Thesis, Dissertations, Student Creative Activity, and Scholarship

Barbara A. Holland Collection for Service Learning and Community Engagement (SLCE)

11-19-2004

The Institutionalization of Service-Learning as a Pedagogical Tool for Campus Engagement at Public Versus Private Higher Education Institutions

Gwenda R. Greene
Union Institute & University

Recommended Citation

PROJECT DEMONSTRATING EXCELLENCE

The Institutionalization of Service-Learning as a Pedagogical Tool for
Campus Engagement at Public Versus Private Higher Education Institutions

by

Gwenda R. Greene

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy
with a concentration in Educational Leadership/Systems
and a specialization in Educational Leadership and Policy

November 19, 2004

Core Faculty: Leland K. Hall, Sr., Ph.D.

Union Institute and University
Cincinnati, Ohio

UMI Number: 3160267

UMI®

Project Demonstrating Excellence (Dissertation)

Abstract

The Institutionalization of Service-Learning as a Pedagogical Tool for Campus Engagement at Public versus Private Higher Education Institutions

Historically, higher education institutions have charged departments such as Academic Affairs with students' academic growth, and Student Affairs with their social and emotional development. Where and how these two come together to engage the holistic development of students will differ widely among institutions. This research premise was to investigate a method that could help bridge Academic Affairs and Student Affairs areas. A comprehensive review of the literature on educational reforms in higher education delineates service-learning as an innovative pedagogy for impacting the holistic development of students while enhancing the scholarship of engagement throughout the institutions. This research outlines theories, principles, and legislation influencing the context of service-learning as an education reform, with specific emphasis on higher education.

In response to the paucity of models that reflect the institutional immersion of service-learning within the total culture of higher education institutions, the Project Demonstrating Excellence (PDE) is a causal-comparative study using quantitative analysis to assess data on the level of service-learning engagement at public versus private colleges and universities in the southeast and the variables that indicate the depth of engagement. The assumption of this study was that there is no significant difference between public and private institutions. The findings conclude that there is a significant difference between the extent of service-learning at private versus public institutions

relative to the following variables: (1) philosophy and mission of service-learning, (2) faculty support for and involvement in service-learning, (3) student support for and involvement in service-learning, (4) community participation and partnerships, and (5) institutional support for service-learning.

Data collected for this study, using the *Self Assessment Rubric for the Institutionalization of Service-Learning in Higher Education*, will help higher education institutions with existing service-learning programs assess their level of engagement. It will also serve as a foundation for building other innovative programs designed to strengthen teaching and learning in higher education by providing concrete variables for broadening their scope of campus engagement. In addition, it encourages the institutional immersion of programs such as service-learning within the culture of higher education institutions as an innovative means for helping to achieve institutions' missions relative to teaching, research, and public service.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Special appreciation to Ruby M. Blair and Angela M. Woodard, who both devoted their technical skills with as much quality and enthusiasm that I manifested as a learner. And, to my staff at Benedict College, I thank God for being a part of the greatest team of women whose personal, professional, and spiritual ethics helped me in my academic pursuit. I could not have done it without you.

And, last but not least, a hearty thanks to my family. First, I wish to thank my husband, Hayward, for his unequivocal support of me during this process and for having the patience of Job. To my son, Charles Alexander, whose sermons, prayers, kisses, academic accomplishments, and spiritual intuition helped me to maintain. I call him "my twin". I hope that he is as proud of me as I am of him, even though he did express a bit of disappointment when he learned that I would not be a "medical doctor." May he grow to discern the difference.

I further acknowledge my brothers and their families who supported me throughout this process. Two things dwell in spirit that my brothers always said to me during this process, "Just tell me what you need" and "Keep your eyes on the prize." A special acknowledgement goes to Hazel Richberg, my sister-in-law, who sacrificed much of her time and each of her summers to help take care of my son. He calls her his provider and I call her my spiritual sister. Also, to my neice Shayla, my mother's only granddaughter, I want you to be encouraged by this feat, in the spirit of sisterhood.

Finally, I dedicate this document to two heroines in my life: my mother, Christine Nimmons Richberg, who taught me balance, perseverance despite the circumstances, and to touch the lives of others; also, Dr. Freddye Davy, my Ph. D. role-model, who *naturally* manifests excellence, and during her tenure as a my supervisor, taught me to "do it well

iv

or not at all." I also dedicate this document in loving memory of my deceased mother-in-law, Mrs. Jessie P. Greene, who gave me her son as my spouse, and another son as a scholarly role-model, Dr. George M. Greene. Also, in the spirit of family and values, I remember my deceased father, Reverend Charles Richburg, and my brother, Craig Lee Richburg, who I know are proud of my accomplishments and whose spirits keep me laughing and motivated to reach higher heights.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLES

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

In our struggle to transform the world, we must be patiently impatient.

- Paulo Freire, 1970

Educators at all levels of the educational process should strive to gain knowledge through professional courses, workshops, in-service training and from practical experiences to build a repertoire of methods and strategies designed to assist diverse student populations. Educators should be holistic thinkers with a philosophy of teaching based upon the rationale that students are uniquely and culturally diverse, both academically and socially. Students bring these differences to the schools, and hence the classrooms. Unfortunately, these same differences can also have a negative impact on student retention. The National Dropout Prevention Center cites that one of the major reasons for student drop-outs in high school is a feeling of detachment from school. Also, students who drop out cite academic failure as a major reason for leaving school. Many of these students have not succeeded with traditional instruction (National Dropout Prevention Center, 2002).

This is important to consider as both high schools and colleges share the struggles of keeping culturally diverse students in the educational system to attain a quality education and graduate them at rates comparable to traditional student populations. Of particular concern to historically black postsecondary institutions, based upon their traditional missions to open doors of educational opportunity to underserved populations, is the National Dropout Prevention Center's conclusion that most drop outs come from the lowest socio-economic groups. The parents of dropouts tend to be high school

dropouts themselves, with a diminished appreciation for higher education (National Dropout Prevention Center, 2002).

The dropout rate will get progressively worse if attention is not given to viewing this issue holistically. High schools must work with their educational cohorts in secondary and post secondary institutions on systematic ways to keep students in school and motivate them to continue to pursue their education. Higher education institutions can not isolate themselves and continue to attract, retain, and graduate comparably diverse groups and higher numbers of students. Therefore, efforts should be made to liken the college to an ideal community by developing systems and activities that promote inclusion while demonstrating caring in the daily operations of the institution. Isolated thoughts of a spirit filled week of orientation for freshmen and sometimes weekends for high school students is not enough to help students develop an ongoing sense of belonging.

Bonnie Benard's (1995) research on resiliency shows that the college and the community can be the ones to set the standard by introducing students to caring adults or mentors, by having high expectations, and by providing students with meaningful and important roles. A continuum of connected activities within and beyond the college community must be strategically and purposefully intertwined in the institutional infrastructure. In setting out to create an environment that involves students in meaningful activities that lead to the discovery of knowledge and relationships pertinent to the course objectives, service-learning is one innovative method that can be incorporated into the curriculum. Research asserts that the unique blend of "service" and "learning" is an innovative methodology for engaging students in the learning process

and preparing them to be leaders in their respective communities and careers (Sigmon, 1990). All of these are steps towards transforming the institutions and their communities.

Community in this context is viewed in a broad sense. It embodies the college campus as a sub-community of the wider communities beyond the campus such as other schools, local neighborhoods, local, state and national businesses, agencies, and organizations. Now more than ever is the time for higher education institutions to transform their academic environments by considering the community as an integral part of the teaching and learning process. Colleges not only need to go to the community, but colleges also need the community to come to their campuses to create a reciprocal environment for learning. The service-learning movement can help bring about this transformation by retooling the teaching and learning process at institutions to extend beyond the traditional purview of scholarship from classrooms and textbooks to the civic engagement of students. The restructuring process can be viewed as an alternative strategy for helping students learn to be successful, regardless of socio-economic or cultural backgrounds, while helping institutions graduate higher populations of students who value the reciprocity of service.

Statement of the Problem

Historically, higher education institutions have placed a great deal of emphasis on the academic growth and the social development of students. Generally, the departments charged with the tasks are called Academic Affairs and Student Affairs. While academic affairs foci are academic development, student affairs work on those areas that develop the student socially and emotionally. Where and how these two come together to engage the holistic development of students will differ widely at different institutions.

Interestingly, service-learning is a method that can help bridge Academic Affairs and Student Affairs to enhance the overall development of students. Moreover, too often individual institutions grapple with integrating service-learning through isolated courses, programs, and projects. Though many programs talk about the institutionalization of service-learning, few institutions seem to have immersed the methodology into their total curricula. Therefore, the level of service-learning engagement varies widely at institutions. This study will examine the development of service-learning institutionalization at public versus private higher education institutions.

Research Questions

The following research questions are framed to investigate the problem:

1. What is the difference between the extent of service-learning institutionalization at public colleges and universities compared to private higher education institutions?

2. What are the key variables that differentiate the depth of engagement of service-learning at both public and private higher education institutions?

Definition of Terms

Academic Affairs – the area in the higher education organizational structure that is dedicated to developing students' intellect. Emphasis is on students' critical thinking, acquisition of knowledge, and academic activities in the classroom. Individuals that work within the structure have areas of expertise that are related to academic disciplines, research, writing, and publishing skills. The reward system is also based on scholarly productivity (Engstrom and Tinto, 2000).

4

Administrators – this study refers to administrators in the context of individuals such as Service-Learning directors/coordinators, Presidents, chief academic officers, or other academic leaders.

Civic education – pedagogical strategies for educating students regarding their responsibilities in a democratic society, allowing them to think about what it means to be a part of the multiple communities in which they find themselves, with the distinct goal of producing a more engaged and knowledgable citizenry (Battistoni, 2002).

Community Partnerships – a two-fold definition is as follows: (1) those work sites or tasks identified by service agencies or community groups as appropriate for course-based student involvement. (2) pointing to relationships that call for significant investments of time and effort on both sides designed to continue far beyond achieving specific tasks. (Zlotkowski). For this study, partners specifically refer to community schools, agencies and/or organizations that partnered with institutions in service-learning initiatives.

Community service - meeting the needs of service recipients, with little or no focus on learning (Cairn and Kielsmeier, 1991).

Curriculum – The set of courses and their contents offered by an educational institution such as a school (www.thefreedictionary.com)

Experiential Education – providing an experience for the learner, and facilitating the reflection on that experience. Experience alone is insufficient to be called experiential education. It is the reflection process which turns experience into experiential education. The process is often call an "action-reflection" cycle (Joplin, 1995).

5

External Funding – non-university funds (www.siu.edu/orda/guide/chap.1.html)

Faculty – persons teaching academic courses at a college or university. This study focuses specifically on those persons who have integrated service-learning in courses.

Higher Education – Colleges and universities that are degree-granting and accredited by an agency recognized by the U.S. Secretary of Education and are classified based on their degree-granting activities. (Carnegie Foundation, 2000). This study is relative only to specific institutions in the Southeast. Also, in this study, the terms are used interchangeably: higher education institutions, colleges and universities, and campuses.

Institutionalization – the process of fostering full integration. Miles and Ekholm (1991) provide indicators of service-learning institutionalization as follows: (1) acceptance by relevant actors, (2) routinization, (3) widespread use, (4) firmly expected continuation, and (5) legitimacy.

Internal Funding – university funds

National and Community Service Trust Act of 1993 – An act signed into law in 1993 as an amendment to the National and Community Service Act of 1990 to establish a Corporation for National Service, enhance opportunities for national service, and provide national service educational awards to persons participating in such service, and for other purposes.

Private Institution – Private colleges and universities are free of direct state or federal government control. Each independent institution is governed by a board of trustees made up of community and business leaders, alumni, faculty, students, and other

6

private citizens. The board of an independent college is its legal owner and final authority. It sets the institution's mission, appoints and monitors the progress of the president or chancellor, guides strategic planning, and ensures strong management (The National Association of Independent Colleges and Universities, 2002). In this study, the terms are used interchangeably: higher education (private) institutions, colleges and universities, and campuses.

Public Institution - locally governed schools supported with public funds. The term *governance* has a particular meaning when applied to the authority and responsibility of governing public boards of colleges and universities. A basic responsibility of governing boards is to oversee the delicate balance between institutional autonomy and public accountability. All states assign responsibility for governing public colleges and universities to one or more boards most often composed of a majority of lay citizens representing the public interest. The names of these boards vary, but "board of trustees" and "board of regents" are the most common. Public institution governing boards were modeled after the lay boards of private colleges and universities. Private college boards usually govern a single institution. In contrast, public institution boards most often govern several public institutions. In fact, 65% of the students in American public postsecondary education attend institutions whose governing boards cover multiple campuses (Education Commission of the States, 2001). In this study, the terms are used interchangeably: higher education (public) institutions, colleges and universities, and campuses.

Reward System – Universities' faculty are rewarded mainly based on research and teaching. For strategic planning to succeed, faculty should be rewarded for a broader

range of things (i.e. initiatives related to strategic planning), while the essence of the university - teaching and research - is preserved. People participate in activities that get rewarded, so universities have to be willing to shift resources and allocate funds for strategic priorities. In essence, strategic planning goals and objectives should be linked to the reward system (www.des.cal.state.edu/uniqueaspects.html)

Service-learning – a method of teaching through which students apply newly acquired academic skills and knowledge to address real-life needs in their own communities (*Alliance for Service-learning in Education Reform Standards of Quality for School-based Service-learning* - ASLER Standards, 1995).

Strategic Planning –   Strategic planning is a formal process designed to help a university identify and maintain an optimal alignment with the most important elements of the environment within which the university resides. This environment consists of the political, social, economic, technological, and educational ecosystem, both internal and external to the university (Rowley, Lujan, Dolence, 1997, p. 14-15).

Student Affairs - the area in the higher education organizational structure that is dedicated to creating conditions for helping students develop coherent values and ethical standards, setting and communicating high expectations for learning, and building supportive and inclusive communities that foster cognitive competence, intrapersonal competence, interpersonal competence, and practical competence. Thus, good student affairs practices provide students with opportunities for experimentation, application, involvement, and reflection through a wide range of programs and functions focused on engaging students in learning experiences. These opportunities include experiential learning, collective decision making, peer instruction, and shared educational experiences

that advance knowledge acquisition and more complex ways of thinking (Blimling and Whitt, 1999).

Students - For the study, students are referenced as those persons attending a college or university who have engaged in service-learning through academic coursework.

Research Hypotheses

Five hypotheses were formulated and tested as a part of this study:

1. There is a significant difference between public and private institutions relative to their philosophy and mission of service-learning.

2. There is a significant difference between public and private institutions relative to faculty support for and involvement in service-learning.

3. There is a significant difference between public and private institutions relative to student support for and involvement in service-learning.

4. There is a significant difference between public and private institutions relative to community participation and partnerships.

5. There is a significant difference between public and private institutions relative to institutional support for service-learning.

Statement of Purpose

In response to the paucity of models that truly reflect the comprehensiveness of institutionalization and models delineating campus-wide service-learning approaches at higher education institutions, the Project Demonstrating Excellence (PDE) will be a quantitative study of the level of engagement in service-learning at public and private colleges and universities in the southeast. This study will assess existing service-learning

programs and will serve as a foundation for building other innovative service-learning programs designed to strengthen teaching and learning in higher education by providing concrete variables for broadening their scope of campus engagement and encouraging institutionalization.

Limitations of the Study

This study is designed to query the level of service-learning institutionalization at colleges and universities. The target population is limited to students, administrators, faculty, and community partners engaged in service-learning at institutions in the southeast. As such, the results will be generic to the southern region. The number of institutions and samples drawn from those institutions may not provide complete comparative results of the full southeastern scope of engagement in service-learning. In addition, there was no attempt to compare institutions based upon demographical similarities. The distinguishing factors were limited to selected public and private institutions.

Social Significance

In a Chronicle on Higher Education article *Tackling the Myth of Black Students' Intellectual Inferiority* Theresa Perry (2003, January) asserts the following:

Many institutions are simply assemblages of disconnected activities and events. Schools and colleges are not intentionally organized to create identities of African-American students as achievers ---- or to inspire hope, to create optimism and sustain effort...black faculty members and administrators will need to create spaces on their campuses where black students can openly discuss their beliefs...Black students, irrespective of class, background, and prior level of

academic preparation, will have difficulty achieving in institutions that are individualistic, highly stratified, and competitive, and that make few attempts to build and ritualize a common, strong culture of achievement that extends to all students. Conversely, African-American students will succeed in institutions that have a strong sense of group membership, and where an expectation that everyone can achieve is explicit and regularly communicated in public settings (p. B12).

