Have teachers follow the IPARD cycle, an inquiry and problem solving model that closely parallels the C3 Framework, to structure the learning experiences that students will encounter during service-learning.
The following section describes the links between our model for backward planning of service-learning and the C3 Framework in more detail.

**STEP 1. IDENTIFYING DESIRED RESULTS**

In working with teachers to identify the desired results of a service-learning unit, we guide them through five steps:

a) **Selecting a topic for service-learning.** In our model, teachers begin the process of identifying desired results of service-learning by selecting a topic in the subject area(s) for service-learning appropriate to the grade level. We define the topic for the service-learning unit as a broad idea or skill set within the subject area discipline(s) for service-learning that is related to a public responsibility or public problem at the heart of the work of subject area practitioners. For example, rather than organizing a service-learning unit around the pollution in a local wetlands, we would suggest that teachers select “human impacts on earth systems” from the Next Generation Science Standards as a topic. Students could then explore ideas related to this topic through a project. Or a Health teacher might choose “advocacy for personal, family, and community health” from the National Health Education Standards as the topic for a service-learning unit and build that allows students to practice health advocacy.

b) **Identifying learning goals.** Once they have isolated a topic, teachers select or construct broad desired results for the service-learning unit that include both:

   i. Academic learning goals including Big Ideas (broad content knowledge and skills goal(s) in the subject area for service-learning; and
   ii. Civic goals, specifically a civic problem-solving goal drawn from Dimension 4 of the C3 Framework: Communicating conclusions and civic action.

c) **Writing a Final Expected Performance.** Once teachers have identified the subject area Big Idea(s) and the civic problem solving goal for their unit, they integrate these into a “Final Expected Performance.” The Final Expected Performance, the terminal goal of a service-learning unit, requires students to demonstrate their subject area and civic learning, i.e. their understanding of the subject area Big Idea and their knowledge and skill at the process of taking civic action in addressing a public problem.

d) **Identifying and Sequencing Building Blocks for Instruction.** In the final step in the first phase of planning, Identifying Desired Results, teachers unpack their Final Expected Performance into a Learning Progression. Learning Progressions delineate the enabling civic and subject area knowledge and the subskills required for informed democratic problem solving. In our model, these subskills are described by the IPARD/C cycle and include inquiry and deliberation (Investigation), Planning, Action, Reflection, and Demonstration/Celebration (what students must be able to do). Teachers are encouraged to draw bodies of civic enabling knowledge for their units from the civic knowledge identified by Dimension 2 of the C3 Framework (such as knowledge about civic and political institutions and processes, rules, and laws) and subskills from the four Dimensions of C3, such as “gather relevant information from multiple sources…” (Dimension 3).

**STEP 2. PLANNING HOW TO GATHER CREDIBLE EVIDENCE OF STUDENT PROFICIENCY ON THE DESIRED RESULTS**

In NYLC’s backward planning model, assessment is understood as part of an ongoing cycle of instructional improvement (IES). In the first step of the cycle, educators gather a variety of data about student learning. Next, they interpret the data and form hypotheses about how to improve instruction. Finally, teachers test their hypotheses by making adjustments to instruction and begin the cycle again. In this paper, we will focus mainly on the first activity in the Instructional improvement cycle: gathering data.

In planning to gather data on student learning through service-learning, teachers complete two tasks:

a) **Identifying assessment targets, i.e., indicators of proficiency on the overall goal of a service-learning unit (the summative assessment target), as well as evidence of progress toward proficiency during the instruction (formative assessment targets) and**

b) **Choosing or constructing assessment tasks.**

In our model of service-learning design, the summative assessment target is the Final Expected Performance for a service-learning unit, that statement of how students will use broad subject area and civic conceptual knowledge or skill sets to carry out informed civic action. For example, in a unit about the topic of Japanese-American internment for a course segment on World War II. The War at Home, the summative assessment target might be: Based on his/her understanding of the internment of Japanese-Americans in WWII and its implications for civil liberties and evaluation of alternatives available at the time (Big Ideas), the student will educate the public about internment (informed civic action).

The formative assessment targets for assessment of progress in service-learning are drawn from the Learning Progressions that teachers created when identifying the desired results for their unit. These Learning Progressions include the enabling subject area and civic knowledge (concepts, facts) that students must know, as well as C3-based subskills they will perform at each phase of the IPARD cycle.

