

**INSTITUTIONALIZING SERVICE-LEARNING IN FAITH-BASED
COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES:
The development of an Evaluation Tool for a Service-Learning Program**

Yorton Clark Jr. & David Wegley
MidAmerica Nazarene University

ABSTRACT The purpose of this project was to develop a tool to guide colleges in developing a sustainable service-learning program. The primary focus was to identify key elements for effective, campus-wide, sustainable service-learning programs at faith-based colleges and universities. The research investigated an extensive range of literature, documents, web sites, experts and best practices, as well as policies, procedures and organizational structures. The evaluation tool that was developed can be utilized as a baseline assessment for ongoing program improvements as well as a practical guide of information to promote change toward a sustainable, fully embedded service-learning program.

INTRODUCTION:

This was a problem-based learning project examining the policies, procedures, and organizational structures surrounding service-learning at colleges and universities in North America. It discovered and utilized normative data and best practices to determine the characteristics of institutionalization that must be met in conjunction with appropriate practice and commitment. It examined an extensive range of documents, web sites, and literature on initiating and maintaining service-learning programming. The process led to the creation of an assessment tool that identifies key standard elements and requirements for an effective campus-wide sustainable service-learning program at faith-based higher education institutions.

IDENTIFYING THE NEED

Early in the process, the team attended a faith-based service-learning conference at Messiah College in Pennsylvania. One particular presentation emphasized that Catholic and liturgical schools appeared to be stronger in their service-learning programming and structure with the perspective of social justice. It was also noted, based on the survey sample of schools represented at the conference, that the Protestant schools tended to have less formalized structure with their service-learning programming, and their focus appeared to be the desire to provide community service, missions and evangelism.

In response to this idea and discussion, the team investigated the mission statements, catalogs, and websites of colleges and universities to find representation and evidence of service-learning. The search process was accomplished by looking into a majority of the institutions involved in the Council for Christian Colleges and Universities (CCCU) to validate the assumption. A central theme or pattern emerged, that many institutions' stated mission and objectives differ from their service-learning practices and outcomes. A need to fully understand this issue and

assist in presenting a solution was recognized, the issue being a closer alignment or link between the institution's stated mission statements, and their service-learning programs. This issue triggered the idea to create a document audit process, and a guide with frequently asked questions and best practices. The audit process and guide could be used for an institution that planned to begin a program or to fully institutionalize an existing service-learning program. These standardized tools would need to contain quality comprehensive categories designed to determine whether a program was meeting the best practices as set forth in the literature.

PROJECT PURPOSE

Faith-based colleges and universities should be using service-learning as a means to benefit the greater needs of society and produce graduates who are committed to lives of service. The faith-based mission of Christian higher education includes an expectation to produce students who, in some form, emulate the mission of Christ (Schaffer, 2004). Jesus himself urged his followers to strive to serve others. He said, "For whoever wants to be great among you must be your servant, and whoever wants to be first must be your slave, just as the Son of Man did not come to be served, but to serve, and to give His life as a ransom for many." (NIV, Matthew 20:27-28).

Changes and innovations in higher education must be assimilated into the core of the institution's structure or they will be short-lived (Curry, 1991). In order to achieve sustainability, service-learning should permeate every aspect of campus life. This is no small or quick undertaking. The institutionalization of service-learning requires gathering support from people throughout the campus community and involves the following challenges: (1) administrative support, (2) funding, (3) awareness and training, and (4) faculty, student, and community partners' involvement (Ward, 1998). Moving service-learning from the campus perimeter to the core of operations, and from an idea into common practice, requires overcoming these challenges while understanding the complexities of the institution's cultural environment. For the universities that meet these challenges, the benefit of service-learning experiences far outweigh the cost invested in time and resources.

Many institutions' executive administrators and presidents benefit from the support for service-learning. University leaders can promote it by creating and supporting an ethos of learning that includes community support-service experiences. For the faith-based colleges, service-learning is supported in biblical scriptures. For example, I Peter 4:10 (NIV) stated, "Each one should use whatever gift he has received to serve others, faithfully administering God's grace in its various forms" and "the King will reply, I tell you the truth, whatever you did for one of the least of these brothers of mine, you did for me" Matthew 25:40 (NIV). This commitment and dedication to service can be communicated from the president of the university to the staff and student body by incorporating a vision of community service in each of the academic, social, and operational departments of the school (Kuh, Douglas, Lund, & Ramin-Gyurnek, 1994).

Frequently, the concept for community involvement and service-learning can be popular, but actual implementation falls short of the ideal because of the necessary time and commitment it takes to fully permeate campus life and transfer into meeting community needs. It requires adequate operational funding of financial and human resources, with regular infusions of on-

going training to support a healthy service-learning program. If authentic academic service-learning is going to thrive on a campus, it must have fiscal and psychological support. The reality is that throughout higher educational campuses nationwide, much variance exists with regard to campus understanding, involvement, and awareness of service-learning. Service-learning research suggests that colleges and universities should implement a majority of the standards and practices as a means for institutionalizing and sustaining their service-learning program. The program standards and process evaluation recommendations put forth in this project are meant to demonstrate the importance of, and contribute to the institutionalization of service-learning in faith-based colleges and universities. If it is not integrated into the campus culture through operational infrastructures (e.g., service-learning offices, budgets, curriculum affairs, training and reward structures), and designed to reach out to develop mutually beneficial relationships with multiple communities, then it is destined to be short-lived or nonexistent. Rubin (1996) argued that a strong, institutionalized service-learning program is one of the most effective methods for developing students toward a lifetime of service to their fellow man.

PROJECT SCOPE: THE BOUNDARIES OF THE REPORT

The project report includes a review of literature on service-learning and its prescribed criteria of best practices for program institutionalization and sustainability for faith-based colleges and universities. An initial literature search resulted in the origination of key standards that formulate an evaluation tool, which incorporates specific indicator guidelines and recommendations for colleges to use for enhancing and institutionalizing service-learning. The report includes suggestions and feedback from industry acclaimed experts and practitioners within service-learning. It includes the application of the Data Collection Evaluation Tool through a preliminary field study with a faith-based institution of higher education.