The PDE study is significant as it examines service-learning in higher education as a context for addressing larger societal issues of connectedness and inclusivity as discussed by Perry. Not only is there a lack of "community" on college campuses that is structurally woven into the infrastructure of the institutions, there is also a lack of "community" that exists in the larger society that gives space for all to feel that each has a voice. Perry's assertions regarding students' intellectual inferiority can help address the premise regarding the flaw in the educational system: the lack of connectedness between components that make-up the educational system and the lack of inclusivity within educational institutions. The Carnegie Foundation helps make the case for service-learning connectivity in higher education:

> The scholarship of engagement means connecting the rich resources of the university to our most pressing social, civic, and ethical problems...But what is also needed is not just more programs, but a larger purpose, a larger sense of mission, a larger clarity of direction in the nation's life (Guidelines for Developing a State Campus Compact, 2001)

Larger issues may never be fully and holistically addressed until communities [groups] of people organize to develop and articulate methods that work, not as isolated but as "institutionalized" activities and decisions.

Format of the Project Demonstrating Excellence

Chapter Two contains a comprehensive review of the literature revealing the economic and social factors that have influenced the historical foundations of the educational system and experiential learning. It also outlines theories, principles, and legislation influencing the context of service-learning as an education reform, with specific emphasis on higher education. Chapter Three discusses the causal-comparative quantitative research design. Chapter Four presents the data and analysis. Chapter Five concludes the study with a summary, significant findings, conclusions, and recommendations for further programs' implementation and further study.

CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

The following literature review is divided into three sections designed to broadly

document current studies, ideas, and scholarly opinions regarding the evolution and

impact of service in the educational system. Section one provides a historical overview

of the foundations of the educational system and experiential learning. It provides insight

on the general purpose and function of education starting from the 1700s. It also reveals

the economic and social factors that have influenced theoretical constructs relative to the

acquisition of education using real-life contexts for skill-building. Section two provides a

thorough view of service-learning theory and principles as it extrapolates information on

the definitions and concepts of service-learning as a teaching and learning methodology.

Section three presents literature relative to the state of service-learning in higher

education. It outlines the national agenda for service by reviewing its legislative impetus

and evaluating higher education institutions' active role in student civic engagement as an

educational strategy. In addition, ideas are delineated relative to factors within and

outside of the curriculum that help demonstrate an institution's commitment to service-

learning. One key point in this section is the discussion of service-learning engagement

through student affairs activities as a strategy for binding the seam between Academic

and Student Affairs to elicit comprehensive campus involvement in nurturing student

excellence.

Historical Foundations

Benjamin Franklin, in 1743, was anxious to establish a school that would

emphasize a general type of training focusing on subjects such as English, mathematics,

morality, geography and history. The curriculum suggested by Franklin was a radical innovation. No country in the world previously had undertaken the task to educate its citizenry on the broad scale attempted in America.

No teacher can hope to succeed until he comprehends clearly the general purpose and function of education. The Report of the Commission on the Reorganization of Secondary Schools said in 1918 that the purpose of education is "to develop in each individual the knowledge, interests, ideals, habits and powers whereby he will find his place and use that place to shape both himself and society toward ever nobler ends" (Bossing, 1942). This was the thinking of the educated American society in the early 1900's from a secondary education perspective. The fact that in American education everybody is perceived as being just American is what many people refer to as the brainwashing function of the United States educational system. For example, for African Americans, the education system has in many ways done what Carter G. Woodson said in his 1933 classic study, The *Miseducation of the Negro*. From a sociological purview, education in America has taught African Americans to understand the ideals, the values, and the norms of White society. It has taught African Americans what White society expects as appropriate normative behavior. It has not taught African Americans anything about themselves or their experience as a people in this particular society (Jackson, 2001).

Douglas Davidson (as cited in Jackson, 2001) comments that from the time of African Americans' inclusion in the American educational system, essentially, African Americans learned the same general set of criteria, the same kind of propaganda that is taught from kindergarten through twelfth grade, regarding how America was founded and

14

what are the important values in America. The education system perpetuates the myth that all Americans are the same and does not recognize the differences among African Americans, Caucasians, Native Americans, nor Mexican Americans, to name a few.

The education system worked very effectively to help white immigrant populations transform themselves into what is considered mainstream, working, and middle class Americans. It was expected to transform people of color in a similar manner. African Americans were expected to become loyal, unquestioning, uncritical, colorblind mainstream Americans. At the same time, African Americans were being taught equality while they were physically segregated. Racism is a reality in the daily lives of African Americans and in their communities. In many ways, it is unavoidable. But there is nothing in the educational system that explains that racism or that accounts for why they are the unique victims of it in so many ways (Jackson, 2001).

From a historical perspective, economic and social factors have created significant effects on schools and colleges. After 150 years of what was perceived as an almost economic expansion, the economy of the United States suffered a decade of near paralysis, now known as the Great Depression of the 1930s. At this time, the Civilian Conservation Corps was created with government funds to put boys into camps where they could do useful work, get vocational training, and at the same time send money home. Shortly afterwards, the National Youth Administration was created to provide work projects in high schools and colleges whereby needy youth could earn enough to pay their school expenses.

During the period immediately following the Depression, the schools and colleges took on a major new function, that of custodial care of youth. Since there was little or no

work available for youth, boys and girls were encouraged to stay in school, aided if necessary by government scholarships and work projects. The rationale for scholarships and work projects was to keep young people out of trouble. The situation was somewhat similar to the government subsidy of work-study and other 'action' learning programs in the 1980s (Levine and Havighurst, 1984). Since the 1960's, experiential educators have argued that service can engage students in active learning. The arguments in favor of experiential-based education grew out of a pragmatic and experiential theory of knowledge. "Early in the twentieth century, industrialists appropriated John Dewey's experience-based model of education as a means of vocational training" (Mattson and Shea, 1977). Service-Learning practitioners have long viewed knowledge as something actively constructed by the learner, not simply given to the learner to retain. Like Dewey, Whitehead and other experiential learning theorists believe that if knowledge is to be accessible to solve a new problem, it is best learned in a context where it is used as a problem-solving tool. To understand academic material is to be able to see its relevance to new situations; without that capacity, the students' knowledge is useless. Dewey called such knowledge "static knowledge" and distinguished between information that has been stored in memory and that which has actually been understood. Understanding is distinct from the ability to recall information when prompted by a test; it is the ability to call it up when it is relevant to a new situation and the ability to use it in that situation. Material that is understood has meaning for the learner (Eyler and Giles, 1999). Leaders in the movement, such as Robert Sigmon (1990), have stressed that environments where students serve, when coupled with spaces to draw lessons from their activities, invite them to become engaged in the unpredictable dynamics of experiencing and learning.

16

"Participating in service-learning", according to Sigmon (1990), "is a way to learn through both intimate involvement and distanced reflection, and examines how differences between these processes [service and reflection] enable us to better understand our complicated world."

Service-Learning Theory and Principles

Enriching student excellence through activities designed to bring about change is the focus of service-learning. "Service-learning is a process through which students are involved in community work that contributes significantly: 1) to positive change in individuals, organizations, neighborhoods and/or larger systems in a community; and 2) to students' academic understanding, civic development, personal or career growth, and/or understanding of larger societal issues" (Mustacio, 2004). Reflection and reciprocity are key concepts of service-learning. Sally Migliore [former President of the National Society for Experiential Education (NSEE)] cites that the hyphen in *service-learning* is critical in that it symbolizes the symbiotic relationship between service and learning. The term *community* in the definition of service-learning refers to local neighborhoods, the state, the nation, and the global community. The human and community needs that service-learning addresses are those needs that are *defined by the community* (Jacoby, 1996). Students learn and develop through the service conducted that meets the needs of a community. Cairn and Kielsmeier (1991) further adds that service-learning intentionally links service activities with the academic curriculum to address real community needs while students learn through active engagement and reflection. Robert Bringle and Julie Hatcher cites service-learning as an organized way to

"gain further understanding of course content, a broader appreciation of the discipline, and an enhanced sense of civic responsibility" (Mustacio, 2004).

A May 1993 publication entitled *Alliance for Service-Learning in Education Reform* (ASLER) *Standards of Quality for School-Based Service-Learning* contains the following definition: "Service-learning is a method of teaching through which students apply newly acquired academic skills and knowledge to address real-life needs in their own communities." A very important dimension of the service-learning experience is that it deals with real-life needs. One frequently heard criticism of today's public education efforts is that they are not relevant to contemporary problems. Service-learning, with its community orientation, is one way to help build the desired relevance. In addition, by having a "real-life" orientation, service-learning is more likely to motivate and generate learner enthusiasm than more traditional text-based approaches. Service-learning provides experiences that: (1) meet actual community needs; (2) are coordinated in collaboration with the school and community; (3) are integrated into each young person's academic curriculum; (4) provide structured time for a young person to think, talk, and write about what he/she did and saw during the actual service activity; (5) provide young people with opportunities to use newly acquired academic skills; (6) knowledge in real-life situations in their own communities; (7) enhance what is taught in the school by extending student learning beyond the classroom; and (8) help to foster a sense of caring for others and civic responsibility.

While many practitioners acknowledge the relationship between service-learning and experiential learning, several assert that while they are similar, there is a major difference between service-learning and experiential learning. This is the concept of

service. Experiential learning is based on the belief that students learn better by doing. Service-learning adds to the belief that students learn best by engaging in activities that are personally meaningful and have a positive impact on others. Service-learning has a different mission than experiential learning (Osborne, Penticuff, & Norman, 1997). As a form of experiential education, service-learning is based on the pedagogical principle that learning and development do not necessarily occur as a result of experience itself, but as a result of a reflective component explicitly designed to foster learning and development. Service-learning programs are also explicitly structured to promote learning about the larger social issues underlying the needs to which their service is responding. This learning includes a deeper understanding of the historical, sociological, cultural, economic, and political contexts of the needs or issues being addressed (Kendall, 1990). Service-learning is a multifaceted pedagogy that crosses all levels of schooling, has potential relevance to all academic and professional disciplines, is connected to a range of dynamic social issues, and operates within a broad range of dynamic social issues, and operates within a broad range of community contexts (Furco and Billig, 2003).

The other essential concept of service-learning is reciprocity between the server and the person or group being served. Through reciprocity, students develop a greater sense of belonging and responsibility as members of a larger community. Kendall (1990) finds that reciprocity creates "a sense of mutual responsibility and respect between individuals in the service-learning exchange"(p. 22). As a pedagogy, service-learning is education that is grounded in experience as a basis for learning and on the centrality and intentionality of reflection designed to enable learning to occur (Jacoby, 1996).

Service-Learning in Higher Education

The federal government's interest in and support of service-learning increased substantially in the 1900s with the passage of the National and Community Service Trust Act of 1990. This Act represented the culmination of George Bush, Sr.'s 1988 presidential campaign recognition of "a thousand points of light," which inspired the creation of the first White House Office of National Service and the Points of Lights Foundation. After the excitement created by Bill Clinton's presidential campaign for a large-scale national service program, a long and heated congressional debate finally culminated in the passage of the National and Community Service Trust Act of 1993. As a result, the Commission on National and Community Service, ACTION, and the newly established National Civilian Community Corps merged to form the Corporation for National and Community Service, generally referred to as the Corporation for National Service. The corporation's programs have given tremendous impetus to service-learning as a part of the curriculum for colleges and universities. Many institutions of higher education have entered into partnerships with community agencies and schools to engage college students in addressing a wide range of needs (Jacoby, 1996).

The National and Community Service Trust Act of 1993 was signed into law on Tuesday, January 5, 1993. Title I of the Act granted authority to establish six functional programs within the Corporation for National Service. These programs are found in the following sections of the Act:

      101. Federal investment in support of national service

      102. National Service Trust and provision of national service educational awards

103. School-based and community-based service-learning programs

104. Quality and innovation activities

105. Public Lands Corps

106. Urban Youth Corps

The provisions of support for higher education innovative programs for community service are codified in Section 119, H. R. 2010, as follows:

Purpose – It is the purpose of this part to expand participation in community service by supporting innovative community service programs carried out through institutions of higher education, acting as civic institutions to meet the human, educational, environmental, or public safety needs of neighboring communities.

General Authority – The Corporation, in consultation with the Secretary of Education, is authorized to make grants to, and enter into contracts with, institutions of higher education (including a combination of such institutions), and partnerships comprised of such institutions and of other public or private nonprofit organizations, to pay for the Federal share of the cost of –

1. Enabling such an institution or partnership to create or expand an organized community service program that –

   A. Engenders a sense of social responsibility and commitment to the community in which the institution is located; and

21

B. Provides projects for participants, who shall be students, faculty, administration, or staff of the institution or resident of the community;

2. Supporting student-initiated and student-designed community service projects through the program;

3. Strengthening the leadership and instructional capacity of teachers at the elementary, secondary, and postsecondary levels, with respect to service-learning, by –

   A. Including service-learning as a key component of the preservice teacher education program of the institution; and

   B. Encouraging the faculty of the institution to use service-learning methods throughout their curriculum;

4. Facilitating the integration of community service carried out under the program into academic curricula, including integration of clinical programs into the curriculum for students in professional schools, so that students can obtain credit for their community service projects;

5. Supplementing the funds available to carry out workstudy programs under part C of title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C 2751 et seq.) to support service-learning and community service through the community service program;

6. Strengthening the service infrastructure within institutions of higher education in the United States through the program; and

7. Providing for the training of teachers, prospective teachers, related education personnel, and community leaders in the skills necessary to develop, supervise, and organize service-learning.

Higher education is a vital and indispensable sect within society that encourages student excellence through public outreach and prepares students to participate actively and productively in our democracy (Rueben, 2004; Battistoni, 2002). According to Battistoni (2002), achieving the civic purposes of higher education is not the sole responsibility of faculty in perceived stereotypical fields such as Political Science, but rather, it is the responsibility of faculty in all disciplines. Education is one of the primary institutions for socializing children. As an agent of socialization, school teaches the language, history, values, and norms of behavior of the larger society. In essence, school has the responsibility of training an individual to become a responsible, loyal citizen; how to become an accepted and effective member of the larger society (Jackson, 2001). Indeed, many argue universities are only interested in theory, not practice; they teach science, not virtue. The only coin of value at a university is verified truth (O'Brien, 2000). In some cases this still holds true, and in other cases, institutions are continually seeking innovative methods for transforming campuses to become more participatory within and outside its infrastructure. Service-Learning has the potential to change the civic culture of a school (Furco and Billig, 2002).

Battistoni (2002) argues for service-learning as the most effective strategy for achieving higher education's civic purposes. He suggests that service-learning is a community engagement teaching method that can be effectively applied equally to all disciplines and can provide the necessary educational opportunities for students across

the academy to practice their citizenship skills. One of John Dewey's most significant propositions was that "democracy must begin at home, and its home is the neighborly community." As an appeal to universities to focus their attention on improving democracy, Jacoby echoes, but updates, Dewey's proposition: "Democracy must begin at home, and its home is the engaged neighborly college and university and its local partners" (Jacoby, 2003).

The term *learning* is a central component of service-learning. However, the term *engagement* is a key term that suggests something that is collaborative, integrated, and sustaining. In this context, learning is analogous to activity and engagement to institutionalization. Service-learning has tremendous potential as a vehicle through which colleges and universities can meet their goals for student learning and development while making unique contributions to addressing unmet community, national, and global needs. (Jacoby, 2003). Ramaley (2000) states, "engagement differs from the customary definitions of outreach and professional or public service in that it involves a shared agenda that is beneficial to both the institution and the community, rather than the usual one-way transfer of knowledge and resources from the university to the community."

Higher education experts, government and business leaders, and society at large are more loudly and more frequently calling on higher education to sustain and increase its commitment to resolving social problems and meeting human needs and, at the same time, to focus more sharply on student learning and development. Through improved town-gown relationships, colleges and universities also gain additional experiential learning settings for students, and new opportunities for faculty to orient research and teaching to meet human and community needs (Jacoby, 1996).

24

While service-learning that is embedded in the curriculum provides opportunities for faculty to enhance students' learning by integrating course content with practical experience in a structured manner intended to meet course objectives, powerful opportunities for student learning and development also occur outside the classroom. Research on student learning outcomes in the 1980s has led to growing recognition of the interplay between the curricular and co-curricular domain. There are many areas, such as service-learning, where formalized and explicit collaboration between academic and student affairs is appropriately effective (Ruben, 2004) for helping to advance the teaching, research, and service mission of institutions across the nation. Service-learning has provided an important opportunity for institutions to re-imagine their roles and missions in communities (Enos and Morton, 2003). Student affairs professionals can and do involve students in co-curricular service-learning programs that contribute to learning and development. While service-learning that is connected to faculty research and community involvement can lead to more broad-based and long-term community enhancement, shorter-term service projects also make considerable contributions to communities in both direct and indirect ways. In fact, even one-time experiences designed to achieve specific student learning and development outcomes and to address community needs as defined by the community can be appropriately called service-learning (Jacoby, 1996). Establishing collaborative partnerships between academic and student affairs are powerful vehicles for transforming institutions into learning-centered organizations that promote individual and institutional civic responsibility and enrich students, institutions, and the society (Engstrom, 2003).