In thinking through how they will gather data, teachers also construct assessment tasks for inferring student achievement and progress on the desired outcomes. A variety of types of assessments is available to teachers, such as constructed response tasks a teacher observation of student performances on the service project. However, we advocate the use of several specific tasks that can serve both as valid measures of and powerful contexts for gaining the desired complex civic and academic outcomes of service-learning. For NYLC, two summative assessments offer the greatest promise for gathering evidence of student overall achievement on the final goal of a service-learning unit, i.e. competence at using subject area Big Ideas and civic problem solving skill to take informed action to resolve a public problem (the Final Expected Performance).
We encourage teachers to have students complete a working portfolio that documents learning throughout the service-learning process. A second potentially powerful summative assessment is a civic change proposal, an argumentation paper in which students build on the knowledge they gained through the service-learning experience to advocate for next steps for addressing their public problem.

Particularly powerful formative assessment tasks for service-learning include discussion, an “open-ended, collaborative exchange of ideas” in which participants “present multiple points of view, respond to the ideas of others, and reflect on their own ideas in an effort to build their knowledge, understanding, or interpretation of the matter at hand” (Wilkinson), the ability to discuss the nature of the public good and how to achieve is an essential skill of democratic citizens. Studies have shown that when students have opportunities to deliberate about civic issues in a climate of free expression and openness to different perspectives, they make gains in civic knowledge, information seeking, critical thinking, and communication skills (Niemi & Junn, 1989; Campbell). In our approach, we encourage teachers to include two types of discussion in service-learning: text-based discussion and deliberation about a solution to a public problem (Parker).

A second powerful type of formative assessment are performance tasks, assessments that present students with a true-to-life problem (real or simulated) that resembles a challenge of adult work or civic life. Performance assessments are complex tasks that require that students recall, organize and apply schema of learned content and skills. Inherent to service-learning units are several naturally occurring activities that can serve as performance assessments. Most important of these, of course, is the service experience, but other potential performance tasks include interviewing (during the inquiry step, civic deliberation, and oral presentation), in which students share what they learned from the service-learning unit with other citizens and/or members of a subject area community.

Service-learning also provides a rich context for the third powerful type of formative assessment: writing tasks. Writing-to-learn tasks are brief, ungraded assignments, in which students explore, explain and/or extend their ideas about learning experiences. In contrast, writing to communicate tasks are more formal, (usually) graded assignments intended to influence the reader by presenting information or argument.

In contrast, writing to communicate tasks are more formal, (usually) graded assignments intended to influence the reader by presenting information or argument.

**STEP 3. THE IPARD CYCLE AND THE C3 FRAMEWORK.**

NYLC’s backward planning model for designing service-learning incorporates elements from the College, Career, and Civic Life Framework at the third step: Planning Learning Experiences. (continued on page 6)

The following table suggests possible writing-to-learn and writing-to-communicate tasks for formative and summative assessment during service-learning.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase of Service-Learning</th>
<th>Writing-to-Learn</th>
<th>Writing-to-Communicate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Investigation/Inquiry</td>
<td>• Summaries of readings</td>
<td>• Capstone writing task: Research report of findings from inquiry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Exit slips</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Learning logs of data gathering experiences, e.g. community mapping, interviewing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investigation/Deliberation</td>
<td>Journal reflection analyzing individual strengths/limitations for different types of civic action</td>
<td>• Capstone writing task: Report of results of group deliberation to select a civic action, including discussion of group strengths and limitations for various civic actions, arguments offered, the civic action selected and reasons for selection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning and Preparation</td>
<td>Draft action plans with ongoing reflection notes</td>
<td>• Capstone writing task: Final Action Plan for service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action</td>
<td>Journal entries with ongoing descriptive reflections on the service experience (who, where, what, and with whom and what the students felt) and analytical reflections (linking the service experience with academic ideas, viewing the problem and solution from multiple perspectives)</td>
<td>• Capstone writing task: Revised action plan including descriptive reflection, interpretive reflection (what student learned), critical reflection on the root causes of the service problem and essential next steps.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflection</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Civic Change Proposal (proposal for next steps in addressing the service problem)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstration</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Script for presenting project and portfolio</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In our approach teaching and learning experiences follow a model of democratic problem solving founded on Dewey’s description of reflective thinking (1910/1933) and long used by service-learning practitioners: the IPARD cycle.