The Data Collection Evaluation Tool was created to assist faith-based colleges and universities to assess their methods, activities, resources, and support structures for service-learning programming. It serves as a resource guide for important indicators needed for effective service-learning programming. The Data Collection Tool and evaluation documents do not measure the effectiveness of the service-learning program objectives or its desired outcomes. The tool and evaluation process are not an all-inclusive guarantee to service-learning program success. It is to be used as an assessment tool and guideline in conjunction with other industry benchmark tools and information guidelines.

FOUNDATIONAL KNOWLEDGE

An emphasis on learning cannot be confined to the walls of a physical classroom or to a short-term university experience. Service-learning can be the appropriate venue for this practical application of learning to occur. Astin (1993) stated, “service-learning is the most effective means of educating students who understand and appreciate not only how democracy is supposed to work, but also their own responsibility to become active and informed participants in it” (p 18). Combining service with learning is a good fit to accomplish many institutional objectives. In order to create vibrant programs embedded into the fabric of the institution as well as those that will maintain their effectiveness and passion for many years, there must be a long-

term practice and assessment in specific standards and indicators. From the literature search, the following six criterion standards were established for evaluating service-learning institutionalization for faith-based institutions:

1. Administration Involvement and Support
2. Organizational Culture and Climate
3. Stakeholder Development and Involvement
4. Academic Integration
5. Faith Integration and Development
6. Program Assessment and Development

DEVELOPMENT OF THE EVALUATION TOOL

The faith-based college and universities are an important venue for community service-learning and practices among students because most college age men and women are spending multiple formative years seeking their self-concepts, values, beliefs, attitudes, and meaning (Astin, 1977). Community service is a fundamental element of responsible citizenship. A Christian's worldview of life and this world should lead to a desire to act favorably to one's neighbor, by using one's skills, knowledge and energy to assist those in need.

Faith-based institutions possess many attributes that naturally foster an environment and structure for the implementation of an effective service-learning program. However, as a relatively new concept, the lack of knowledge, understanding, and limited resources, have all caused service-learning to be limited to internships, field work, or mission efforts (Eyler & Giles, 1999). Thus, in many cases the efforts and results of the programs tend to be limited and short-lived in terms of effectiveness. They tend to lack the necessary attributes required for a strong and sustainable service-learning program to meet the stated institutional mission, and influence the student learning values and behaviors for a lifetime of service.

Through professional networking, conferences, seminars, literature, assessment and accreditation processes, many college staff and faculty start service-learning initiatives that begin with great aspirations, but eventually, do not meet expectations for multiple reasons. An evaluation tool and measurement method is needed, to reveal and investigate the types of emerging practices. Particularly, to identify and measure important indicators that merit more comprehensive implementation, research, and thought, to become an important part of the institutional fiber. Most of the tools or models found involved large institutions or unique community colleges. Smaller faith-based institutions may have fewer resources available; however, they may have the ability to change their practices and programs rapidly, unencumbered by the administrative systems of larger organizations. The evaluative tool was designed specifically for evaluating smaller (<500 students) to mid-sized (>5000 students) faith-based American colleges because of the specific standards and indicators used to measure. The tool could be used and adapted to larger institutions; however, the nature of the evidence-based evaluation could make the process quite burdensome.

The evaluation tool was developed to be an informative initial program start-up tool, as well as an evaluation tool for an existing program focusing on improvement and advancement. It is

aimed at being user-friendly, while being solidly grounded in good evidence-based evaluation practice. The tool is not meant to quantify the success of an institution's service-learning program, but rather to assess whether they have strong evidence of the key indicators that assure program sustainability (Appendix A).

VALIDATION OF THE EVALUATION TOOL

Expert Panel Feedback and Review

This section discusses the process used to develop and improve the data collection evaluation tool through employing a seven member expert panel. The method will be described in detail, and will share the panel's detailed suggestions and results.

Individuals were identified and assembled from the literature review process. The criteria was that they be directors of higher educational service-learning programs and/or had published work that was cited by other scholarly work in the service-learning field. From that list, ten nationally recognized experts in academic higher education service-learning were selected and contacted (Appendix B). The expert panel was utilized to validate the data collection evaluation tool and rubric scale. From the ten individuals, seven signed a consent agreement to consult on the project evaluation tool and scale. All of the panel members were currently employed in higher education and all but one of the panel members has doctorate degrees in the educational field.

Each of the panel members were provided a brief explanation of the purpose and goals of the evaluation tools, a participation form to sign, a list of the five standards with objective indicators for each standard, and a five point rubric scale used to measure each indicator. The panel was given two options to respond; through hard copies by mail, or electronic copies by email. The panel was asked to rate each of the five standards as well as the rubric scale by the degree that the standard and its related indicators comprehensively capture the key concepts that are essential to service-learning. One of the seven panel members chose not to rate the document. In addition, the key thrust of our inquiry was that the panel members could provide additional qualitative feedback and recommendations, as well as their opinions about the tools specific existing information, and its implementation process.

Additional comments and suggestions were solicited from the expert panel. All seven of the panel members offered multiple suggestions. Six of the panel reviewers provided comments to the strengths of the tools and three of the reviewers provided comments on areas of improvement. Two commented that the evaluation tool appeared to be valid and very helpful, but questioned if colleges would want to invest the time to collect evidence of the indicators. Many liked the quantitative rubric scale, but one panelist questioned who would rate the indicator evidence, university personnel or an outside consultant. A list of all of the panel's comments and suggestions are available in Appendix C and D.