Community agencies play a vital role in any service-learning endeavor. As key stakeholders in service-learning, it is important to know how agencies perceive the service experience, the students who serve in their agencies, and their relationship with the college. Such knowledge is critical to understanding and meeting the needs of all stakeholder groups and to creating lasting college and community partnerships (Johnson, Young, & Johnson 1997). Community benefits include new energy and assistance to broaden delivery of existing services or to begin new ones; fresh approaches to solving problems; access to resources; and opportunities to participate in the teaching and learning process (Jacoby, 1996).

Different types of institutions have distinctly different missions, traditions, and approaches regarding service and service-learning. Some embrace service-learning as a philosophy and have developed programs that encompass the critical elements of reflection and reciprocity. Others support student involvement in community service to varying extents and may or may not include the fundamental concepts of service-learning (Jacoby, 1996). Historical research argues that there are some institutions that have done both by embracing service-learning as a philosophy while integrating the critical elements.

Service-learning programs must have some academic context and be designed in such a way that ensures that service enhances the learning and the learning enhances the service (Furco, 1996). Increasingly, service-learning is being adopted by institutions of higher education with a variety of academic disciplines (Lewis, 1995; Exley, Johnson, S. & Johnson, D., 1966). Both college students and the communities they serve stand to reap substantial benefits from engaging in service-learning. Among frequently cited benefits

26

to student participants in service-learning are developing the habit of critical reflection; deepening their comprehension of course content; integrating theory with practice; increasing their understanding of the issues underlying social problems; strengthening their sense of social responsibility; enhancing their cognitive, personal, and spiritual development; heightening their understanding of human differences and commonalities; and sharpening their abilities to solve problems creatively and to work collaboratively (Jacoby, 1996).

Service-learning programs exist at a wide range of levels of institutional commitment. At institutions where service-learning is central, it is a prominent and highlighted aspect of the mission; institutional funding is secure; policies explicitly support service; student, faculty, and staff involvement in service-learning is recognized and rewarded; and a strong commitment to service-learning is shared among all constituents. At the other end of the continuum are many colleges and universities where those who promote and attempt to coordinate service-learning remain on the periphery of their institutions' policies and practices, where funding is scarce and constantly in question. Such is the case of many historically black institutions that connect service and leadership and ground their programs in community partnerships and public problem solving (Jacoby, 1996). This is also pertinent to institutions that have instituted service-learning within the evaluation criteria for faculty. Most institutions are continually seeking ways to foster the scholarly development and interaction. In some cases, institutions who embrace the continuum of a learning-centered campus have found ways to recognize both faculty and staff for scholarship. Scholarship in the areas of teaching, research, and service can be evaluated through a variety of activities: research, including

creative activities; teaching, including delivery of instruction, mentoring, and curricular activities; and, community outreach ("Policies and Procedures for the Evaluation of Faculty" 2000). Those institutions that are committed to total campus engagement, through entities such as service-learning, reap long-term benefits: students engaged in service-learning report stronger faculty relationships than those who are not involved in service-learning, service-learning improves student satisfaction with college, and students engaged in service-learning are more likely to graduate (Eyler, Giles, & Gray 1999).

CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGY

Sample and Procedure

The learner conducted a demographics analysis of identified colleges and universities in the southeast with Service-learning programs. Data such as historical missions, enrollment, majors, and faculty-student ratios were examined. The sample for the study consisted of 227 subjects from the target population of faculty, administrators, students, and community partners from 4 public and 3 private colleges and universities in the southeast. Samples were drawn from a total of 19 administrators, 154 students, 28 faculty, and 26 community partners. The administrators were individuals such as Service-learning directors/coordinators, Presidents, chief academic officers, or other academic leaders. The students were those who have engaged in service-learning. The faculty was those who have integrated service-learning in courses. The community partners were the community schools, agencies and/or organizations that had partnered with institutions in service-learning initiatives. The samples extracted represent a 54% return of the 227 total subjects that responded to the study.

Instrument Construction and Validation

This study utilized findings from an instrument developed by Andrew Furco (2002), a national researcher in service-learning. Permission to utilize this instrument was granted in September 2003 by Karen Partridge, Publications Coordinator for Campus Compact, a national service-learning organization. The assessment instrument is entitled the *Self-Assessment Rubric for the Institutionalization of Service-Learning in Higher Education.* The instrument is a rubric designed to gauge campus's level of service-learning

institutionalization efforts. The rubric is structured by five dimensions, which are considered by most service-learning experts the key factors for higher education service-learning institutionalization. Each dimension is comprised of several components that characterize the dimension:

Dimension I: Philosophy and Mission of Service-Learning
 A. Definition of Service-Learning
 B. Strategic Planning
 C. Alignment with Institutional Mission
 D. Alignment with Educational Reform Efforts

Dimension II: Faculty Support for and Involvement in Service-Learning
 A. Faculty Knowledge
 B. Faculty Involvement & Support
 C. Faculty Leadership
 D. Faculty Incentive and Rewards

Dimension III: Student Support for and Involvement in Service-Learning
 A. Student Awareness
 B. Student Opportunities
 C. Student Leadership
 D. Student Incentive & Rewards

Dimension IV: Community Participation and Partnerships
 A. Community Partner Awareness
 B. Mutual Understanding
 C. Community Partner Voice & Leadership

Dimension V: Institutional Support for Service-Learning
 A. Coordinating Entity
 B. Policy-making Entity
 C. Staffing
 D. Funding
 E. Administrative Support
 F. Departmental Support
 G. Evaluation and Assessment

For each component, a three-stage continuum of development has been established. Stage One is the *Critical Mass Building* stage. At this stage campuses are beginning to recognize and are building a campus-wide constituency for the effort. Stage

Two is the *Quality Building* stage. At this stage campuses are focused on ensuring the development of "quality" service-learning activities; the quality of service-learning activities begins the quantity of service-learning activities. Stage Three is the *Sustained Institutionalization* stage. At this stage a campus has fully institutionalized service-learning into the fabric of the institution. For the purpose of this study, the five dimensions were divided and assigned to the subjects in the target population as follows:

Administrative Leaders	Dimensions I, II, III, IV, V
Faculty	Dimensions I, II, III, IV, V
Students	Dimension III
Community Partners	Dimension IV

Data Collection

Key coordinators at targeted institutions were identified and contacted in December 2003 to request permission to distribute surveys. If they were not contacted, the material was sent to them based on previous information gained through networking in the field of service-learning. During this process, the learner discovered that three (3) of the eleven (11) institutions originally targeted, no longer had programs. Additional surveys were distributed throughout the month of January. Within a four-month period, all data was collected. A total of 227 subjects participated from seven (7) institutions: 4 public and 3 private.

Survey Administration

Appropriate administrators or other key personnel at targeted institutions were contacted via telephone or e-mail for permission to distribute surveys and to identify an authorized coordinator to disseminate the surveys. The authorized coordinator is referred to in this study as the Key Coordinator. After the Key Coordinators were identified, packets containing instructional letters and surveys were administered to Key

Coordinators based upon their preferred method of receipt: mail, e-mail, or fax. The Key

Coordinators distributed the surveys to the selected sampling. In each packet, there were

3 surveys for administrators who may include individuals such as service-learning

directors/coordinators, Presidents, chief academic officers, or other academic leaders; 5

faculty surveys for faculty who used service learning in a class; 25 student surveys for

students who had engaged in service-learning; and, 5 community agency surveys for each

agency that partnered with the institution. The average time for taking the survey was

estimated at 15 minutes. A self –addressed envelope was enclosed for the return of the

completed survey by mail. Otherwise, it was returned electronically via e-mail. One

partner returned the survey via facsimile transmission. Follow-up correspondences were

employed to enhance the return percentage. A copy of the survey package is made a part

of Appendices A, B, and C.

Data Analysis

Following the coding of the data and the creation of a computer data file in Excel,

the data was analyzed using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS).

Descriptive data (i.e. mean, mode, probability, and standard deviation) was computed to

establish itemized response profiles. Inferential statistics, such as the t-Test, was

employed to discern differences among the sample of respondents. Frequency

distributions were conducted to determine itemization validity. The descriptive data

provided the empirical data needed to address each research hypothesis.

Significance of the Study

The data resulting from this study will be used as a foundation from which to assess

existing service-learning programs or to build other innovative programs designed to

strengthen teaching and learning in higher education. The results of the inquiry will provide indicators for the level of service-learning institutionalization in higher education institutions in the southeast, with a specific focus on the following variables:

1. Differences between public and private institutions relative to their philosophy and mission of service-learning.

2. Differences between public and private institutions relative to faculty support for and involvement in service-learning.

3. Differences between public and private institutions relative to student support for and involvement in service-learning.

4. Differences between public and private institutions relative to community participation and partnerships.

5. Differences between public and private institutions relative to institutional support for service-learning.

CHAPTER FOUR

FINDINGS, RESULTS, AND DISCUSSION

The purpose of this study was to assess the level of engagement in service-learning at public versus private colleges and universities in the southeast. The ultimate goal of this study will serve as a foundation for strengthening existing service-learning programs and will provide concrete variables for broadening and encouraging the institutional immersion of service-learning within the culture of higher education institutions as an innovative means for helping to achieve the institutions' missions. The design of the research instrumentation set the parameters for the two-part analysis: one part of the survey, named the *Background Information Sheet*, was a demographics inquiry and the second part of the survey was the rubric. The results of the analyses performed in this study are divided into two parts, accordingly. First, there are results of descriptive analyses of the demographic data collected in Part I. Part I includes the frequency and percentage of responses relative to the institutions, courses, and survey participants. Second, findings and statistical analysis using the t-Test for independent means are presented as Part II in this chapter. The results from the statistical procedures will be the premise for discussion.

Descriptive Findings

<u>Faculty</u>

At least 5 faculty members from the target institutions who have used or are currently using service-learning in classes completed each of the five dimensions of the survey. Twenty-six faculty members responded to the survey by completing a background informational sheet (see Appendix A) and each of the five dimensions of the

survey: 13 from private institutions and 13 from public institutions. An equal percentage of faculty responded to the survey: 50% faculty from private institutions and 50% faculty from public institutions. Faculty members were asked to respond to the training in service-learning in which they have engaged and the top three include: 46.2% - workshops, 38.5% - trainings, 34.6% - regional conferences. Faculty members who responded stated that they view *enhanced college/community collaboration* as the primary benefit of service-learning. This is the same view held by administrative leaders who participated in the survey.

For faculty members' classroom experiences, 88.5% integrated service-learning as a required component, as opposed to an optional choice. A large percentage, 76.9%, required students to engage in 10-25 hours to fulfill course requirements. Another 50% of the faculty members had between 21-40 students who were primarily classified as sophomores and juniors enrolled in the courses that infuse service-learning.

To implement the project, 34.6% faculty members stated that contact was handled by someone other than themselves. When contact was made by faculty members, 19.2% equally stated that from 1-6 contacts were made to successfully implement projects. Of the faculty members, 92.3% did not receive external funding for the implementation of the projects. The primary need area of service was education where 46.2% of the faculty assigned projects. In addition, 42.3% of the faculty members stated they have more than 20 years of teaching experience. The next top two responses spanned from 11-15 years to 1-5 years of teaching experience. Of the faculty members, 26.9% have utilized service-learning in courses for 1-2 years and 26.9% have utilized service-learning in courses for 3-4 years.

Students

At least 25 students from the target institutions who have engaged in or are currently enrolled in courses that utilize service-learning completed the survey. A total of 154 students responded to the survey by completing a background informational sheet (see Appendix A) and Dimension III of the survey: 91 from private institutions and 63 from public institutions. Responding to the survey were 59.1% students from private institutions and 40.9% students from public institutions. Of the respondents, 64.9% were females and 33.1% were males between the ages of 17-22. Most of the respondents were classified as juniors and seniors with 41.6% majoring in the areas of education and health. The highest cumulative grade point averages were between 2.6-3.5 (on a 4.0 scale).

Community Partners

At least five community agencies that are currently partners or have partnered with the institutions in service-learning initiatives were asked to complete the *Service-Learning Community Partners* survey. A total of 27 community partners completed a background informational sheet (see Appendix A) and Dimension IV of the survey: 14 were partners with private institutions and 13 were partners with public institutions.

Responding to the survey, 51.9% of the community partner sampling were partners with private institutions and 48.1% were partners with public institutions. Both educational and human service agencies were represented equally at 44.4%, with 48.1% viewing the college/university as a great resource for the community. Moreover, 70.4% of the community partners are aware of an identified office at the college/university that supports service and 33.3% have been partners with the institutions 5 or more years.

An initial assessment on the level of engagement from students and institutions found that 6-10 students served at agency sites, community partners interacted with 1-3 faculty member and 1-3 staff members. In addition, 77.8% of the community partners stated that someone from the agency requested the continuation of service by the students beyond the duration of the course. Community partners also cited enhanced *college/community collaboration* as the primary benefit of service-learning. Like the student respondents, community partners cited enhanced leadership skills as a benefit.

<u>Administrative Leaders</u>

At least 3 administrative leaders who have played key roles in helping service-learning evolve on the campus were sent the survey. Administrative leaders included individuals such as service-learning directors/coordinators, college/university Presidents, chief academic officers, or other academic leaders. Nineteen administrative leaders responded to the survey by completing a background informational sheet (see Appendix A) and each of the five dimensions of the survey: 9 from private institutions and 10 from public institutions.

Responding to the survey were 47.4% administrative leaders from private institutions and 52.6% administrative leaders from public institutions. Twenty six percent of the sampling represented institutions sized 4000-4999, while 21% represented institutions sized 1000-1999. Administrative leaders were given the opportunity to check the resources provided by the institution to support service-learning on their campuses. The top four answers were equally split to cite the following resources: 68.4% - workshops or forums, 68.4% - clerical support, 63.2% - service-learning or community service centers, and 63.2% - service recognized for promotion and/or tenure.

An initial assessment on the level of engagement was ascertained where 42.1% of the administrative leaders stated that service-learning is not required for graduation. In instances where service-learning is a graduation requirement at institutions, an equal percentage stated that 1-30 hours or more than 90 hours are required for graduation. A small percentage of the administrative leaders stated that community service is a requirement for graduation where students are required to complete 31-60 hours. However, the larger percentage of respondents, 57.9%, stated that community service is not a requirement for graduation. To assess the number of faculty who utilize service-learning on campuses, administrative leaders split an equal percentage of 26.3% between the figure of 1-10 faculty members and more than 40 faculty members. No matter whether it is basic or widespread, undoubtedly campuses engage in service-learning because they envision benefits. Administrative leaders answered *enhanced college/community collaboration* as the primary benefit of service-learning.

Statistical Analysis

Means of the institutional differences were calculated for each of the five variables - philosophy and mission, faculty support, student support, community partnerships, and institutional support – that were on the survey rubric. The t-test, which is a parametric test of statistical significance (Fraenkel and Wallen, 2003), was used to assess whether there is a statistically significant difference between the means of the five variables relative to the two groups: public versus private institutions. The determinant levels of significance were based upon the ratio between the .05 norm and number of comparisons made within each dimension relative to the sample population

responses (referred to as G in the following example): .05/G = Alpha Level of

Significance.   As noted in the tables, the significant levels were .01 and .007.

Philosophy of Mission – Testing of Hypothesis 1

Hypothesis 1:   There is a significant difference between public and private institutions relative to their philosophy and mission of service-learning.

Philosophy of Mission – Definition of Service-Learning

This survey was answered by faculty members. In the survey, this item queries faculty members' level of understanding of what is service-learning. The premise is that faculty who use service-learning as a teaching methodology should have a consistent understanding of the application of the term. A more consistent understanding generally leads to higher quality classroom and campus-wide engagement in appropriate service-learning activities. A significant difference was not found between the mean rating of private institutions (2.77) and the mean rating of public institutions (2.10). The null hypothesis of no significant difference was retained (see Table 1).

Philosophy of Mission – Strategic Planning

Strategic Planning relates to faculty members' knowledge of service-learning's inclusion in the institution's strategic plans. Institutions that have included service-learning in their formal planning process not only view the program as an important element but also align service-learning with their institutional goals. Alignment with the direction of the institution advances the implementation of service-learning goals which help faculty members understand the connection between service-learning implementation in the classroom and the strategic direction of the institution. A statistical significant difference was not found between the mean rating of private institutions (2.85) and the mean rating of public institutions (2.00). The null hypothesis of no significant difference was retained (see Table 1).

Philosophy of Mission – Alignment with the Institutional Mission

This item queries faculty. Alignment with the institutional mission further endorses the inclusion of service-learning in the institutional planning and articulation components. One major form of articulation is the institution's mission statement. Stating service in the mission statement demonstrates to faculty the institution's commitment. A statistical significant difference was not found between the mean rating of private institutions (2.92) and the mean rating of public institutions (1.88). The null hypothesis of no significant difference was retained (see Table 1).