The IPARD cycle includes five phases: Investigation (inquiry and deliberation), Planning and Preparation, Action, Reflection, and Demonstration. In NYLC’s adaptation, students learn and practice subject-specific, democratic modes of inquiry, deliberation, planning, and preparation, service, and knowledge sharing throughout the cycle. Additionally, subject area, civic learning, and literacy learning are promoted through structured learning experiences, a learning community of peers and expert mentors, and student reflection on the quality of their learning, and effectiveness of their work.

1. Developing questions and planning inquiries
2. Applying disciplinary concepts and tools
3. Evaluating sources and using evidence,
4. Communicating conclusions and taking informed civic action.

As we explained previously, the Inquiry Arc of the C3 Framework includes four dimensions of teaching and learning:

From these descriptions, it is clear that IPARD and the C3 Framework Inquiry Arc share many components in common, including inquiry, civic action, and communicating conclusions.

The following table delineates parallels between the IPARD cycle and the Inquiry Arc in more detail and describes elements of the C3 Framework that NYLC encourages teachers to adopt.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IPARD Cycle of Service-Learning</th>
<th>C3 Framework Inquiry Arc</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Phase 1. Investigation</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Inquiry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Teacher asks a Driving Question about the subject area topic/public problem that will move inquiry into it</td>
<td>• Students generate compelling questions for inquiry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Students generate and refine Supporting Questions (more narrow than compelling questions)</td>
<td>• Students generate supporting questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Students use research and opinions generated by others, including brainstorming sources, to address the inquiry questions.</td>
<td>• Students determine helpful sources for addressing questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Students conduct own empirical research to address</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Students synthesize findings from sources and own research and produce a summary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>b. Deliberation</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Based on the results of inquiry, students use deliberative discussion to first select a type of civic action and then a specific service project to address the public problem for the unit. In our professional development, we guide teachers to structure the deliberation step around three skills for civic deliberation identified in the College, Career, and Civic Life (C3) Framework, including:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Using disciplinary and interdisciplinary lenses to understand...challenges and opportunities faced by those trying to address...problems over time and place</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Assessing (one’s) own options for individual and collective action to address local, regional, and global problems by engaging in self-reflection, strategy identification, and complex causal reasoning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Applying a range of deliberative and democratic strategies and procedures to make decisions and take action in their classrooms and school, online, and in out-of-school civic and political contexts.” (C3 Framework)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Throughout Deliberation (as well as Planning and Preparation and the service project, we also encourage teachers to have students apply civic virtues and democratic principles (e.g. tolerance for diverse points of view, respect for the rule of law, commitment to the common good).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IPARD Cycle of Service-Learning</th>
<th>C3 Framework Inquiry Arc</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phase 2. Planning and Preparation</td>
<td>Dimension 4. Take action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 3. Action (the Service Project)</td>
<td>Communicating conclusions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstration</td>
<td>Present adaptations of arguments and explanations that feature evocative ideas and perspectives on issues and topics to reach a range of audiences and venues outside the classroom using print and oral technologies...and digital technologies.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Conclusion

Since its founding, the United States recognized the essential role of schooling in preparing an engaged, informed citizenry. Civic competence is not transmitted through the genes; instead, each generation must gain anew the knowledge, skills, and the “traits of private and public character” that will allow our democracy to thrive. Yet current levels of civic knowledge and participation in the U.S. remain low.

When it is structured around processes central to democratic civil life, including inquiry, dialogue, deliberation, decision-making, and problem solving, service-learning can have positive effects on the development of civic competencies. Yet conventional approaches to planning service-learning that originate in a community problem have often neglected these outcomes. By beginning with civic knowledge, skills, and dispositional outcomes, NYLC’s model of backward planning of service-learning provides an alternative—a path to designing and teaching civicly robust service-learning. An invaluable resource for our model is The College, Career, and Civic Life (C3) Framework for Social Studies State Standards which informs our service-learning planning process at each stage. If implemented in K-12 schools across the country, service-learning, and the C3 framework will increase the civic knowledge and actions of our youngest citizens.
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