All of the feedback from the panel members were individually considered and evaluated for implementation. The most significant contributions to change were the stronger emphasis in faith integration and outcomes assessment. With those suggestions, a sixth standard of faith

integration with its associated indicators was added to the evaluation tool, and the title and indicators to the outcome assessment standard were modified. The depth of the panel's suggestions greatly enhanced the tool with substantive and comprehensive information. This study provides validation that the standards and indicators of the evaluation tool can benefit and influence higher education service-learning programming in a positive manner.

APPLICATION OF THE EVALUATION TOOL

A preliminary field study was conducted at a private, faith-based liberal arts university. Two program directors, associated with the service and assessment departments from the university being evaluated, assisted in the facilitation of the field study findings. For two to three weeks tangible document evidence and data were gathered to assure objective results for scoring. The process and implementation of the Data Collection Tool and the Program Evaluation Summary were major components of the field study.

OVERALL PROJECT ANALYSIS

The project was developed around four guiding questions. Those questions served as the basis for directing the review of literature with the purpose of developing the Data Collection Tool. The Data Collection Tool addresses the issues that came from responding to the guiding questions. The team continually revisited the project's guiding questions and discussed the answers to those questions and their implications for practice in higher education. This section also discusses the important lessons learned from the project.

Guiding Question One

Is there an academically accepted definition to service-learning and how can colleges communicate and reinforce its understanding across their campuses?

Answer and Discussion - There may not be a single, universally accepted definition, but there are common elements that are found in the majority of definitions of service-learning. This project developed and used the following definition of service-learning: *Service-learning is a teaching strategy that enhances students' learning of academic content by engaging them in authentic activities with which they apply the content of the course or discipline to address identified needs in the local and broader community.*

The key element in this definition, as well as countless others, is that the learning of academic content is connected to a specific course while addressing the needs in the community. Students may work on projects that address community needs, but lack a connection to a specific course or academic content. These projects may be beneficial to both the students and to the community, but since there is not direct connection to academic content, they are a form of community service, not service-learning.

If higher education leaders are confused over the definition of service-learning, they may incorrectly believe that their institution is already doing service-learning when in reality their

college is actually focused on community service. Leaders naturally spend time on areas that need improvement and if they believe that their institution is already actively involved in service-learning, they will not recognize the need to initiate any organizational changes that might be crucial for the institutionalization of service-learning on their campus. This is especially true given the constant battle over limited resources that most higher education leaders face.

While it is important for the college leadership to understand the difference between community service and service-learning, it is also important for the faculty and staff to have an accurate understanding of service-learning. For example, professors are less likely to use service-learning in one of their courses if they fail to understand the benefits of student learning. For this reason, it is important for the institution to continually communicate the difference between service-learning and community service.

Guiding Question Two

What are the typical options for fitting service-learning within the organizational structure of colleges or universities and how do those options generally impact the institutionalization and sustainability of service-learning programs?

Answer and Discussion- This question assumes that the college has appointed a director to oversee and promote the service-learning functions on the campus. This is a fundamental issue if the college hopes to have a sustainable service-learning program that is embedded in the organizational structure. Establishing a service-learning advisory board is important to the success of the service-learning program. The advisory board can be a help to build credibility, ownership and momentum on the campus. To be effective in this effort, the board should include influential people from multiple departments of the institution, as well as those community partners and stakeholders who can directly impact the sustainability of a service-learning program.

Community engagement is a term used to entail all off-campus service projects. Most colleges house the community engagement function either under the area of student development or under academic affairs. Placing community engagement under student development is a natural fit for institutions that are primarily involved in community service with limited service-learning projects. It is less clear where community engagement should be housed when the programming between service-learning and community service is more evenly balanced.

Having the academic provost or school deans on the advisory board is highly recommended. Building a strong connection to academics is a primary concern in the effort to institutionalize service-learning. Structuring the service-learning program under the academic side of the college is a significant step toward building and maintaining this critical connection with academics. If faculty see service-learning as a student development function they are more likely to think it does not relate to them and their function on campus.

Guiding Question Three

Is there a set of best practices or industry standards at leading service-learning programs and if so, what are they?

Answer and Discussion- In addition to establishing a director for service-learning and an advisory board, there are a number of common practices found at institutions that have built and established service-learning programs that are considered prominent in the service-learning movement. In general, these practices include developing a supporting organizational culture that celebrates service-learning, training and supporting stakeholders, ensuring academic integration of service-learning and ongoing program assessment.

Service-learning programs can and should be characteristically unique from one college to the next. The distinctions are a function of many factors including the institution's unique mission, the campus culture, and the community that surrounds the college. Still, much can be gained by learning from successful service-learning programs that have faced similar issues and concerns when developing their programs.

Learning from thriving programs helps new programs address issues that they might not otherwise have considered. For example, if a system of evaluating the faculty does not acknowledge service-learning, the system might actually deter faculty from making the transition to service-learning. This is just one of many factors that could discourage stakeholders from engaging in service-learning.

Guiding Question Four

Can a faith-based college or university design and structure its service-learning program in a manner so that it aligns with and contributes to the institution's unique faith related mission?

Answer and Discussion- Service-learning programs at faith-based colleges can be designed and structured in a manner that supports the institution's mission. First, the Director of Service-learning should include the college's chaplain or a similar, high profile, representative from the Campus Ministries office on the service-learning advisory board. This person will then assist the director in developing a mission for the program that includes faith integration in a manner that is consistent with the institutional mission statement as well as the college's faith tradition. Including the chaplain on the advisory board also helps to maintain an ongoing emphasis on faith integration in the service-learning program and the specific service-learning projects.

For faith-based colleges, connecting the service-learning program to the institution's mission will help the college to live out its distinctive mission. It is also important to make all stakeholders aware of the connection between the service-learning program and the institution's mission. This strong identity connection can benefit the college in multiple ways. For example, the college will be more likely to attract both students and faculty whose beliefs, ideals and goals are in alignment with those of the institution.