Philosophy of Mission – Alignment with Educational Reform Effort

This item queries faculty members' understanding of service-learning as an educational reform effort. Institutions adopt innovative methods that help to enhance the quality of their educational programs. If service-learning is viewed by the institution as a method for enhancing teaching and learning, then it is accepted as an educational reform effort. To achieve this, it must be aligned accordingly. A statistical significant difference was found between the mean rating of private institutions (2.92) and the mean rating of public institutions (2.13). The null hypothesis of no significant difference was rejected at the .01 level of significance (see Table 1).

Table 1   Faculty perception of Dimension I - Philosophy and mission

Philosophy and Mission	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	T Value	Probability
Definition of Service-Learning					
Private	13	2.77	.439		
				1.985	.071
Public	10	2.10	.994		
Strategic Planning					
Private	13	2.85	3.76		
				2.679	.021
Public	10	2.00	.943		
Alignment with Institutional Mission					
Private	13	2.92	.277		
				2.922	.020
Public	8	1.88	.991		
Alignment with Educational Reform Efforts					
Private	13	2.92	.277		
				3.972	.001
Public	8	2.13	.641		

*significant at the .01 level

<u>Philosophy of Mission – Definition of Service-Learning</u>

This survey was answered by Administrative Leaders. In the survey, this item queries individual administrators' level of understanding of what is service-learning. The premise is that administrators should have a consistent understanding of the application of the term. A more consistent understanding generally leads to higher quality campus-wide engagement in appropriate service-learning activities. A statistical significant difference was found between the mean rating of private institutions (2.67) and the mean rating of public institutions (1.63). The null hypothesis of no significant difference was rejected at the .01 level of significance (see Table 2).

<u>Philosophy of Mission – Strategic Planning</u>

Strategic Planning relates to administrators' knowledge of service-learning's inclusion in the institution's strategic plans. Institutions that have included service-learning in their formal planning process not only view the program as an important element but also align service-learning with their institutional goals. Alignment with the direction of the institution advances the implementation of service-learning goals. A statistical significant difference was found between the mean rating of private institutions (2.89) and the mean rating of public institutions (1.63). The null hypothesis of no significant difference was rejected at the .01 level of significance (see Table 2).

<u>Philosophy of Mission – Alignment with the Institutional Mission</u>

Alignment with the institutional mission further endorses the inclusion of service-learning in the institutional planning and articulation components. One major form of articulation is the institution's mission statement. Stating service in the mission statement demonstrates the institution's commitment. A statistical significant difference was found

between the mean rating of private institutions (2.67) and the mean rating of public institutions (1.75). The null hypothesis of no significant difference was rejected at the .01 level of significance (see Table 2).

<u>Philosophy of Mission – Alignment with Educational Reform Effort</u>

This item queries administrators' understanding of service-learning as an educational reform effort. Institutions adopt innovative methods that help to enhance the quality of their educational programs. If service-learning is viewed by the institution as a method for enhancing teaching and learning, then it is accepted as an educational reform effort. To achieve this, it must be aligned accordingly. A significant difference was not found between the mean rating of private institutions (2.67) and the mean rating of public institutions (2.00). The null hypothesis of no significant difference was retained (see Table 2).

Table 2   Administrative Leaders' perception of Dimension I - Philosophy
           and mission

Philosophy and Mission	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	T Value	Probability
Definition of Service-Learning					
Private	9	2.67	.500		
				3.425	.004
Public	8	1.63	.744		
Strategic Planning					
Private	9	2.89	.333		
				5.904	.000
Public	8	1.63	.518		
Alignment with Institutional Mission					
Private	9	2.67	.500		
				3.115	.007
Public	8	1.75	.707		
Alignment with Educational Reform Efforts					
Private	9	2.67	.500		
				1.879	.080
Public	8	2.00	.926		

*significant at the .01 level

Faculty Support and Involvement - Testing of Hypothesis 2

Hypothesis 2: There is a significant difference between public and private institutions relative to faculty support for and involvement in service-learning.

Faculty Support and Involvement – Faculty Knowledge

Faculty knowledge refers to faculty members' understanding of the distinctive components of service-learning that distinguishes it from other forms of experiential learning activities. Service-learning is different from community service, internships, etc. A significant difference was not found between the mean rating of private institutions (2.38) and the mean rating of public institutions (2.00). The null hypothesis of no significant difference was retained (see Table 3).

Faculty Support and Involvement – Faculty Involvement and Support

Faculty involvement and support queries the level of support and implementation of service-learning in academic courses. Faculty that support service-learning see a connection between the aim of the methodology and their professional work. In addition, they understand its relation to the institutional mission. A significant difference was not found between the mean rating of private institutions (2.31) and the mean rating of public institutions (2.00). The null hypothesis of no significant difference was retained (see Table 3).

Faculty Support and Involvement – Faculty Leadership

The faculty leadership item queries the level of high ranking faculty members' engagement in service-learning. Highly respected faculty members' engagement in service-learning is influential. Faculty members in this regard serve as advocates and become leaders for advancing service-learning on campus. A significant difference was

not found between the mean rating of private institutions (2.62) and the mean rating of public institutions (2.40). The null hypothesis of no significant difference was retained (see Table 3).

Faculty Support and Involvement – Faculty Incentive and Rewards

Faculty incentive and rewards are institutions' system for acknowledging faculty members' merit in teaching and research. Relative to service-learning, institutions should recognize service-learning as an innovative method for teaching and research. As a result, faculty members who are involved in service-learning receive recognition during the institutions' review, tenure, and promotion processes. A significant difference was not found between the mean rating of private institutions (2.08) and the mean rating of public institutions (1.89). The null hypothesis of no significant difference was retained (see Table 3).

Table 3   Faculty perception of Dimension II - Faculty support and involvement

Faculty Support and Involvement	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	T Value	Probability
Faculty Knowledge					
Private	13	2.38	.650		
				1.391	.179
Public	10	2.00	.667		
Faculty Involvement and Support					
Private	13	2.31	.630		
				1.072	.297
Public	9	2.00	.707		
Faculty Leadership					
Private	13	2.62	.506		
				.858	.400
Public	10	2.40	.699		
Faculty Incentive and Rewards					
Private	13	2.08	.641		
				.619	.543
Public	9	1.89	.782		

*significant at the .01 level

Student Support and Involvement – Student Awareness

Faculty answered this survey to determine the knowledge of mechanisms for informing students about service-learning opportunities, in addition to providing opportunities for student engagement. Examples of campus-wide mechanisms for informing students are as follows: course syllabi, catalogues, class schedules, flyers, etc. A significant difference was found between the mean rating of private institutions (2.69) and the mean rating of public institutions (1.78). The null hypothesis of no significant difference was rejected at the .01 level of significance (see Table 4).

Student Support and Involvement – Student Opportunities

Faculty answered this survey to determine their level of knowledge concerning campus-wide infusion of service-learning. This item queries whether service-learning is isolated to a few courses and/or specific groups of students, majors, or academic departments. A significant difference was not found between the mean rating of private institutions (2.62) and the mean rating of public institutions (2.13). The null hypothesis of no significant difference was retained (see Table 4).

Student Support and Involvement – Student Leadership

This item queries faculty members' knowledge of opportunities in which students can assume leadership roles in service-learning. As leaders, students become advocates and ambassadors for service-learning in their departments and campus-wide. A significant difference was not found between the mean rating of private institutions (2.38) and the mean rating of public institutions (1.78). The null hypothesis of no significant difference was retained (see Table 4).

49

Student Support and Involvement – Student Incentives and Rewards

This item queries faculty members' knowledge of formal and informal methods for recognizing and encouraging student participation in service-learning. Incentives include informal mechanisms such as news stories in school papers, unofficial student certificates of achievement, etc. Formal mechanisms include catalogued list of service-learning courses, transcript documentations, etc. A statistical significant difference was found between the mean rating of private institutions (2.54) and the mean rating of public institutions (1.78). The null hypothesis of no significant difference was rejected at the .01 level of significance (see Table 4).

Table 4   Faculty perception of Dimension III - Student support and involvement

Student Support and Involvement	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	T Value	Probability
Student Awareness					
Private	13	2.69	.480		
				4.535	.000
Public	9	1.78	.441		
Student Opportunities					
Private	13	2.62	.650		
				1.687	.108
Public	8	2.13	.641		
Student Leadership					
Private	13	2.38	.650		
				2.430	.025
Public	9	1.78	.441		
Student Incentive and Rewards					
Private	13	2.54	.519		
				3.698	.002
Public	9	1.78	.441		

*significant at the .01 level

Community Participation and Partnerships– Community Partner Awareness

The faculty's role in nurturing community partnerships is important. The item queries faculty members' understanding of the level of awareness of community partners. It addresses whether community partners fully understand what is service-learning, its connection to the institutions' goals, and the range of service-learning opportunities available to students. A significant difference was not found between the mean rating of private institutions (2.23) and the mean rating of public institutions (1.90). The null hypothesis of no significant difference was retained (see Table 5).

Community Participation and Partnerships– Mutual Understanding

The faculty's role in helping to develop a sense of reciprocity is important. The item queries faculty members' understanding of the campus and community partners' needs, timelines, goals, resources, and capacity for developing and implementing service-learning activities. There is generally a broad agreement between the campus and community on the goals for service-learning that stakeholders such as faculty should know. A significant difference was not found between the mean rating of private institutions (2.15) and the mean rating of public institutions (2.00). The null hypothesis of no significant difference was retained (see Table 5).

Community Participation and Partnerships– Community Partner Voice and Leadership

This item addresses faculty members' knowledge of opportunities available for community agency representatives to take on leadership roles in advancing service-learning at the institutions. It also addresses the community partners' voice as it looks at the provision of opportunities for partners to express their needs or recruit student and faculty participation. A significant difference was not found between the mean rating of

52

private institutions (2.38) and the mean rating of public institutions (2.22). The null

hypothesis of no significant difference was retained (see Table 5).

Table 5   Faculty perception of Dimension IV - Community participation and partnerships

Community Participation and Partnerships	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	T Value	Probability
Community Partner Awareness					
Private	13	2.23	.725		
				1.188	.248
Public	10	1.90	.568		
Mutual Understanding					
Private	13	2.15	.555		
				.538	.596
Public	10	2.00	.816		
Community Partner Voice and Leadership					
Private	13	2.38	.768		
				.514	.613
Public	9	2.22	.667		

*significant at the .01 level

Institutional Support for Service-Learning – Coordinating Entity

Institutions must provide substantial resources, support, and muscle toward the effort of institutionalizing service-learning. This item addresses faculty members' knowledge of the institutions' support for service-learning as measured by its campus-wide coordination. Coordinating entities include service-learning committees, centers, or clearinghouses which are devoted primarily to assisting the various campus constituencies in the implementation of service-learning. A significant difference was found between the mean rating of private institutions (2.92) and the mean rating of public institutions (1.89). The null hypothesis of no significant difference was rejected at the .007 level of significance (see Table 6).

Institutional Support for Service-Learning – Policy-making Entity

This item addresses faculty members' knowledge of the institutions' mechanisms for instituting policies that advance service-learning as an educational goal. Official boards and committees are recognized as examples of institutions' influential entities that develop and implement service-learning policies. A significant difference was found between the mean rating of private institutions (2.92) and the mean rating of public institutions (1.90). The null hypothesis of no significant difference was rejected at the .007 level of significance (see Table 6).

Institutional Support for Service-Learning – Staffing

This item addresses faculty members' knowledge of funds appropriated for staff members whose paid responsibility is to advance service-learning. These full-time staff members understand service-learning and hold appropriate titles that can influence the institutionalization of service-learning. A significant difference was found between the

mean rating of private institutions (2.54) and the mean rating of public institutions (1.40). The null hypothesis of no significant difference was rejected at the .007 level of significance (see Table 6).

Institutional Support for Service-Learning – Funding

This item relates to the institutions' funding allotted for the support of service-learning. It queries faculty members' knowledge of soft and hard funding that help support the operations for service-learning. A significant difference was not found between the mean rating of private institutions (2.08) and the mean rating of public institutions (1.33). The null hypothesis of no significant difference was retained (see Table 6).

Institutional Support for Service-Learning – Administrative Support

This item addresses administrative leaders' clear understanding of service-learning. This item queries faculty's view of administrative leaders' understanding and support of service-learning. It also addresses the active cooperation of service-learning as a visible and important part of the campus' work. A significant difference was not found between the mean rating of private institutions (2.54) and the mean rating of public institutions (1.90). The null hypothesis of no significant difference was retained (see Table 6).

Institutional Support for Service-Learning – Departmental Support

This item queries service-learning as a formal part of the academic programs. Indicators of formal inclusion are based upon the provision of varied departmental opportunities and/or funds for service-learning. A significant difference was found between the mean rating of private institutions (2.77) and the mean rating of public

56

institutions (1.80). The null hypothesis of no significant difference was rejected at the .007 level of significance (see Table 6).

Institutional Support for Service-Learning – Evaluation and Assessment

This item queries faculty members' knowledge of an ongoing, systematic effort to account for the number and quality of service-learning activities throughout the campus. A significant difference was found between the mean rating of private institutions (2.69) and the mean rating of public institutions (1.44). The null hypothesis of no significant difference was rejected at the .007 level of significance (see Table 6).

Table 6   Faculty perception of Dimension V - Institutional support

Institutional Support	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	T Value	Probability
Coordinating Entity					
Private	13	2.92	.277	3.806	.004
Public	9	1.89	.782		
Policy-making Entity					
Private	13	2.92	.277	3.560	.005
Public	10	1.90	.876		
Staffing					
Private	13	2.54	.519	5.227	.000
Public	10	1.40	.516		
Funding					
Private	13	2.08	.862	2.320	.031
Public	9	1.33	.500		
Administrative Support					
Private	13	2.54	.776	1.850	.078
Public	10	1.90	.876		
Departmental Support					
Private	13	2.77	.439	3.493	.004
Public	10	1.80	.789		
Evaluation and Assessment					
Private	13	2.69	.751	3.882	.001
Public	9	1.44	.726		

*significant at the .007 level

Student Support and Involvement - Testing of Hypothesis 3

Hypothesis 3:   There is a significant difference between public and private institutions relative to student support for and involvement in service-learning.

Student Support and Involvement – Student Awareness

Students answered this survey to determine their knowledge of mechanisms at the institution for informing the student body about service-learning opportunities and opportunities for student engagement. Examples of campus-wide mechanisms for informing students are as follows: course syllabi, catalogues, class schedules, flyers, etc. A significant difference was found between the mean rating of private institutions (2.34) and the mean rating of public institutions (1.81). The null hypothesis of no significant difference was rejected at the .01 level of significance (see Table 7).

Student Support and Involvement – Student Opportunities

Students answered this survey to determine their level of knowledge concerning campus-wide infusion of service-learning. This item queries whether students view service-learning as an entity isolated to a few courses and/or specific groups of students, majors, or academic departments. A significant difference was found between the mean rating of private institutions (2.31) and the mean rating of public institutions (1.90). The null hypothesis of no significant difference was rejected at the .01 level of significance (see Table 7).

Student Support and Involvement – Student Leadership

This item queries students' knowledge of opportunities in which they can assume leadership roles in service-learning. As leaders, students become advocates and ambassadors for service-learning in their departments and campus-wide. A significant

difference was found between the mean rating of private institutions (2.37) and the mean rating of public institutions (1.82). The null hypothesis of no significant difference was rejected at the .01 level of significance (see Table 7).

Student Support and Involvement – Student Incentives and Rewards

This item queries students' knowledge of formal and informal methods for recognizing and encouraging student participation in service-learning. Incentives include informal mechanisms such as news stories in school papers, unofficial student certificates of achievement, etc. Formal mechanisms include catalogued list of service-learning courses, transcript documentations, etc. A significant difference was found between the mean rating of private institutions (2.26) and the mean rating of public institutions (1.64). The null hypothesis of no significant difference was rejected at the .01 level of significance (see Table 7).

Table 7   Student perception of Dimension III - Student support and involvement

Student Support and Involvement	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	T Value	Probability
Student Awareness					
Private	87	2.34	.587		
				5.109	.000
Public	63	1.81	.692		
Student Opportunities					
Private	86	2.31	.740		
				3.375	.001
Public	59	1.90	.712		
Student Leadership					
Private	86	2.37	.720		
				4.424	.000
Public	62	1.82	.779		
Student Incentive and Rewards					
Private	84	2.26	.661		
				5.607	.000
Public	61	1.64	.659		

*significant at the .01 level

Community Participation and Partnerships - Testing of Hypothesis 4

Hypothesis 4:   There is a significant difference between public and private institutions relative to community participation and partnerships.

Community Participation and Partnerships– Community Partner Awareness

This item queries community partners' understanding of what is service-learning, its connection to the institutions' goals, and the range of service-learning opportunities available to students. A significant difference was found between the mean rating of private institutions (2.79) and the mean rating of public institutions (1.91). The null hypothesis of no significant difference was rejected at the .01 level of significance (see Table 8).