LESSONS LEARNED

Some writers have questioned whether leaders of higher education can make a significant difference or not. Pfeffer (1977) argued that in higher education there is an ambiguity of leadership. His primary point was that it is difficult to measure how effective leaders actually are and that they are limited in the impact they can make on the institution. It became evident from this project that often, leaders are more able to influence the organization than they are able to control it. Influence can be a very powerful force given the right direction and structures.

First, higher education leaders must clearly define their terms when they are casting the mission and vision for their institution. Communicating these definitions to all involved stakeholders is equally important. Absent common definitions, colleges risk stakeholders working in different directions.

Leaders should also examine the institution's structure, systems, and policies to ensure that they all well aligned well with the desired mission and vision. This is especially true when considering significant organizational change. Existing structures are in place to support and encourage current practices and might work against the proposed change.

Next, when considering significant organizational change, leaders in higher education should search for examples from successful programs found at other schools. These models can often provide a great starting point of best practices for implementing the change. Learning from the lessons of others can help avoid many potential issues that might not otherwise have been considered.

Finally, when considering any organizational change, leaders should always make sure that the change is consistent with the institution's unique mission. It is fine to learn from the best practices found at other schools as long the leader remembers that programs should reflect the missions of their schools. Leaders can be a powerful force for change if they stay focused on their institution's unique mission and then set a clear, well-defined direction and establish organizational structures, programs, and policies in a manner that supports that direction.

PROJECT RESULTS AND FINDINGS

Throughout the problem-based learning process, it was discovered that service-learning programs had a wide array of levels in which they were embedded in colleges and universities, from those that are just beginning implementation to those who have had it for years. A project goal was to construct a piece that was a benchmark for both new and existing service-learning programs. The result was the creation of a data collection tool and rubric evaluation scale with industry standards and descriptive indicators. The Data Collection Tool can serve as a roadmap for new programs where the college leadership is interested in service-learning, but does not know the steps of implementation. Secondly, it can be used as a self-study tool for existing programs that desire to elevate the quality of their program. Existing programs could also use it in conjunction with outside trained experts. In this scenario, the institution would collect the data with supporting evidence, and the expert would evaluate the evidence of each standard that

had been discovered. This application method is the preferred mode of application of the tool. In essence, the document allows schools to determine the extent to which it is used, but ultimately it serves the purpose of embedding the service-learning program within the organization for sustainability. Finally, the tool could also be used in conjunction with a formal organization that sets the seal of approval and adds credibility, as well as to validate and substantiate additional financial budgeting resources. A key feature included in the tool is that it requires the institution to provide specific, objective (policy, document, etc.) evidence through the study of each standard of best practices and their descriptive indicators as a quality control mechanism. It takes away the subjectivity to reinforce what a program is doing well and gives recommendations on how to improve in their areas of weakness. This tool is comprehensive in nature.

The realities of using a data collection tool to evaluate a service-learning program sounds great in concept, but there are some potential road blocks that deter and hinder the implementation process. The team realizes there are budget implications, faculty and staff load issues, training needs, time constraints, and one of the most important – presidential and administrative understanding and support. Also, having an external trained expert to audit the evidential documents validates the indicators, but it can impede the authenticity if not audited by a knowledgeable external reviewer. This element may be difficult to understand and may hinder the straightforward facilitation of the tools. However, it is vital to the process to ensure the objective validity and significance of the results. Each of these areas, if not addressed in a positive and earnest fashion, can block the inception or completion of the tool and its intended outcomes.

FINAL THOUGHTS

Service-learning can be the appropriate venue for the practical application of learning and meaningful service to occur. Faith-based schools can progress from just a community service or a mission's orientation to a sustainable service-learning program by combining learning with serving and applying many of the best practice standards given in the project evaluation tool. In order to create holistic community engagement programs that are embedded into the curriculum and fabric of a faith-based institution, as well as those that maintain their effectiveness and passion for many years, there must be a reliable continuing practice of training, evaluation and commitment to implement critical best practice standards and indicators.

Bibliography

- Abes, E., Jackson, G., & Jones, S. (2002). Factors that motivate and deter faculty use of service-learning. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 9(1), 5-17. Retrieved July 23, 2009, from <http://quod.lib.umich.edu/cgi/t/text/text-idx?c=mjcs1;idno=3239521.0009.101;cc=mjcs1>
- Alliance for Service-Learning in Education Reform. (1995). Standards of quality for school-based and community-based service-learning. *The Social Studies*, 88(5), 215-219. Retrieved April 14, 2009, from <http://www.servicelearning.org/filemanager/download/12/asler95.pdf>
- Archambault, R. D. (Ed.). (1964). *John Dewey on education: Selected writings*. New York: Random House.
- Astin, A. W. (1977). *Four critical years*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Astin, A. W. (1985). *Achieving educational excellence: A critical assessment of priorities and practices in higher education*. San Francisco: Josey-Bass.
- Astin, A. W. (1993). *What matters in college? Four critical years revisited*. San Fransisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Astin, A. W. (2004, Spring). Why spirituality deserves a central place in liberal education. *Liberal Education*, 90(2), 34-41. Retrieved July 24, 2009 from http://www.eric.ed.gov/ERICDocs/data/ericdocs2sql/content_storage_01/0000019b/80/29/e6/b2.pdf
- Astin, A., & Astin, H. (2000). *Leadership reconsidered: Engaging higher education*. Battle Creek, MI: W.K Kellogg Foundation. Retrieved July 26, 2009, from <http://eric.ed.gov/ERICWebPortal/contentdelivery/servlet/ERICServlet?accno=ED444437>
- Baird, B. (1998). Rationale for measuring multiple domains when conducting service-learning student evaluation. In T. Pickeral & K. Peters (Eds.), *Assessing internal and external outcomes of service-learning collaborations* (pp. 17-22). Online publication, Campus Compact, Retrieved July 27, 2009, from <http://www.mc.maricopa.edu/other/engagement/Outcomes/FullText.pdf>
- Bloom B. S. (1956). *Taxonomy of educational objectives, Handbook I: The Cognitive Domain*. New York: David McKay Co Inc.
- Bolman, L. G., & Deal, T. E. (2003). *Reframing organizations: Artistry, choice, and leadership*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

- Boyer, E. L (1990). *Scholarship reconsidered: Priorities of the professoriate*. Princeton, N.J.: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.
- Boyer, E. L. (1994, March). Creating the new American college. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, A48.
- Bradley, L. R. (1997). Evaluating service-learning: Toward a new paradigm. In A. S. Waterman (Ed.), *Service-learning: Applications from the research* (p. 151). New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- Braskamp, L. (2003). Fostering student development through faculty development: A national survey of chief academic officers at church related colleges, Loyola University Chicago, Retrieved August 1, 2009 from <http://www.luc.edu/projectfaculty/publications.html>
- Braskamp, L. A. (2007). Fostering religious and spiritual development of students during college. *Essay Forum on the Religious Engagements of American undergraduates*, 1-10. Retrieved August 3, 2009 from <http://religion.ssrc.org/reforum/>.
- Braskamp, L., Trautvetter, L., & Ward K., (2005). How college fosters faith development in students, *Spirituality in Higher Education Newsletter*, 2, 1- 6, Retrieved July 28, 2009 from http://spirituality.ucla.edu/newsletter_new/past_issues_vol2.htm
- Braskamp, L., Trautvetter, L., & Ward, K. (2008, March). Putting students first: Promoting lives of purpose and meaning. *About Campus*, 13(1), 26-32. Retrieved August 3, 2009, doi:10.1002/abc.244
- Bringle, R., & Hatcher, J. (1996). Implementing service learning in higher education. *Journal of Higher Education*, 67, 2. Retrieved July 17, 2009 from <http://www.servicelearning.org/library/resource/1782>
- Bringle, R., & Hatcher, J. (2000, May). Institutionalization of service learning in higher education. *Journal of Higher Education*, 71(3), 273-290. Retrieved July 17, 2009, from Academic Search Complete database.
- Brown, C., & Ratcliffe, J. L. (Eds.). (2000). *Organizational culture in the study of higher education*. Boston: Pearson Custom Publishing.
- Bucco D., & Busch, J. (1996). Starting a service-learning program. In B. Jacoby (Ed.), *Service-Learning in Higher Education: Concepts and Practices* (pp. 231-245). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Burke, W.W. (2002). *Organization change: Theory and practice*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

- Campbell, J. (2006). Practices from spiritual direction that deepen civic engagement, *Journal of College and Character*, 7, 1-5, Retrieved August 3, 2009 from <http://collegevalues.org/newsletters/November%202006%20issue.pdf>
- Campus Compact. (2010, April). Retrieved from <http://www.compact.org/about/history-mission-vision/>
- Coste, T. G., & Durker, M. (2001, Spring). Assessing the effects of incorporating service in learning: The search for a comprehensive process of service learning Evaluation. *Academic Exchange Quarterly*, 5(1), 10. Retrieved July 28, 2009, from Educator's Reference Complete via Gale: <http://find.galegroup.com.ezproxy.augsburg.edu/itx/start.do?prodId=PROF>
- Council for Christian Colleges & Universities. (2010, April). Retrieved from <http://www.cccu.org/about>
- Curry, B. K., (1991). Institutionalization: The final phase of the organizational change process. *Administrator's Notebook* , 35(1), 1-5.
- Dalton, J. C., Eberhardt, D., Bracken, J., & Echols, K. (2006). Inward journeys: Forms and patterns of college student spirituality. *Journal of College and Character*, 7 (8), 1-21. <http://collegevalues.org/newsletters/November%202006%20issue.pdf>
- Durker, M. (2001). Assessing the effects of incorporating service in learning: The search for a comprehensive process of service learning evaluation. *Academic Exchange Quarterly*, 1, 1-8.
- Enos, S., & Troppe, M. (1996). Service-learning in the curriculum. In B. Jacoby (Ed.), *Service-Learning in Higher Education: Concepts and Practices* (pp. 156-181). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Evans, N. J., Forney, D. S., & Guido-DiBrito, F. (1998). *Student development in college: Theory, research and practice*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Eyler, J., & Giles, D. E. Jr. (1999). *Where's the learning in service-learning?* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Feldner, S. (2006, April). Living our mission: A study of university mission building. *Communication Studies*, 57(1), 67-85. Retrieved August 10, 2009, from E-Journals database.
- Fowler, J. (2004, Fall). Faith development at 30: Naming the challenges of faith in a new millennium. *Religious Education*, 99(4), 405-421. Retrieved July 18, 2009, i:10.1080/00344080490513036