61

Community Participation and Partnerships– Mutual Understanding

This item queries community partners' level of mutual understanding between their role and the institution's role for developing and implementing service-learning activities. It assesses community partners' knowledge of the institutions' and their own needs, timelines, goals, resources, and capacity. There is generally a broad agreement between the campus and community on the goals for service-learning that both the community partner and the institution should mutually understand. A significant difference was not found between the mean rating of private institutions (2.71) and the mean rating of public institutions (2.09). The null hypothesis of no significant difference was retained (see Table 8).

Community Participation and Partnerships– Community Partner Voice and Leadership

This item queries community partners' understanding of their roles as leaders in advancing service-learning at the institutions. It also addresses the community partners' voice as it looks at the institutions' provision of opportunities for partners to express their needs or recruit student and faculty participation. A significant difference was not found between the mean rating of private institutions (2.64) and the mean rating of public institutions (2.36). The null hypothesis of no significant difference was retained (see Table 8).

Table 8   Community Partners perception of Dimension IV - Community
             participation and partnerships

Community Participation and Partnerships	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	T Value	Probability
Community Partner Awareness					
Private	14	2.79	.579		
				3.428	.002
Public	11	1.91	.701		
Mutual Understanding					
Private	14	2.71	.469		
				2.374	.026
Public	11	2.09	.831		
Community Partner Voice and Leadership					
Private	14	2.64	.497		
				1.193	.245
Public	11	2.36	.674		

*significant at the .01 level

63

Institutional Support for Service-Learning - Testing of Hypothesis 5

Hypothesis 5:   There is a significant difference between public and private
                         institutions relative to institutional support for service-learning.

<u>Faculty Support and Involvement – Faculty Knowledge</u>

This item queries administrative leaders' perception of faculty members'

understanding of the distinctive components of service-learning. Faculty knowledge

refers to the distinguishing characteristics of service-learning from other forms of

experiential learning activities. Service-learning is different from community service,

internships, etc. A significant difference was not found between the mean rating of

private institutions (2.56) and the mean rating of public institutions (1.88). The null

hypothesis of no significant difference was retained (see Table 9).

<u>Faculty Support and Involvement – Faculty Involvement and Support</u>

Faculty involvement and support queries administrative leaders' perception of

faculty members' support and implementation of service-learning in academic courses at

the institutions. Faculty that support service-learning see a connection between the aim of

the methodology and their professional work. Key to administrative leaders is faculty

members' understanding of service-learning as its relates to the institutional mission. A

significant difference was not found between the mean rating of private institutions (2.44)

and the mean rating of public institutions (1.88). The null hypothesis of no significant

difference was retained (see Table 9).

<u>Faculty Support and Involvement – Faculty Leadership</u>

The faculty leadership item queries administrative leaders' knowledge of high

ranking faculty members' engagement in service-learning. Highly respected faculty

members' engagement in service-learning is influential. Faculty members in this regard

serve as advocates and become leaders for advancing service-learning on campus with the support of administrators. A significant difference was not found between the mean rating of private institutions (2.67) and the mean rating of public institutions (2.00). The null hypothesis of no significant difference was retained (see Table 9).

Faculty Support and Involvement – Faculty Incentive and Rewards

Faculty incentive and rewards are institutions' system for acknowledging faculty members' merit in teaching and research. Relative to service-learning, administrative leaders should recognize service-learning as one innovative mechanism for evaluating faculty members' teaching and research during the institutions' review, tenure, and promotion processes. A significant difference was found between the mean rating of private institutions (2.67) and the mean rating of public institutions (1.75). The null hypothesis of no significant difference was rejected at the .01 level of significance (see Table 9).

Table 9   Administrative Leaders perception of Dimension II - Faculty support and involvement

Faculty Support and Involvement	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	T Value	Probability
Faculty Knowledge					
Private	9	2.56	.527		
				2.036	.060
Public	8	1.88	.835		
Faculty Involvement and Support					
Private	9	2.44	.527		
				1.453	.176
Public	8	1.88	.991		
Faculty Leadership					
Private	9	2.67	.500		
				2.021	.063
Public	7	2.00	.816		
Faculty Incentive and Rewards					
Private	9	2.67	.500		
				3.115	.007
Public	.8	1.75	.707		

*significant at the .01 level

Student Support and Involvement – Student Awareness

Administrative leaders answered this survey to determine their knowledge of mechanisms at the institution for informing students about service-learning opportunities and opportunities for student engagement. Examples of campus-wide mechanisms for informing students are as follows: course syllabi, catalogues, class schedules, flyers, etc. A significant difference was found between the mean rating of private institutions (2.78) and the mean rating of public institutions (1.75). The null hypothesis of no significant difference was rejected at the .01 level of significance (see Table 10).

Student Support and Involvement – Student Opportunities

Administrative leaders answered this survey to determine their level of knowledge concerning campus-wide infusion of service-learning. This item queries whether service-learning is isolated to a few courses and/or specific groups of students, majors, or academic departments. A significant difference was found between the mean rating of private institutions (3.00) and the mean rating of public institutions (2.00). The null hypothesis of no significant difference was rejected at the .01 level of significance (see Table 10).

Student Support and Involvement – Student Leadership

This item queries administrative leaders' knowledge of opportunities in which students can assume leadership roles in service-learning. Students can become advocates and ambassadors for service-learning in their departments and campus-wide. A significant difference was not found between the mean rating of private institutions (2.33) and the mean rating of public institutions (1.50). The null hypothesis of no significant difference was retained (see Table 10).

<u>Student Support and Involvement – Student Incentives and Rewards</u>

This item queries administrative leaders' knowledge of formal and informal

methods for recognizing and encouraging student participation in service-learning.

Incentives include informal mechanisms such as news stories in school papers, unofficial

student certificates of achievement, etc. Formal mechanisms include catalogued list of

service-learning courses, transcript documentations, etc. A significant difference was

found between the mean rating of private institutions (2.67) and the mean rating of public

institutions (1.38). The null hypothesis of no significant difference was rejected at the

.01 level of significance (see Table 10).

Table 10   Administrative Leaders' perception of Dimension III - Student support and involvement

Student Support and Involvement	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	T value	Probability
Student Awareness					
Private	9	2.78	.667	3.084	.008
Public	8	1.75	.707		
Student Opportunities					
Private	9	3.00	.000	3.055	.018
Public	8	2.00	.926		
Student Leadership					
Private	9	2.33	.707	2.348	.033
Public	8	1.50	.756		
Student Incentive and Rewards					
Private	9	2.67	.500	5.230	.000
Public	8	1.38	.518		

*significant at the .01 level

Community Participation and Partnerships– Community Partner Awareness

The institutions' role in nurturing community partnerships is important. The item queries administrative leaders' understanding of the level of awareness of community partners. It addresses whether community partners fully understand what is service-learning, its connection to the institutions' goals, and the range of service-learning opportunities available to students. A significant difference was not found between the mean rating of private institutions (2.56) and the mean rating of public institutions (1.88). The null hypothesis of no significant difference was retained (see Table 11).

Community Participation and Partnerships– Mutual Understanding

The administrative leaders' role in helping to develop a sense of reciprocity is important. The item queries their understanding of the campus and community partners' needs, timelines, goals, resources, and capacity for developing and implementing service-learning activities. There is generally a broad agreement between the campus and community on the goals for service-learning that administrative leaders should know. A significant difference was found between the mean rating of private institutions (2.67) and the mean rating of public institutions (1.50). The null hypothesis of no significant difference was rejected at the .01 level of significance (see Table 11).

Community Participation and Partnerships– Community Partner Voice and Leadership

This item addresses administrative leaders' knowledge of opportunities available for community agency representatives to take on leadership roles in advancing service-learning at the institutions. It also addresses the community partners' voice as it looks at the provision of opportunities for partners to express their needs or recruit student and

70

faculty participation. A significant difference was not found between the mean rating of

private institutions (2.67) and the mean rating of public institutions (1.88). The null

hypothesis of no significant difference was retained (see Table 11).

Table 11   Administrative Leaders' perception of Dimension IV - Community
                participation and partnerships

Community Participation and Partnerships	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	T Value	Probability
Community Partner Awareness					
Private	9	2.56	.527		
				2.036	.060
Public	8	1.88	.835		
Mutual Understanding					
Private	9	2.67	.500		
				4.649	.000
Public	8	1.50	.535		
Community Partner Voice and Leadership					
Private	9	2.67	.707		
				2.118	.051
Public	8	1.88	.835		

*significant at the .01 level

<u>Institutional Support for Service-Learning – Coordinating Entity</u>

Institutions must provide substantial resources, support, and muscle toward the effort of institutionalizing service-learning. This item addresses administrative leaders' knowledge of the institutions' support for service-learning as measured by its campus-wide coordination. Coordinating entities include service-learning committees, centers, or clearinghouses which are devoted primarily to assisting the various campus constituencies in the implementation of service-learning. A significant difference was found between the mean rating of private institutions (2.89) and the mean rating of public institutions (1.50). The null hypothesis of no significant difference was rejected at the .007 level of significance (see Table 12).

<u>Institutional Support for Service-Learning – Policy-making Entity</u>

This item addresses administrative leaders' knowledge of the institutions' mechanisms for instituting policies that advance service-learning as an educational goal. Official boards and committees are recognized as examples of institutions' influential entities that develop and implement service-learning policies. A significant difference was found between the mean rating of private institutions (2.89) and the mean rating of public institutions (1.50). The null hypothesis of no significant difference was rejected at the .007 level of significance (see Table 12).

<u>Institutional Support for Service-Learning – Staffing</u>

This item addresses administrative leaders' knowledge of funds appropriated for staff members whose paid responsibility is to advance service-learning. These full-time staff members understand service-learning and hold appropriate titles that can influence the institutionalization of service-learning. A significant difference was found between

the mean rating of private institutions (2.56) and the mean rating of public institutions

(1.38). The null hypothesis of no significant difference was rejected at the .007 level of

significance (see Table 12).

Institutional Support for Service-Learning – Funding

This item relates to the institutions' funding allotted for the support of service-

learning. It queries administrative leaders' knowledge of soft and hard funding that help

support the operations for service-learning. A significant difference was not found

between the mean rating of private institutions (2.22) and the mean rating of public

institutions (1.75). The null hypothesis of no significant difference was retained (see

Table 12).

Institutional Support for Service-Learning – Administrative Support

This item addresses administrative leaders' clear understanding and support of service-

learning. It also addresses the active cooperation of service-learning as a visible and

important part of the campus' work. A significant difference was found between the

mean rating of private institutions (2.78) and the mean rating of public institutions (1.63).

The null hypothesis of no significant difference was rejected at the .007 level of

significance (Table 12).

Institutional Support for Service-Learning – Departmental Support

This item queries administrative leaders' understanding of service-learning as a formal

part of the academic programs. Indicators of formal inclusion are based upon the

provision of varied departmental opportunities and/or funds for service-learning. A

significant difference was found between the mean rating of private institutions (2.78)

and the mean rating of public institutions (1.63). The null hypothesis of no significant difference was rejected at the .007 level of significance (see Table 12).

Institutional Support for Service-Learning – Evaluation and Assessment

This item queries administrative leaders' knowledge of an ongoing, systematic effort to account for the number and quality of service-learning activities throughout the campus. A significant difference was found between the mean rating of private institutions (2.89) and the mean rating of public institutions (1.38). The null hypothesis of no significant difference was rejected at the .007 level of significance (Table 12).

Table 12   Administrative Leaders' perception of Dimension V - Institutional support

Institutional Support	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	T Value	Probability
Coordinating Entity					
Private	9	2.89	.333		
				4.799	.001
Public	8	1.50	.756		
Policy-making Entity					
Private	9	2.89	.333		
				6.335	.000
Public	8	1.50	.535		
Staffing					
Private	9	2.56	.527		
				4.649	.000
Public	8	1.38	.518		
Funding					
Private	9	2.22	.441		
				1.674	.115
Public	8	1.75	.707		
Administrative Support					
Private	9	2.78	.441		
				3.943	.001
Public	8	1.63	.744		
Departmental Support					
Private	9	2.78	.441		
				4.961	.000
Public	8	1.63	.518		
Evaluation and Assessment					
Private	9	2.89	.333		
				7.072	.000
Public	8	1.38	.518		

*significant at the .007 level

CHAPTER FIVE
SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS

"Education either functions as an instrument which is used to facilitate the integration of the younger generation into the logic of the present system and bring about conformity to it, or it becomes the practice of freedom, the means by which men and women deal critically and creatively with reality and discover how to participate in the transformation of their world."

Paulo Freire, 1970

Summary

The assumptions of this study were that there is no significant difference between public and private institutions relative to their (1) philosophy and mission of service-learning, (2) faculty support for and involvement in service-learning, (3) student support for and involvement in service-learning, (4) community participation and partnerships, and (5) institutional support for service-learning. The purpose of this study was to investigate the extent of engagement in service-learning at public and private colleges and universities in the southeast and the variables that indicate the depth of engagement. Data for this study was collected using the *Self Assessment Rubric for the Institutionalization of Service-Learning in Higher Education* developed by Andrew Furco, a Campus Compact Engaged Scholar and director of the Service-Learning Research and Development Center, University of California, Berkeley.

The data collected in this study will help higher education institutions with existing service-learning programs assess their level of engagement and make recommendations for their improvement focusing on its benefits through a broader scope of engagement. For institutions that are building or considering service-learning on campuses, it may assist with carefully designing the programs to be integrated within the

culture of the institution as an innovative method for meeting institutional needs, as opposed to a single course or department.

Major Findings

The data gathered from this study were analyzed using a quantitative methodology. The causal-comparative study presented the following major findings:

1. In the dimension of the survey measuring philosophy and mission, it was found that there is a significant difference in public versus private institutions faculty responses to Dimension I relative to their perception of service-learning alignment with educational reform efforts.

2. In the dimension of the survey measuring philosophy and mission, it was found that there is a significant difference in public versus private institutions administrative leaders' responses to Dimension I relative to the definition of service-learning, their strategic planning for advancing service-learning, and their alignment of service-learning with the institutional mission.

3. In the dimensions of the survey measuring faculty support and involvement, it was found that there is a significant difference in public versus private institutions' faculty responses to Dimension II relative to their perception of student awareness of campus-wide mechanisms for informing students about service-learning opportunities and providing them with opportunities for engagement.

4. In the dimensions of the survey measuring faculty support and involvement, it was found that there is a significant difference in responses to Dimension III relative to the perception of faculty at public versus private institutions formal mechanisms that

encourage students to participate in service-learning and reward students for their participation in service-learning.

5. In the dimensions of the survey measuring faculty support and involvement, it was found that there is a significant difference in responses to Dimension V relative to faculty at public versus private institutions knowledge of institutional support for service-learning as measured by its campus-wide coordination which includes service-learning committees, centers, or clearinghouses devoted primarily to assist the various campus constituencies in the implementation of service-learning.

6. In the dimensions of the survey measuring faculty support and involvement, it was found that there is a significant difference in responses to Dimension V relative to faculty at public versus private institutions knowledge of the institution's mechanisms for instituting policies that advance service-learning as an educational goal.

7. In the dimensions of the survey measuring faculty support and involvement, it was found that there is a significant difference in responses to Dimension V relative to faculty at public versus private institutions knowledge of institutional funds appropriated for staff members whose paid responsibility is to advance service-learning.

8. In the dimensions of the survey measuring faculty support and involvement, it was found that there is a significant difference in responses to Dimension V relative to faculty at public versus private institutions knowledge of departmental support of service-learning as a formal part of the academic programs at institutions.

9. In the dimensions of the survey measuring faculty support and involvement, it was found that there is a significant difference in responses to Dimension V relative to

faculty at public versus private institutions knowledge of evaluation and assessment as an ongoing, systematic institutional effort to account for the number and quality of service-learning activities.

10. In the dimensions of the survey measuring student support and involvement, it was found that there is a significant difference in responses to Dimension III relative to students' perception at public versus private institutions regarding student awareness of campus-wide mechanisms for informing students about service-learning opportunities and providing them with opportunities for engagement.

11. In the dimensions of the survey measuring student support and involvement, it was found that there is a significant difference in responses to Dimension III relative to students' perception at public versus private institutions regarding student opportunities in core academic courses that are available throughout the institutions, regardless of major, classification, or academic and social interests.

12. In the dimensions of the survey measuring student support and involvement, it was found that there is a significant difference in responses to Dimension III relative to the perception of students at public versus private institutions regarding opportunities to take on leadership roles as advocates and ambassadors for institutionalizing service-learning on their campuses.

13. In the dimensions of the survey measuring student support and involvement, it was found that there is a significant difference in responses to Dimension III relative to the perception of students at public versus private institutions regarding formal mechanisms that encourage participation in service-learning and reward students for their participation in service-learning.

14. In the dimension of the survey measuring community participation and partnerships, it was found that there is a significant difference in public versus private institutions community partners' in responses to Dimension IV relative to their awareness of the campus' goals for service-learning and the full range of service-learning opportunities that are available to students.