- Furco, A. (1996). Service-learning: A balanced approach to experiential education. *Expanding Boundaries: Service and Learning* (pp.2-6). Washington D.C.: Corporation for National Service.
- Furco, A. (2001). Advancing service-learning at research universities. *New Directions for Higher Education*, 114, 67-78. Retrieved July 27, 2009, from <http://web.ebscohost.com.ezproxy.augsburg.edu/ehost/pdf?vid=15&hid=105&sid=f38cdc>
- Furco, A. (2002). Self-assessment rubric for the institutionalization of service-learning in higher education. Berkeley, CA: University of California.
- Gugety, C. & Swezey, E. (1996). Developing campus-community relationships. In Barbara Jacoby & Assoc. (Eds.), *Service-Learning in Higher Education: Concepts and Practices* (pp. 92-108). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Heist, V., & Ebersole, R., (2006). Institutional use of spirituality data: What can we learn from the work of others?: Alvernia college: Assessing mission at a religious – based institution – challenges and response, *Spirituality in Higher Education Newsletter*, 2006, 2, 3-8, Retrieved August 3, 2009 from http://spirituality.ucla.edu/newsletter_new/past_issues_vol2.htm
- Higher Education Research Institute. (2004). The spiritual life of college students: A national study of students' search for meaning and purpose. Retrieved August 10, 2009 from <http://www.spirituality.ucla.edu/results/index.html>
- Holcomb, G., & Nonneman, A. (2004, July). Faithful change: Exploring and assessing faith development in Christian liberal arts undergraduates. *New Directions for Institutional Research*, 122, 93-103. Retrieved August 10, 2009 from E-Journals database.
- Holland, B. A. (1997, January 1). Analyzing institutional commitment to service: A model of key organizational factors. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 4, 30-41. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. EJ581996) Retrieved June 11, 2009, from ERIC database.
- Holland, B. A. (2004). Assessment strategies for higher education LSA programs [PowerPoint slides]. Retrieved from <http://www.foressay.net/en/default.asp?bul...xxx=PPT>
- Honnet, E. P., & Poulson, S. J. (1989). Principles of good practice for combining service and learning. (Wingspread Special Report). Racine, WI: The Johnson Foundation.
- Howard, J., (1998). Academic Service Learning: A Counternormative Pedagogy. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning*, 73, 21. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

- Jacoby, B. (1996). Service-learning in today's higher education. In Barbara Jacoby & Assoc. (Eds.), *Service-learning in higher education: Concepts and practices* (pp. 3-25). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Jacoby, B. & Associates. (1996). *Service-learning in higher education: Concepts and practices*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Julius, D., Baldrige, J., & Pfeffer, J., (1999, January 1). Determinants of administrative effectiveness: Why some academic leaders are more influential and effective than others. Professional File, 19. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED445619), Retrieved July 17, 2009, from ERIC database.
- Karayan, S., & Gathercoal, P. (2005). Assessing service-learning in teacher education. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 32(3), 79-92. Retrieved from Education Research Complete database.
- Kellett, C. E., & Goldstein, A. E. (1999). Transformation in the university and the community: The benefits and barriers of collaboration. *Journal of Family and Consumer Sciences*, 91(2).
- Kolb, D. A. (1984). *Experiential learning: Experience as the source of learning and development*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Koth, K. (2003, January 1). Deepening the commitment to serve: Spiritual reflection in service-learning. *About Campus*, 7(6), 2-7. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. EJ662304) Retrieved August 9, 2009 from ERIC database.
- Koth, K. (2005, January). Fostering a long-term commitment to service: The role of campus religious leaders in service-learning, *Spirituality in Higher Education*, 2(1), 1-7, Retrieved August 9, 2009 from <http://spirituality.ucla.edu/publications/newsletters>
- Kotter, J. (1995, March). Leading change: Why transformation efforts fail. *Harvard Business Review*, 73(2), 59-67. Retrieved July 20, 2009, from Business Source Complete database.
- Kotter, J., & Schlesinger, L. (2008, July). Choosing strategies for change. *Harvard Business Review*, 86(7/8), 130-139. Retrieved July 20, 2009, from Business Source Complete database.
- Kuh, G. D., Douglas, K. B., Lund, J. P., & Ramin-Gyurnek, J. (1994). Student learning outside the classroom: Transcending artificial boundaries. *ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report*, 8, Washington, D.C.
- Larson, C. E., & LaFasto, F. M. (1989). *Team work: What must go right / what can go wrong*. Newbury Park: SAGE Publications, Inc.
- Lewin, K. (1964). *Field theory in the social science*. New York: Harper Collins

- Lewis, J. P. (2002). *Fundamentals of project management: Developing core competencies to help outperform the competition*. New York: AMACOM
- Lindholm, J. (2007, September 1). *Spirituality in the academy: Reintegrating our lives and the lives of our students*. *About Campus*, 12(4), 10-17. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. EJ791404) Retrieved August 10, 2009 from ERIC database.
- Lovett, C., Mundhenk, R., Shulock, N., Reed, C., Rust Jr., E., Layzell, T., et al. (2004, September 3). *How can colleges prove they're doing their jobs?*. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, 51(2), B6-B10. Retrieved July 28, 2009, from Academic Search Premier database.
- Mader, D. C. (1995, November). *The purpose and challenge of assessment: Organizing assessment to improve student learning and maintain faculty ownership of the process*. Paper presented at the speech communication association annual convention, San Antonio, TX.
- Mahin, L., & Kruggel, T. G. (2006, September). *Communication facilitation and assessment of student learning in business*. *Business Communication Quarterly*, 69(3), 323-327. Retrieved June 16, 2009, from Business Source Premier database.
- Meehan, C. (2002, March). *Promoting spiritual development in the curriculum*. *Pastoral Care in Education*, 20(1), 16. Retrieved August 6, 2009 from Academic Search Complete database.
- Mintz, D., & Hesser, G. (1996). *Principles of good practice in service-learning*. In Barbara Jacoby & Assoc. (Eds.), *Service-Learning in Higher Education: Concepts and Practices* (pp. 26-52). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Morphew, C., & Hartley, M. (2006, May). *Mission statements: A thematic analysis of rhetoric across institutional type*. *Journal of Higher Education*, 77(3), 456-471. Retrieved August 10, 2009, from Professional Development Collection database.
- Morris, J., Beck, R., & Smith, A. (2004, October). *Examining student/institution fit at a Christian university: The role of spiritual integration*. *Journal of Education & Christian Belief*, 8(2), 87-100. Retrieved August 8, 2009 from Academic Search Complete database.
- Morris, J., Smith, A., & Cejda, B. (2003, December). *Spiritual integration as a predictor of persistence at a Christian institution of higher education*. *Christian Higher Education*, 2(4), 341. Retrieved August 8, 2009, from Academic Search Complete database.
- Morton, K., & Troppe, M. (1996, January). *From the margin to the mainstream: Campus compact's project on integrating service with academic study*. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 15(1), 21-32. Retrieved July 22, 2009, from Business Source Complete database.

- O'Byrne, K. (2001). How professors can promote service-learning in a teaching institution. *New Directions for Higher Education*, 114, 79-87. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Oates, K., & Leavitt, L. (2003). *Service-learning and learning communities: Tools for integration and assessment*. Association of American Colleges and Universities, Washington, DC.
- O'Meara, K., & Braskamp, L. (2005, December 1). Aligning faculty reward systems and development to promote faculty and student growth. *NASPA Journal*, 42(2), 223-240. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. EJ746589) Retrieved July 22, 2009, from ERIC database.
- Parks, S. (2000). *Big questions, worthy dreams: Mentoring young adults in their search for meaning, purpose, and faith*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Pashiardis, P. (1996, May). Towards effectiveness: Campus climate at the university of cyprus. Paper presented at the Annual Forum of the Association for Institutional Research, Albuquerque, New Mexico.
- Pfeffer, J. (1977). The ambiguity of leadership. *Academy of Management Review*, 2(1), 104-112. Retrieved from Business Source Complete database.
- Robinson, G. (2000). *Creating sustainable service learning programs: Lessons learned from the Horizons Project, 1997-2000*. American Association of Community Colleges, Annapolis Junction: Community College Press.
- Rubin, S. (1996). Institutionalizing service-learning. In Barbara Jacoby & Assoc. (Eds.), *Service-learning in higher education: Concepts and practices* (pp. 297-316). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Schaffer, R. (2004, April). Service-learning in Christian higher education: Bringing our mission to life. *Christian Higher Education*, 3(2), 127-145. Retrieved June 18, 2009, from Academic Search Complete database.
- Schein, E. H. (1985). *Organizational culture and leadership*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Schneider, M. K. (1998/9, June). Models of good practice for service-learning programs. *AAHE Bulletin*, 9-12. Retrieved on June 28, 2009, from <http://www.aahea.org/bulletins/articles/schneider.pdf>
- Schreiner, L. (2000). FIPSE - Through the eyes of retention, 10-12. Retrieved August 3, 2009 from http://www.cccu.org/professional_development/resource_library
- Schwartzman, R., & Phelps, G. A. (2001, November). "In loco communitas": Service-learning and the liberal arts. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the National Communication Association, Atlanta, GA.

- Seider, S. (2007). Frame-changing experiences and the freshman year: Catalyzing a commitment to service-work and social action. *Journal of College and Character*, 8(2), 1-18. Retrieved August 2, 2009 from <http://www.collegevalues.org/pdfs/Frame.pdf>
- Shumer, R. (1997). Standards and indicators for effective service-learning practice. Retrieved on June 11, 2009, from <http://www.servicelearning.org/page/index.php?detailed=278>
- Sigmon, R. L. (1979, Spring). Service-learning: Three principles. *Synergist*. National Center for Service-Learning, 8(1).
- Soukup, P. A. (1999). Proceedings from annual meeting '99: The National Communication Association. Chicago, IL: ERIC.
- Stark, J. S., & Lattuca, L. R. (1997). *Shaping the college curriculum: Academic plans in action*. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Strange, C. C., & Banning, J. H. (2001). *Educating by design: Creating campus learning environments that work*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.
- Troppe, M. (Ed.). (1995). *Connecting cognition and action: Evaluation of student performance in service-learning courses*. Providence, R.I.: Campus Compact.
- Tsui, L. (2000, Summer). Effects of campus culture on students' critical thinking. *The Review of Higher Education*, 23, 421-441. Retrieved July 02, 2009, from Academic Search Premier database.
- Ward, K. (1998, Spring). Addressing academic culture: Service learning, organizations, and faculty work. *New Directions in Teaching and Learning*, 73, 73-80. Retrieved July 23, 2009, from Academic Search Premier database.
- Ward, K., & Vernon, A. (1999). Community perspectives on student volunteerism and service learning. ASHE Annual Meeting Paper.
- Weigert, K.M. (1998). Academic service learning: Its meaning and relevance. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning*, 73, 3. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Westbrook, R. B. (1991). *John Dewey and American Democracy*. Ithica, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1991.
- Wilhite, S., & Silver, P. (2005, July). A false dichotomy for higher education: Educating citizens vs. educating technicians. *National Civic Review*, 94(2), 46-54. Retrieved August 14, 2009, from E-Journals database.

Woodrow, J. (2006, October). Institutional mission: the soul of Christian higher education. *Christian Higher Education*, 5(4), 313-327. Retrieved August 10, 2009, doi:10.1080/15363750600860778

Young, C., Shinnar, R., Ackerman, R., Carruthers, C., & Young, D. (2007, March). Implementing and sustaining service-learning at the institutional level. *Journal of Experiential Education*, 29(3), 344-365. Retrieved July 31, 2009, from Academic Search Complete database.

Zlotkowski, E. (2001, Summer). Humanistic learning and service-learning at the liberal arts college. *New Directions for Higher Education*, Retrieved July 28, 2009 from Academic Search Premier database.

Zlotkowski, E. (1995). Does service-learning have a future? *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 2, 123-133.

Appendix A: Data Collection Tool
Data Collection Tool

Instructions

- A. Please locate and provide the evaluator(s) with evidence to support each indicator.
- B. The evidence can be a document, a policy statement, or other specific tangible form that verifies the indicator.
- C. Briefly describe the evidence for each indicator in the space provided to the right of the indicator. (see example below)
- D. Submit a copy of all evidence found with the Data Collection Tool for the evaluator(s).
- E. If no evidence is found, simply circle the appropriate box to the right of the indicator. (see example below)
- F. Blocking – In some situations, the institution may have policies or practices that prohibit or embed the service-learning efforts. Please make a note of any “blocking” situations that are discovered during the investigation of the institutions service-learning program.