15. In the dimensions of the survey measuring institutional support for service-learning, it was found that there is a significant difference in the perception of administrative leaders at public versus private institutions in responses to Dimension IV relative to the recognition service-learning as one innovative mechanism for evaluating faculty members' teaching and research incentives and rewards during the institutions' review, tenure, and promotion processes.

16. In the dimensions of the survey measuring institutional support and involvement, it was found that there is a significant difference in the perception of administrative leaders at public versus private institutions responses to Dimension III regarding their knowledge of mechanisms at the institution for student awareness of service-learning opportunities.

17. In the dimensions of the survey measuring institutional support and involvement, it was found that there is a significant difference in responses to Dimension III relative to the knowledge of administrative leaders at public versus private institutions campus-wide infusion of service-learning opportunities for students.

18. In the dimensions of the survey measuring institutional support and involvement, it was found that there is a significant difference in the perception of administrative leaders at public versus private institutions responses to Dimension III relative to

formal mechanisms that encourage students to participate in service-learning and reward students for their participation in service-learning.

19. In the dimension of the survey measuring institutional support and involvement, it was found that there is a significant difference in public versus private institutions responses to Dimension IV relative to administrative leaders' perception of the mutual understanding between the partners and institutions in regards to developing and implementing service-learning activities.

20. In the dimensions of the survey measuring institutional support and involvement, it was found that there is a significant difference in administrative leaders at public versus private institutions responses to Dimension V relative to their support for service-learning as measured by its campus-wide coordination which includes service-learning committees, centers, or clearinghouses devoted primarily to assist the various campus constituencies in the implementation of service-learning.

21. In the dimensions of the survey measuring institutional support and involvement, it was found that there is a significant difference in administrative leaders at public versus private institutions responses to Dimension V relative to their knowledge of the institution's mechanisms for instituting policies that advance service-learning as an educational goal.

22. In the dimensions of the survey measuring institutional support and involvement, it was found that there is a significant difference in administrative leaders at public versus private institutions responses to Dimension V relative to their knowledge of institutional funds appropriated for staff members whose paid responsibility is to advance service-learning.

23. In the dimensions of the survey measuring institutional support and involvement, it was found that there is a significant difference in administrative leaders at public versus private institutions responses to Dimension V relative to their understanding and support of service-learning, and their active cooperation with making service-leaning a visible and important part of the campus' work.

24. In the dimensions of the survey measuring institutional support and involvement, it was found that there is a significant difference in administrative leaders at public versus private institutions responses to Dimension V relative to their support of service-learning as a formal part of the academic programs at institutions.

25. In the dimensions of the survey measuring institutional support and involvement, it was found that there is a significant difference in administrative leaders at public versus private institutions responses to Dimension V relative to their knowledge of evaluation and assessment as an ongoing, systematic institutional effort to account for the number and quality of service-learning activities.

Conclusions

There seems to be sufficient evidence to conclude that there is a significant difference between the extent of institutionalization at public versus private institutions in the southeast. The data fairly substantiated significant difference based upon 53% responses to the dimension variables that constitute these differences. Although differences do exist, it can also be noted that the institutions, both public and private, surveyed in the study are beyond the beginning stages, based upon the three-stage continuum of development. Most of the institutions are between stages two and three: Stage Two, which is the *Quality Building* stage where campuses are focused on ensuring the

development of "quality" service-learning activities rather than the quantity of service-learning activities and Stage Three, which is the *Sustained Institutionalization* stage where campuses have fully institutionalized service-learning into the fabric of the institution. The findings that indicate institutions' average rank between stages two and three are commensurate to the study. The colleges and universities surveyed have service-learning programs or components at their institutions. The study proves that the selected institutions' programs have not been fully institutionalized. If fully institutionalized, the majority of the institutions would be at or beyond stage three. The cross between stages two and three indicate, however, that the selected institutions support service-learning as a methodology and they are continually seeking ways to more fully develop its quality on their campuses.

Recommendations

Based on the overall findings and conclusions drawn from the data are the following recommendations:

1. Public and private institutions should work more collaboratively to share best practices for institutionalizing service-learning and/or strengthening existing efforts.

2. It is further recommended that individual institutions utilize the rubric as a part of their own institutional assessment of their current service-learning activities and practices.

3. Institutions without service-learning programs or institutions that wish to expand or re-establish their efforts should use the rubric's dimensions to identify variables that can help build the foundation for sustaining service-learning.

4. It is recommended that an assessment tool be designed that addresses the next step to further enriching service-learning on campuses where it is already fully institutionalized. The instrumentation should be a continuum of the style of the rubric where all aspects of the institution are assessed. This is more comprehensive than much of the existing research that basically focuses on partial entities of service-learning programs without considering the ongoing support structures necessary for sustainability (i.e. courses, student outcomes, etc.)

5. It is recommended that future surveys should include items to ascertain more demographic information regarding the institutions to be surveyed.

Implications for Further Research

1. It is recommended that a qualitative study be designed to supplement the rubric in order to glean more descriptive information that can be used as a model for higher education institutions.

2. It is recommended that a comparative study be conducted of the southeastern institutions in relation to institutions in different regions.

3. It is recommended that a similar study be done specifically to assess service-learning institutionalization at historically black colleges and universities.

REFERENCES

Alliance for Service-Learning in Education Reform (ASLER). (1995). Standards of quality for school-based and community-based service-learning. From http://www.servicelearning.org/filemanager/download/12/asler95.pdf

Barr, M. J., Desler, M. K., & Associates. (2000). The handbook of student affairs administration (2nd ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Battistoni, R. M. (2002). Civic engagement across the curriculum. Providence, RI: Campus Compact.

Benedict College Catalogue 1995-97. (1995). Columbia, SC: Benedict College.

Benedict College Catalogue 2001-2003. (2001). Columbia, SC: Benedict College.

Blalock, H. M., Jr. (1984). Basic dilemmas in the social sciences. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Blimling, G. S. & Whitt, W. J. (1999). Identifying the principles that guide students affairs practice. In Gregory S. Blimling and Elizabeth J. Whitt (Eds.), Good practice in student affairs: principles to foster students learning (pp. 1-20). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Bloom., A. (1987). The closing of the american mind. New York, NY: Simon and Schuster.

Bossing, N. L. (1942). Progressive methods of teaching in secondary schools. New York, NY: Houghton Mifflin.

Brown, S. C., Stevens, R. A., Troiano, P. F., & Schneider, M. K. (March-April 2002). Exploring complex phenomena: Grounded theory in student affairs research. Journal of College Student Development, 43 (2). 173-183.

Cairn, R. W. & Kielsmeier, J. C. (1995). Growing hope: A sourcebook on integrating youth service into the school curriculum. St. Paul, MN: NYLC.

Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. (2000). A classification of institutions of higher education, 2000 Edition. Princeton: Author.

Cline, Z. & Nechochea, J. (April – June 2000). Socialization paradox: A challenge for educational leaders. International Journal of Leadership in Education, 3 (2). 151-158.

Coleman, D. G. & Creighton, T. B. (Winter 2002). Bringing university education administration programs up to par: Oh? You're talking about a leadership practice

field. <u>Education Leadership Review, 3</u> (1). 16-20.

Collison, M. N-K. (2000, July 6). Studied indifference. <u>Black Issues in Higher Education, 7</u> (10). 32-35, 37.

Covey, S. (1992). <u>Principle-centered leadership</u>. New York, NY: Simon & Schuster.

Damon, W. (1997). <u>The youth charter.</u> New York, NY: Free Press.

Dewey, J. (1916). <u>Democracy and education</u>. New York, NY: Macmillan.

Donmoyer, R. (October 1999). Paradigm talk (and its absence) in the second edition of the handbook of research on educational administration. <u>Educational Administration, 35</u> (4). 614-641.

Duckenfield, M, & Swick, K. (2002). <u>A gallery of portraits in service-learning action research in teacher education</u>. Clemson, SC: National Dropout Prevention Center.

Education Commission of the States. (2001). Grievance and coordination: Definitions and distinctions. Denver, CO: Author.

Elam, K, & Duckenfield, M. (2000). <u>Creating a community of learners</u>. Clemson, SC: National Dropout Prevention Center.

English, F. W. (October 2000). A critical appraisal of Sara Lawrence-Lightfoot's portraiture as a method of educational research. <u>Educational Research, 29</u> (7). 21-26.

Engstrom, C. M. (2003). Developing collaborative student affairs – academic affairs partnerships for service-learning. In B. Jacoby, <u>Building Partnerships for Service-Learning</u>. (pp. 65-82). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Engstrom, C. M. & Tinto, V. (2000). Developing partnerships with academic affairs to enhance student learning. In Margaret J. Barr, Mary K. Desler, and Associates (Eds.), <u>The Handbook of Student Affairs Administration</u> (pp. 425-452). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Enos, S. & Morton, K. (2003). Developing a theory and practice of campus-community partnerships. In B. Jacoby, <u>Building Partnerships for Service-Learning</u>. (pp. 20 - 40). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Exley, R., Johnson, S., & Johnson, D. (1996). Assessing the effectiveness of service-learning. expanding boundaries. <u>Service and Learning</u> 1: 62-63.

Eyler, J. and Giles, D. (1999). <u>Where's the learning in service-learning</u>. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Eyler, J., Giles, D., & Gray, C. (1999). Research at a glance: What we know about the effects of service-learning on students, faculty, institutions and communities, 1993-1999. In Introduction to service-learning toolkit (pp.19-22). Providence, RI: Campus Compact.

Fine, M. (2000). Creating inclusive communities: An inquiry into organizational approaches to pursuing diversity. New York, NY: The Academy for Educational Development.

Frank, C. (1999). Ethnographic eyes: A teacher's guide to classroom observation. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Freire, P. (1970). Pedagogy of the oppressed. New York: Herder and Herder.

Furco, A. (2002). Institutionalizing service-learning in higher education. The Journal of Public Affairs, VI, 39-67.

Furco, A. (1996). Service-Learning: A balanced approach to experiential education. Expanding Boundaries, I, 2-6.

Furco, A. and Billig, S. H., (Eds.). (2003). Service-Learning: The essence of the pedagogy. Greenwich. CT.: Information Age Publishing.

Galura, J., Meiland, R., Ross, R., Callan, M. J.& Smith, R. (Eds.). (1993). Praxis II: service-learning resources for university students, staff, and faculty. Michigan: OCSL Press.

Gardner, H. (1991). The unschooled mind. New York, NY: Basic Books.

Greene, H.(1998).The select: Realities of life and learning in american elite colleges. New York, NY: Cliff Street Books.

Greenleaf, R. (1977). Servant leadership. New Jersey: Paulist Press.

Guidelines for developing a state campus compact. (2001). Providence, RI: Campus Compact.

Hum, D. (July 2000). The relative returns from research and teaching: A market perspective. Journal of Educational Administration and Foundation, 15 (1). 23-32.

Ianni, F. A. J. (1989). The search for structure. New York: Free Press.

Jackson, C. L. (2001). African American education: A reference handbook. Santa Barbara, CA: ABC Clio.

Jacoby, B. and associates. (1996). Service-learning in higher education: Concepts and practices. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass

Jacoby, B. and associates. (2003). Building partnerships for service-learning. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Johnson, S. B., Young, Joshua B. & Johnson, David B. (1997, Spring). Agency perceptions of service-learning: Voices from the community. Expanding Boundaries, II. 102-106.

Joplin, L. (1995). Experiential learning in schools and higher education. Dubuque, IA: Kendall Hunt.

Kaye, C. B. (2004). The complete guide to service-learning. Minneapolis. MN: Free Spirit.

Kelley, R. (2201, March 15). An integrated approach to student services. Distance Education Report, 5 (6). 5.

Kendall, J. C. (1990). Combining service and learning: An introduction. In J. C. Kendall and Associates (Eds.), Combining Service and Learning: A Resource Book for Community and Public Service. Raleigh, N. C.: National Society for Experiential Education.

Kluth, P., Villa, R. A., & Thousand, J. S. (December 2001-January 2002). Our school doesn't offer inclusion and other legal blunders. Educational Leadership, 59 (4). 24-27.

Kolb, D. (1984). Experiential learning. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Kozol, J. (1991). Savage inequalities. New York, NY: Crown Publishers.

Lawrence-Lightfoot, S. L., & Davis, J. H. (1997). The art and science of portraiture. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Leedy, P. D., Newby, T. J., & Ertmer, P. A. (2001) Practical research: Planning and Design (7th ed.). New York, NY: Prentice Hall.

Leviac, R. & Glatter, R. (January 2001). Really good ideas? Developing evidence-informed policy and practice in education leadership and management. Educational Management and Administration, 29 (1) 5-25.

Levine, D. U. & Havighurst, R. J. Society and education. (1984). 6th ed. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Lewis A. (1995). Youth service: Releasing the power of our potential through learning, labor and love. Service Line 6(1). 6.

Mattson, K. & Shea, M. (Spring 1997).The selling of service-learning to modern university: How much will it cost? Expanding Boundaries, 11. 12-19.

Miles, M B. & Ekholm, M. (1991, April). Will new structures stay restructured? Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, IL.

Milson, A. J. (Spring 2000). Social studies teacher educator's perceptions of character education. Theory and Research in Social Education, 28 (2). 144-169.

Mulligan, J. & Griffin, C.(Eds.) (1992). Empowerment through experiential learning. London: Kogan Page.

Mutascio, P. (2004). Essential resources. Providence, RI: Campus Compact.

National Association of Independent Colleges and Universities. (2002). Facts about private colleges. Washington, DC: Author.

O'Brien, G. D. (2000). All the essential half-truths about higher education. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Osborne, R. E., Penticuff, J. & Norman, J. (1997, Spring). Reality-based service-learning: A paradigm for sustaining momentum. Expanding Boundaries 11. 20-25.

Patton, M. (1997).Utilization-focused evaluation. (3rd ed.). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Patton, M. . (2002). Qualitative research and evaluation methods. Rev. ed. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Perry, T. (2003, January 10). Tackling the myth of black students' intellectual inferiority. The Chronicle of Higher Education. B10-12.

Policies and procedures for the evaluation of faculty for tenure, promotion, and merit increases. (2000). In Introduction to service-learning toolkit (pp.263-272). Providence, RI: Campus Compact.

Ramaley, J. A. (2000). The perspective of a comprehensive university. In T. Ehrlich (ed.), Civic Responsibility and Higher Education. Phoenix: Oryx.

Rodgers, R. & Jenson, J. L. (March – April 2001). Cumulating the intellectual gold of case study research. Public Administration Review, 61 (2). 235-246.

Rowley, D. J., Lujan, H. D., & Dolence, M.G. (1997). Strategic change in colleges and universities. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Ruben, B. D. (2004) Pursuing excellence in higher education. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Sa, J. (June 2002). Diary writing: An interpretative research method of teaching and learning. Educational Research and Evaluation: An International Journal on Theory and Practice, 8 (2). 142-168.

Scholnick, R. (Fall 2001). Power and form: Learning and unlearning the lessons of the academy. ADE Bulletin, 129. 35-39.

Schon, D. (1983). The reflective practitioner. New York: Basic Books.

Schuh, J. & Whitt, E. J. (Nov. 1999). Creating successful partnerships between academic and student affairs. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Sharp, V. F. (1979). Statistics for the social sciences. Boston, Little Brown.

Sigmon, R. (1990). Service-learning: Three principles. In J. C. Kendall et al. (Eds.), Combining Service and Learning: A Resource Book for Community and Public Service. Raleigh, NC: National Society for Internships and Experiential Education.

Sigmon, R. (1996).The problem of definitions in service-learning. In S. G. Pelletier (Ed.), Journey to Service-Learning (pp. 9-11). Washington, DC: Council of Independent Colleges.

Stock P. L. (January 2001). Toward a theory of genre in teacher research: Contributions from a reflective practitioner. English Education, 33 (2). 100-114.

Taylor, G. R. (2000). Integrating Quantitative and Qualitative Research Methods: Discovering Possibilities. Lanham, MD: University Press.

Walters, E. (2001-2002). The use of qualitative research methods in student affairs: A practical guide. Journal in College Student Retention, 3 (2). 183-194.

Wisker, G., & Brown, S. (1996). Enabling student learning. London: Kogan Page.

Wright, B. D. (Spring 2000). Basic research methods. Popular Measurement, 3 (1). 77.

Zinn, M. (December, 1979) Field methods in minority communities. Social Problems, 27 (2): 16-26.

Zlotkowski, E. (n.d.) Pedagogy and Engagement. From http://www/usi.edu/ctle/Pedagogy%20and%20Engagement.htm

Appendix A

Background Information
(Demographic Survey Component)

Service-Learning Faculty Background Information Sheet

Directions: Please answer each of these background information questions pertaining to you and the course which you taught with a service-learning component. Check the box that best answers the question (or click the box using the mouse if completing electronically – e.g., ☒ Answer).

1. **Have you attended any conferences, workshops, or training sessions focusing on service learning?** (check all that apply)
   - ☐ regional conference
   - ☐ national conference
   - ☐ workshops
   - ☐ trainings
   - ☐ none
   - ☐ other

2. **What do you view as the <u>primary</u> benefit of service-learning?** (Mark only one)
   - ☐ supports a course requirement
   - ☐ develops leadership skills
   - ☐ career exploration
   - ☐ cognitive development
   - ☐ promotes change within the community
   - ☐ meets an agency need
   - ☐ enhances college/community collaboration

3. **How is the service-learning component integrated into that class?**
   - ☐ required
   - ☐ optional

4. **How many service-learning hours must be fulfilled by the student throughout the duration of that class?**
   - ☐ Hours not required
   - ☐ Less than 10 hours
   - ☐ 10-25 hours
   - ☐ 26-40 hours
   - ☐ more than 40 hours

5. **How many students are/were enrolled in that class?**
   - ☐ 1-20 students
   - ☐ 21-40 students
   - ☐ 41-60 students
   - ☐ 61-80 students
   - ☐ more than 80 students

6. **What was the classification of the majority of the students in that class?**
   - ☐ freshmen
   - ☐ sophomore
   - ☐ junior
   - ☐ senior
   - ☐ graduate

7. **For the duration of the course with the service-learning component, how many total contacts are/were there between yourself and the agency?**
   ☐ none (handled by someone else)
   ☐ 1-3 contacts
   ☐ 4-6 contacts
   ☐ 7-10 contacts
   ☐ over 10 contacts

8. **Did you receive any external funding for the project?**
   ☐ yes
   ☐ no

9. **What area did the service activity address?**
   ☐ education
   ☐ environment
   ☐ human needs
   ☐ public safety
   ☐ technology
   ☐ health
   ☐ research

10. **How many years of teaching experience do you have?**
    ☐ 1– 5 years
    ☐ 6 – 10 years
    ☐ 11 – 15 years
    ☐ 16 – 20 years
    ☐ more than 20 years

11. **How many years have you utilized service-learning in courses?**
    ☐ 1– 2 years
    ☐ 3 – 4 years
    ☐ 4 – 6 years
    ☐ more than 6 years

SERVICE-LEARNING STUDENTS BACKGROUND INFORMATION SHEET

Directions: Please answer each of these background information questions pertaining to you and the course in which you enrolled with a service project. Check the box that best answers the question (or click the box using the mouse if completing electronically – e.g., ☒ Answer).

1. **Age:**
   - ☐ 17 – 22
   - ☐ 23 – 27
   - ☐ 28 – 32
   - ☐ 33 – 37
   - ☐ over 37

2. **Sex:**
   - ☐ male
   - ☐ female

3. **Class:**
   - ☐ freshman
   - ☐ sophomore
   - ☐ junior
   - ☐ senior
   - ☐ graduate

4. **Major:**
   - ☐ education/health
   - ☐ math/science/engineering
   - ☐ liberal arts
   - ☐ business
   - ☐ social sciences
   - ☐ social work
   - ☐ other

5. **Cumulative GPA (on a 4.0 scale):**
   - ☐ under 2.0
   - ☐ 2.1 – 2.5
   - ☐ 2.6 – 3.0
   - ☐ 3.1 – 3.5
   - ☐ over 3.6

6. **How many semesters, including this semester, have you taken a class that involved a service project?**
   - ☐ 1 semester
   - ☐ 2 semesters
   - ☐ 3 semesters
   - ☐ 4 semesters
   - ☐ 5 or more semesters

7. **How would you best describe the most recent course that involved a service project?**
   - ☐ education/health
   - ☐ math/science/engineering
   - ☐ liberal arts
   - ☐ business
   - ☐ social sciences
   - ☐ social work
   - ☐ other

8. **What is the primary reason for enrolling in the course?**
   - ☐ required for my major or graduation requirement
   - ☐ friends encouraged me to take it
   - ☐ professor's reputation
   - ☐ to learn specific skills
   - ☐ desire to make a positive change in my community or society

9. **How many hours were spent doing service for that course during the semester?**
   - ☐ 1 – 10 hours /semester
   - ☐ 11 – 25 hours/semester
   - ☐ 26 – 40 hours/semester
   - ☐ more than 40 hours/semester

10. **What do you view as the primary benefit of service- learning?** (Mark only one)
   - ☐ supports a course requirement
   - ☐ develops leadership skills
   - ☐ career exploration
   - ☐ cognitive development
   - ☐ promotes change within the community
   - ☐ meets an agency need
   - ☐ enhances college/community collaboration

SERVICE-LEARNING COMMUNITY PARTNERS BACKGROUND INFORMATION SHEET

Directions: **Please answer each of these background information questions pertaining to your agency and the service learning experiences that you supervised (in conjunction with a university or college course).** Check the box that best answers the question (or click the box using the mouse if completing electronically – e.g., ☒ Answer).

1. **What type of agency are you?**
   ☐ educational
   ☐ human service
   ☐ environmental
   ☐ public safety

2. **Is the college/university viewed as a resource for the community?**
   ☐ not at all
   ☐ slightly
   ☐ moderately
   ☐ quite a bit
   ☐ a great deal

3. **Is there an identified office that supports service in the community at the college/university?**
   ☐ yes
   ☐ no
   ☐ don't know

4. **How many college students were in service projects in your agency per semester?**
   ☐ under 5 students
   ☐ 6 – 10 students
   ☐ 11 – 20 students
   ☐ 21 – 40 students
   ☐ more than 40 students

5. **How many hours did the student service providers collectively perform?**
   ☐ under 100 hours
   ☐ 101 – 250 hours
   ☐ 251 – 500 hours
   ☐ 501 – 999 hours
   ☐ over 1,000 hours

6. **How many faculty or staff members do you work with from the college/university relative to service-learning initiatives?**
   ☐ 1 – 3 faculty   ☐ 1 – 3 staff
   ☐ 4 – 6 faculty   ☐ 4 – 6 staff
   ☐ 7 – 9 faculty   ☐ 7 – 9 staff
   ☐ 10 or more   ☐ 10 or more

7. **Did or will someone from your agency request the continuation of service beyond the duration of the course?**
   ☐ yes
   ☐ no

8. **What do you view as the primary benefit of service- learning?** (Mark only one)
   ☐ supports a course requirement
   ☐ develops leadership skills
   ☐ career exploration
   ☐ cognitive development
   ☐ promotes change within the community
   ☐ meets an agency need
   ☐ enhances college/community collaboration

9. **How long has your agency been partners with the institution?**
   ☐ 1 – 2 years
   ☐ 3 – 4 years
   ☐ 5 or more years
   ☐ I don't know

ADMINISTRATIVE LEADERS BACKGROUND INFORMATION SHEET

Directions: Please answer each of these background information questions pertaining to your institution and Service-Learning on your campus. Check the box that best answers the question (or click the box using the mouse if completing electronically – e.g., ☒ Answer).

1. **Institution Size:**
   ☐ Less than 1000 full-time students
   ☐ 1000-1999 full-time students
   ☐ 2000-2999 full-time students
   ☐ 3000-3999 full-time students
   ☐ 4000-4999 full-time students
   ☐ 5000-5999 full-time students
   ☐ 6000-6999 full-time students
   ☐ 7000-7999 full-time students
   ☐ 8000-8999 full-time students
   ☐ 9000-9999 full-time students
   ☐ more than 10,000 full-time students

2. **What resources does your institution provide to support service learning?** (Check all that apply)
   ☐ Service learning or community service center
   ☐ Database of agencies
   ☐ Clerical support
   ☐ Separate budget item (funding)
   ☐ Service recognized for promotion and/or tenure
   ☐ Faculty release time
   ☐ Faculty awards
   ☐ Faculty training
   ☐ Travel expenses for faculty
   ☐ Workshops or forums

3. **How many service learning hours are required for graduation by your institution?**
   ☐ 0 hours
   ☐ 1-30 hours
   ☐ 31-60 hours
   ☐ 61-90 hours
   ☐ 91+ hours

4. **How many community service hours are required for graduation by your institution?**
   ☐ 0 hours
   ☐ 1-30 hours
   ☐ 31-60 hours
   ☐ 61-90 hours
   ☐ 91+ hours

5. **How many faculty members are utilizing service-learning on your campus?**
   ☐ 1- 10 faculty members
   ☐ 11 - 20 faculty members
   ☐ 21 – 30 faculty members
   ☐ 31 - 40 faculty members
   ☐ More than 40 faculty members

6. **What do you view as the <u>primary</u> benefit of service- learning?** (Mark only one)
   ☐ supports a course requirement
   ☐ career exploration
   ☐ promotes change within the community
   ☐ enhances college/community collaboration
   ☐ develops leadership skills
   ☐ cognitive development
   ☐ meets an agency need

Appendix B

Survey Instrument

Self-Assessment Rubric for the Institutionalization of SERVICE-LEARNING IN HIGHER EDUCATION *(Revised 2002)*

DIMENSION I: PHILOSOPHY AND MISSION OF SERVICE-LEARNING
A primary component of service-learning institutionalization is the development of a campus-wide definition for service-learning that provides meaning, focus, and emphasis for the service-learning effort. How narrowly or broadly service-learning is defined on your campus will effect which campus constituents participate/do not participate, which campus units will provide financial resources and other support, and the degree to which service-learning will become part of the campus' institutional fabric.

DIRECTIONS: For each of the four categories (rows), check the box that best represents the *CURRENT* status of the development of a definition, philosophy, and mission of service-learning (or click the box using the mouse if completing electronically- e.g., ☒ Stage One).

	STAGE ONE *Critical Mass Building*	**STAGE TWO** *Quality Building*	**STAGE THREE** *Sustained Institutionalization*
DEFINITION OF SERVICE-LEARNING	There is no campus-wide definition for service-learning. The term "service-learning" is used inconsistently to describe a variety of experiential and service activities ☐ **Stage One**	There is an operationalized definition for service-learning on the campus, but there is some variance and inconsistency in the application of the term. ☐ **Stage Two**	The institution has a formal, universally accepted definition for high quality service-learning that is used consistently to operationalize many or most aspects of service-learning on campus. ☐ **Stage Three**
STRATEGIC PLANNING	The campus does not have an official strategic plan for advancing service-learning on campus. ☐ **Stage One**	Although certain short-range and long-range goals for service-learning have been defined for the campus, these goals have not been formalized into an official strategic plan that will guide the implementation of these goals. ☐ **Stage Two**	The campus has developed an official strategic plan for advancing service-learning on campus, which includes viable short-range and long-range institutionalization goals. ☐ **Stage Three**

99

ALIGNMENT WITH INSTITUTIONAL MISSION	While service-learning complements many aspects of the institution's mission, it remains on the periphery of the campus. Service-learning is rarely included in larger efforts that focus on the core mission of the institution. ☐ **Stage One**	Service-learning is often mentioned as a primary or important part of the institution's mission, but service-learning is not included in the campus' official mission or strategic plan. ☐ **Stage Two**	Service-learning is part of the primary concern of the institution. Service-learning is included in the campus' official mission and/or strategic plan. ☐ **Stage Three**
ALIGNMENT WITH EDUCATIONAL REFORM EFFORTS	Service-learning stands alone and is not tied to other important high profile efforts on campus (e.g., campus/community partnership efforts, establishment of learning communities, improvement of undergraduate teaching, writing excellence emphasis, etc.) ☐ **Stage One**	Service-learning is tied loosely or informally to other important high profile efforts on campus (e.g., campus/community partnership efforts, establishment of learning communities, improvement of undergraduate teaching, writing excellence emphasis, etc.) ☐ **Stage Two**	Service-learning is tied formally and purposefully to other important, high profile efforts on campus (e.g., campus/community partnership efforts, establishment of learning communities, improvement of undergraduate teaching, writing excellence emphasis, etc.) ☐ **Stage Three**

DIMENSION II: FACULTY SUPPORT FOR AND INVOLVEMENT IN SERVICE-LEARNING

One of the essential factors for institutionalizing service-learning in higher education is the degree to which faculty members are involved in implementation and advancement of service-learning on campus (Bell, Furco, Ammon, Sorgen, & Muller, 2000).

DIRECTIONS: For each of the four categories (rows), check the box that best represents the *CURRENT* status of faculty involvement in and support for service-learning on your campus (or click the box using the mouse if completing electronically- e.g., ☒ Stage One).

	STAGE ONE *Critical Mass Building*	**STAGE TWO** *Quality Building*	**STAGE THREE** *Sustained Institutionalization*
FACULTY KNOWLEDGE	Very few members know what service-learning is or understand how service-learning is different from community service, internships, or other experiential learning activities. ☐ **Stage One**	An adequate number of faculty members know what service-learning is or understand how service-learning is different from community service, internships, or other experiential learning activities. ☐ **Stage Two**	A substantial number of faculty members know what service-learning is or understand how service-learning is different from community service, internships, or other experiential learning activities. ☐ **Stage Three**
FACULTY INVOLVEMENT & SUPPORT	Very few faculty members are instructors, supporters, or advocates of service-learning. Few support the strong infusion of service-learning into the academy or into their own professional work. Service-learning activities are sustained by a few faculty members on campus. ☐ **Stage One**	While a satisfactory number of faculty members are supportive of service-learning, few of them are advocates for infusing service-learning in the overall mission and/or their own professional work. An inadequate or unsatisfactory number of KEY faculty members are engaged in service-learning. ☐ **Stage Two**	A substantial number of influential faculty members participate as instructors, supporters, and advocates of service-learning and support the infusion of service-learning both into the institution's overall mission AND the faculty members' individual professional work. ☐ **Stage Three**
FACULTY LEADERSHIP	None of the most influential faculty members on campus serves as a leader for advancing service-learning on the campus. ☐ **Stage One**	There are only one or two influential faculty members who provide leadership to the campus' service-learning effort. ☐ **Stage Two**	A highly respected, influential group of faculty members serve as the campus' service-learning leaders and/or advocates. ☐ **Stage Three**

FACULTY INCENTIVE & REWARDS	In general, faculty members are not encouraged to engage in service-learning; few if any incentives are provided (e.g., mini-grants, sabbaticals, funds for conferences, etc.) to pursue service-learning activities; faculty members' work in service-learning is not usually recognized during their review, tenure, and promotion process. ☐ **Stage One**	Although faculty members are encouraged and are provided various incentives (mini-grants, sabbaticals, funds for conferences, etc.) to pursue service-learning activities; their work in service-learning is not always recognized during their review, tenure, and promotion process. ☐ **Stage Two**	Faculty who are involved in service-learning receive recognition for it during the campus' review, tenure, and promotion process; faculty are encouraged and are provided various incentives (mini-grants, sabbaticals, funds for conferences, etc.) to pursue service-learning activities. ☐ **Stage Three**

102

DIMENSION III: STUDENT SUPPORT FOR AND INVOLVEMENT IN SERVICE-LEARNING

An important element of service-learning institutionalization is the degree to which students are aware of service-learning opportunities on campus and are provided opportunities to play a leadership role in the development of service-learning on campus.

DIRECTIONS: For each of the four categories (rows), check the box that best represents the *CURRENT* status of student support for and involvement in service-learning on your campus (or click the box using the mouse if completing electronically- e.g., ☒ Stage One).

	STAGE ONE *Critical Mass Building*	STAGE TWO *Quality Building*	STAGE THREE *Sustained Institutionalization*
STUDENT AWARENESS	There is no campus-wide mechanism for informing students about service-learning courses, resources, and opportunities that are available to them. ☐ **Stage One**	While there are some mechanisms for informing students about service-learning courses, resources, and opportunities that are available to them, the mechanisms are sporadic and concentrated in only a few departments or programs (e.g., course flyers). ☐ **Stage Two**	There are campus-wide, coordinated mechanisms (e.g., service-learning listings in the schedule of classes, course catalogs, etc.) that help students become aware of the various service-learning courses, resources, and opportunities that are available to them. ☐ **Stage Three**
STUDENT OPPORTUNITIES	Few service-learning opportunities exist for students; only a handful of service-learning courses are available. ☐ **Stage One**	Service-learning options (in which service is integrated in core academic courses) are limited to only certain groups of students in the academy (e.g., students in certain majors, honors students, seniors, etc.) ☐ **Stage Two**	Service-learning options and opportunities (in which service is integrated in core academic courses) are available to students in many areas throughout the academy, regardless of students' major, year in school, or academic and social interests. ☐ **Stage Three**
STUDENT LEADERSHIP	Few, if any, opportunities on campus exist for students to take on leadership roles in advancing service-learning in their departments or throughout the campus. ☐ **Stage One**	There are a limited number of opportunities available for students to take on leadership roles in advancing service-learning in their departments or throughout the campus. ☐ **Stage Two**	Students are welcomed and encouraged to serve as advocates and ambassadors for institutionalizing service-learning in their departments or throughout the campus. ☐ **Stage Three**

103

STUDENT INCENTIVE & REWARDS	The campus has neither <u>formal</u> mechanisms (e.g., catalogued list of service-learning courses, service-learning notation on students' transcripts, etc.) or <u>informal</u> mechanisms (news stories in paper, unofficial student certificates of achievement) that encourage students to participate in service-learning or reward students for their participation in service-learning. ☐ **Stage One**	While the campus offers some <u>informal</u> incentives and rewards (news stories in paper, unofficial student certificates of achievement) that encourage students to participate in service-learning and/or reward students for their participation in service-learning, the campus offers few or no <u>formal</u> incentives and rewards (catalogued list of service-learning courses, service-learning notation on students' transcripts, etc.) ☐ **Stage Two**	The campus has one or more <u>formal</u> mechanisms in place (e.g., catalogued list of service-learning courses, service-learning notation on students' transcripts, etc.) that encourage students to participate in service-learning and reward students for their participation in service-learning. ☐ **Stage Three**

DIMENSION IV: COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION AND PARTNERSHIPS

An important element of service-learning institutionalization is the degree to which the campus nurtures community partnerships and encourages community agency representatives to play a role in implementing and advancing service-learning on campus.

DIRECTIONS: For each of the three categories (rows), check the box the cell that best represents the *CURRENT* status of community participation and partnership on your campus (or click the box using the mouse if completing electronically- e.g., ☒ Stage One).

	STAGE ONE *Critical Mass Building*	STAGE TWO *Quality Building*	STAGE THREE *Sustained Institutionalization*
COMMUNITY PARTNER AWARENESS	Few, if any, community agencies that partner with the college or university are aware of the campus' goals for service-learning and the full range of service-learning opportunities that are available to students. ☐ **Stage One**	Some, but not the majority of community agencies that partner with the college or university are aware of the campus' goals for service-learning and the full range of service-learning opportunities that are available to students. ☐ **Stage Two**	Most community agencies that partner with the college or university are aware of the campus' goals for service-learning and the full range of service-learning opportunities that are available to students. ☐ **Stage Three**
MUTUAL UNDERSTANDING	There is little or no understanding between the campus and community representatives regarding each other's needs, timelines, goals, resources, and capacity for developing and implementing service-learning activities. ☐ **Stage One**	There is some understanding between the campus and community representatives regarding each other's needs, timelines, goals, resources, and capacity for developing and implementing service-learning activities, but there are some disparities between community and campus goals for service-learning. ☐ **Stage Two**	Both the campus and community representatives are aware of and sensitive to each other's needs, timelines, goals, resources, and capacity for developing and implementing service-learning activities. There is generally broad agreement between the campus and community on the goals for service-learning. ☐ **Stage Three**
COMMUNITY PARTNER VOICE & LEADERSHIP	Few, if any, opportunities on campus exist for community agency representatives to take on leadership roles in advancing service-learning on the campus; community agency representatives are not usually invited or encouraged to express their particular agency needs or recruit student and faculty participation in service-learning. ☐ **Stage One**	There are a limited number of opportunities available for community agency representatives to take on leadership roles in advancing service-learning on campus; community agency representatives are provided limited opportunities to express their particular agency needs or recruit student and faculty participation in service-learning. ☐ **Stage Two**	Appropriate community agency representatives are formally welcomed and encouraged to serve as advocates and ambassadors for institutionalizing service-learning on the campus; community agency representatives are provided substantial opportunities to express their particular agency needs or recruit student and faculty participation in service-learning. ☐ **Stage Three**

DIMENSION V: INSTITUTIONAL SUPPORT FOR SERVICE-LEARNING

In order for service-learning to become institutionalized on college and university campuses, the institution must provide substantial resources, support, and muscle toward the effort.

DIRECTIONS: For each of the six categories (rows), check the box the cell that best represents the *CURRENT* status of your campus' institutional support for service-learning(or click the box using the mouse if completing electronically- e.g., ☒ Stage One).

	STAGE ONE *Critical Mass Building*	STAGE TWO *Quality Building*	STAGE THREE *Sustained Institutionalization*
COORDINATING ENTITY	There is no campus-wide coordinating entity (e.g., committee, center, or clearinghouse) that is devoted to assisting the various campus constituencies in the implementation, advancement, and institutionalization of service-learning. ☐ **Stage One**	There is a coordinating entity (e.g., committee, center, or clearinghouse) on campus, but the entity either does not coordinate service-learning activities exclusively or provides services only to a certain constituency (e.g., students, faculty) or limited part of the campus (e.g., certain majors) ☐ **Stage Two**	The institution maintains coordinating entity (e.g., committee, center, or clearinghouse) that is devoted primarily to assisting the various campus constituencies in the implementation of service-learning. ☐ **Stage Three**
POLICY-MAKING ENTITY	The institution's official and influential policy-making board(s)/committee(s) do not recognize service-learning as an essential educational goal for the campus. ☐ **Stage One**	The institution's official and influential policy-making board(s)/committee(s) recognize service-learning as an essential educational goal for the campus, but no formal policies have been developed. ☐ **Stage Two**	The institution's policy-making board(s)/committee(s) recognize service-learning as an essential educational goal for the campus and formal policies have been developed or implemented. ☐ **Stage Three**
STAFFING	There are no staff/faculty members on campus whose primary paid responsibility is to advance and institutionalize service-learning on the campus. ☐ **Stage One**	There are an appropriate number of staff members on campus who understand service-learning fully and/or who hold appropriate titles that can influence the advancement and institutionalization of service-learning throughout the campus; however their appointments are temporary or paid from soft money or external grant funds. ☐ **Stage Two**	The campus houses and funds an appropriate number of permanent staff members who understand service-learning and who hold appropriate titles that can influence the advancement and institutionalization of service-learning on campus. ☐ **Stage Three**

FUNDING	The campus' service-learning activities are supported primarily by soft money (short-term grants) from sources outside the institution. ☐ **Stage One**	The campus' service-learning activities are supported by both soft money (short-term grants) from sources outside the institution as well as hard money from the institution. ☐ **Stage Two**	The campus' service-learning activities are supported primarily by hard funding from the campus. ☐ **Stage Three**
ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT	The campus' administrative leaders have little or no understanding of service-learning, often confusing it with other campus outreach efforts, such as community service or internship programs. ☐ **Stage One**	The campus' administrative leaders have a clear understanding of service-learning, but they do little to make service-learning a visible and important part of the campus' work. ☐ **Stage Two**	The campus' administrative leaders understand and support service-learning, and actively cooperate to make service-learning a visible and important part of the campus' work. ☐ **Stage Three**
DEPARTMENTAL SUPPORT	Few, if any, departments recognize service-learning as a formal part of their formal academic programs. ☐ **Stage One**	Several departments offer service-learning opportunities and courses, but these opportunities typically are not a part of the formal academic program of the department and/or are not primarily supported by departmental funds. ☐ **Stage Two**	A fair to large number of departments provide service-learning opportunities that are a part of the formal academic program and/or are primarily supported by departmental funds. ☐ **Stage Three**
EVALUATION & ASSESSMENT	There is no organized, campus-wide effort underway to account for the number and quality of service-learning activities taking place. ☐ **Stage One**	An initiative to account for the number and quality of service-learning activities taking place throughout the campus has been proposed. ☐ **Stage Two**	An ongoing, systematic effort is in place to account for the number and quality of service-learning activities that are taking place throughout the campus. ☐ **Stage Three**

Developed by Andrew Furco, University of California, Berkeley, 1999. Based on the Kecskes/Muyllaert Continuums of Service Benchmark Worksheet.

107

Appendix C

Request to Conduct Research

INFORMATION FOR PARTICIPANTS IN SERVICE-LEARNING INSTITUTIONALIZATION IN HIGHER EDUCATION STUDY

Thank you for participating in a study of service-learning institutionalization in higher education on campuses in the southeast. For the study, administrators, faculty, students, and community agency partners engaged in service-learning will complete a brief survey. The survey is comprised of two parts: (1) a background information sheet requesting general information about the institutions, courses, and survey participants, and (2) a service-learning rubric, *Self Assessment Rubric for the Institutionalization of Service-Learning in Higher Education,* developed by Andrew Furco, a Campus Compact Engaged Scholar and director of the Service-Learning Research and Development Center, University of California, Berkeley entitled was.

The average time for completing the survey is about 15 minutes. Participants will be able to complete the survey manually or electronically. If participants choose to complete the surveys **manually**, they will simply check the box that best answers the questions. If participants choose to complete the surveys **electronically**, they will click the box using the mouse.

Please be assured that the confidentiality of all participants will be protected. For your participation in the study, a summary of the findings and a service-learning resource will be sent to you. Questions or concerns regarding the survey should be directed to:

GWENDA R. GREENE
Benedict College Service-Learning Program Director
MSC 16 ◆ 1600 Harden Street ◆ Columbia, SC 29204
Office Phone: (803) 806-3227 ◆ E-mail: greeneg@benedict.edu

**Thank you very much for participating in this study of
Service-Learning institutionalization**

ABOUT THE SURVEY

One part of the survey is the *Background Information Sheet,* which is a general information inquiry on the institutions, courses, and survey participants. The second, and primary, part of the survey is a rubric, entitled *Self Assessment Rubric for the Institutionalization of Service-Learning in Higher Education,* by Andrew Furco, a Campus Compact Engaged Scholar and director of the Service-Learning Research and Development Center, University of California, Berkeley. It is designed to establish a set of criteria upon which the progress of service-learning institutionalization can be measured. It is structured by five dimensions, which are considered by most service-

learning experts to be key factors for higher education service-learning institutionalization. Each dimension is comprised of several components that characterize the dimension. For each component, a three-stage continuum of development has been established. Stage One is the *Critical Mass Building* stage. At this stage campuses are beginning to recognize service-learning and are building a campus-wide constituency for the effort. Stage Two is the *Quality Building* stage. At this stage campuses are focused on ensuring the development of "quality" service-learning activities; the quality of service-learning activities begins to supercede the quantity of service-learning activities. Stage Three is the *Sustained Institutionalization* stage. At this stage a campus has fully institutionalized service-learning into the fabric of the institution.

For the purpose of this study, the five dimensions have been divided and assigned to the identified groups to complete based upon the given components. The dimension assignments are as follows:

Administrative Leaders	Dimensions I, II, III, IV, V
Faculty	Dimensions I, II, III, IV, V
Students	Dimension III
Community Partners	Dimension IV

There is no one right way to use the rubric. What is most important is to gain insight on the overall status of campus' institutionalization progress rather than the progress of individual components. The results of this status assessment can provide useful information for the development of an action plan to advance service-learning on the campuses of the participating institutions. It can help identify which institutionalization components or dimensions are progressing well and which need additional attention.

INFORMATION FOR KEY COORDINATORS OF THE SERVICE-LEARNING INSTITUTIONALIZATION IN HIGHER EDUCATION STUDY

Packet Contents

The contents to be sent to each institution will be comprised of the following: (1) a *Key Coordinator's Information Sheet*, (2) a *Background Information Sheet* and (3) the *Self-Assessment Rubrics* labeled for the appropriate group to complete. The numbers of surveys contained in each packet are listed below. If transmitted electronically one set of each will be sent.

Three (3) Administrative Leaders surveys   Five (5) Faculty surveys
Twenty-five (25) Student surveys   Five (5) Community Partners surveys

General Instructions for Distribution and Collection of Surveys

1. A key coordinator will be named at each institution to facilitate the distribution and collection of the surveys with the stated groups. The surveys will be disseminated to the key coordinators through two means: (a) via US mail and (b) electronically via e-mail. Each key coordinator will in return disseminate the surveys to participants in the specified groups based upon the preference of the participant.

2. Each key coordinator will complete the *Key Coordinator's Information Sheet* regarding the participants in the study.

3. The key coordinator will forward the *Administrative Leaders* surveys to 3 administrators who have played key roles in helping service-learning evolve on the campus. Administrators may be individuals such as service-learning directors/coordinators, college/university Presidents, chief academic officers, or other academic leaders.

4. The key coordinator will select 5 faculty members who have used or are currently using service-learning in classes and forward to them the *Service-Learning Faculty* survey.

5. The key coordinator will ask each faculty member to distribute surveys to 5 of their students who have engaged in or are currently enrolled in courses that utilize service-learning. This
    will be a total of 25 students to complete the *Service-Learning Students* survey.

6. Upon the recommendation of the key coordinator and/or faculty members, 5 community agencies that are currently partners or have partnered with the institution in service-learning initiatives will be selected to complete the *Service-Learning Community Partners* survey. Through a collaborative effort between the key coordinator and faculty members, the *Service-Learning Community Partners* survey will be forwarded.

7. If US Mail is the preferred method, the key coordinator will collect the surveys and return them in the self-addressed envelope. If transmitted electronically via e-mail by the key coordinator, the participants will return the surveys back to the key coordinator. Accordingly, the key coordinator will return the surveys electronically.

8. Notes: (a) because different groups will complete different dimensions of the survey, the time allotment for completing the survey will vary from 10 – 30 minutes at the most, (b) there may not be the number of persons available in each category involved in service-learning on your campus and if not, contact as many as you can.

Please be assured that the confidentiality of all participants will be protected. Thank you very much for participating in this study of service-learning institutionalization. Should you have any questions or concerns, please contact me immediately using the listed information.

Questions or concerns regarding the survey should be directed to:
GWENDA R. GREENE
Benedict College Service-Learning Program Director
MSC 16   1600 Harden Street
Columbia, SC 29204
Office Phone: (803) 806-3227
E-mail: greeneg@benedict.edu

Appendix D

IRB Permission to Conduct Research

UNION INSTITUTE & UNIVERSITY

December 2, 2003

Ms. Gwenda Greene
109 Brickingham Way
Columbia, SC 29229
Re: IRB 00024: An Assessment of Service Learning Institutionalization in Higher Education
Dear Ms. Greene:
Your proposed research project qualified for IRB review for exemption; the IRB member who reviewed your proposal has recommended approval. Accordingly, I am pleased to approve your proposed research project on behalf of the IRB.

You indicated in your application that you were seeking waiver of the need for signed informed consent from participants. That request has also been approved: it is the IRB's position that, in studies such as yours, return of the completed questionnaire constitutes evidence of a subject's consent to participate, making a separate signed form redundant. Your covering communication adequately covers informed consent issues. You may wish to consider including the enclosed IRB document, "Your Rights as a Participant in Research," in the packet of information you provide to prospective participants.

The IRB's approval will extend for a period of twelve months, beginning with the date of this letter and through December 1, 2004. If your project is likely to extend beyond that date, including the data analysis stage, you should apply for continued approval well in advance of the expiration date.

The IRB reserves the right to review your study as part of its continuing review process. Continuing reviews are typically scheduled in advance, however, the IRB may choose, under certain conditions, to not announce a continuing review. Please notify the IRB Chair when you have concluded your study.

—————————PERSONAL • PROGRESSIVE • POWERFUL—————————

440 E. MCMILLAN ST., CINCINNATI, OH 45206-1925 • 513/861-6400 • 8OO/486-3116 • TDD 800/486-9968 • FAX 513/861-0779 • www.tui.edu

114

We understand that your Learning Agreement has been submitted to the deans for review and approval of your committee's recommendation for certification. Normally, the IRB requires completion of the certification process as a pre-requisite for consideration of proposals. However, due to the recent implementation of the requirement for this requirement has been waived. If—as a result of the dean's review or any other reason—you wish to make substantive changes in your study design, survey instruments, consent processes, or any other aspect of the study that might affect study participants, you are required to halt the study and submit proposed changes to the IRB for review.

On behalf of the IRB, I wish you success with your study and a satisfactory conclusion to your doctoral program. Please do not hesitate to contact me if you have any questions or concerns.

Warmest Regards,

Linda C. Van Volkenburgh Coordinator and Co-Chair, *ex officio,* Institutional Review Board

Copy: Dr. Leland K. Hall, Sr.
       Dr. Richard Green

Appendix E

Permission to Use Survey Instrument

September 26, 2003

Gwenda R. Greene
Director
Benedict College Service-Learning Program
MSC16
1600 Harden Street
Columbia, SC 29204

Dear Ms. Greene:
Enclosed please find a copy of Andrew Furco's "Self-Assessment Rubric for the Institutionalization of Service-Learning in Higher Education." Campus Compact hereby grants permission to reproduce and use the rubric in your doctoral research. Please make sure that each copy of the rubric you use includes appropriate attribution, including the name of the publication, the author, the publisher, and the date. (As an aside, note that the rubric will be included in a full-length book to be published in 2004 by Anker Publishing in cooperation with Campus Compact; you may find the book useful as your research progresses.)

We will discuss the best course to take regarding use of Campus Compact's survey of engagement as soon as we receive details of your proposed project. In the meantime, if I can be of any further assistance, please do not hesitate to ask. My direct number here is 401-867-3922. You may also find it useful to talk with Campus Compact's resource coordinator Pam Mutascio, who has access to a large database of resources, indexed by category. You can reach her at pmutascio@compact.org or at 401-867-3949.

Yours truly,

Karen Partridge
Publications Coordinator