For example:

A. University Administration Involvement		
<p>1. President Is there evidence that the President supports and encourages service-learning? <i>(Public speeches, statements in university publications, etc.)</i></p>	<p><i>No evidence found</i></p>	<p>Description Of Document Or Policy</p>
	<p><i>The university President stressed the importance of service-learning in the 2006 Fall edition of the "Accent". This is a quarterly publication sent to alumni. A copy of the article is attached..</i></p>	
<p>2. Chief Academic Officer Is there evidence that the chief academic officer supports and encourages service-learning? <i>(Public speeches, statements in university publications, etc.)</i></p>	<p><i>No evidence found</i></p>	<p>Description Of Document Or Policy</p>

Appendix A: Data Collection Tool (Continued)

- Standard #1: Administration Involvement and Support**
A. Institutional Mission
B. Administration Involvement
C. Organizational Structure and Support
- Standard #2: Organizational Culture and Climate**
A. Reinforcement of the University Mission & Vision
B. Celebration and Recognition
C. Visibility and Organizational Significance of Service-Learning
- Standard #3: Stakeholder Development and Involvement**
A. All Stakeholders (Campus Community and Community Organizations)
B. Faculty
C. Students
D. Community Partners
- Standard #4: Academic Integration**
A. Campus-wide Program Integration
B. Course Level Integration
- Standard #5: Faith Integration & Development**
A. Administration and Faith Development – Faith Development
B. Organizational Culture and Climate – Faith Development
C. Stakeholders – Faith Development
D. Academic Integration – Faith Development
E. Program Assessment and Development – Faith Development
- Standard #6: Program Assessment & Development**
A. Assessment of Service-Learning
B. Leadership
C. Support Functions

Appendix A: Data Collection Tool (Continued)

Standard #1: Administration Involvement and Support

Effective programs must receive administrative support, become line items in the organization's budget, be allocated appropriate physical space, equipment, and transportation, and allow for scheduled release time for participants and program leaders.

Wingspread Principles of Good Practice For Combining Service and Learning

A. Institutional Mission		
1. Institutional Purpose Is there evidence that the institutional mission and vision statements state that service is a fundamental concern of the university?	<i>No evidence found</i>	Description of document or policy
2. Long-Range Planning Is there evidence that service-learning is embedded in the school's long-range planning and strategic initiatives?	<i>No evidence found</i>	Description of document or policy
3. Other Is there additional evidence that the university has a strong connection between their mission statement and their service-learning program?	<i>No evidence found</i>	Description of document or policy
B. Administration Involvement		
1. President Is there evidence that the President supports and encourages service-learning? Is there evidence that the President supports the service-learning program without appearing to control the program? (Public speeches, statements in university publications, etc.)	<i>No evidence found</i>	Description of document or policy
2. Leadership Understands Service-Learning Is there evidence that the university leadership has an accurate understanding of service-learning? Does the administration understand the difference between community service and service-learning? Does the administration understand the difference between mission trips and service-learning?	<i>No evidence found</i>	Description of document or policy
3. Organizational Change If the university is in the early stages of implementing institutionalizing service-learning, is there evidence that initial steps are consistent with the requirements for significant organizational change. <i>(Strong coalition, communication, celebrate small wins, remove obstacles, etc.)</i>	<i>No evidence found</i>	Description of document or policy
4. Membership Is the university a member of service-learning organizations such as Campus Compact?	<i>No evidence found</i>	Description of document or policy

Appendix A: Data Collection Tool (Continued)

B. Administration Involvement (continued)		
<p>5. Chief Academic Officer Is there evidence that the chief academic officer supports and encourages service-learning? <i>(Public speeches, statements in university publications, etc.)</i></p>	<i>No evidence found</i>	Description of document or policy
<p>6. Deans & Department Heads Is there evidence that service-learning has the support and encouragement of the administrators of the various schools or divisions within the university?</p>	<i>No evidence found</i>	Description of document or policy
<p>7. Institutional Advancement Is there evidence that efforts are made to gain funding (grants and other donations) to support service-learning?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Endowed leadership and staff positions ▪ Funding service-learning projects ▪ Funding for facilities and equipment ▪ Other service-learning needs (training and development, conferences and professional organizations, etc) 	<i>No evidence found</i>	Description of document or policy
<p>8. Information Technology Is there evidence that efforts are made to utilize technology to increase the effectiveness and efficiency of service-learning programs and processes? <i>(Information on community organizations, standard forms, best practices, etc.)</i></p>	<i>No evidence found</i>	Description of document or policy
<p>9. Campus Ministries Is there evidence that the office of Campus Ministries is actively engaged in service-learning?</p>	<i>No evidence found</i>	Description of document or policy
<p>10. Other Departments Is there evidence that service-learning is embraced and supported by other areas on the campus? <i>(Student Development, Athletics, Registrar, Career Center, etc.)</i></p>	<i>No evidence found</i>	Description of document or policy
<p>11. Community Organizations Is there evidence that administrators are involved with community partner organizations? <i>(Serving on the board, volunteering, consulting, etc.)</i></p>	<i>No evidence found</i>	Description of document or policy
<p>12. Other Is there additional evidence of involvement and support from the university administration?</p>	<i>No evidence found</i>	Description of document or policy

Appendix A: Data Collection Tool (Continued)

C. Organizational Structure and Support		
1. Director of Service-Learning Does the university have a Director of Service-Learning to provide leadership and support for service-learning? If the institution does have a Director of Service-Learning, what portion of their load is dedicated to service-learning versus teaching or other campus responsibilities?	<i>No evidence found</i>	Description of document or policy
2. Physical Space & Office Support Does the university have a "Center for Service-Learning" or other form of physical space on campus? Does the university provide support staff and supplies for service-learning activities?	<i>No evidence found</i>	Description of document or policy
3. Location of the Center for Service-Learning Is the office physical space for the Center for Service-Learning in a significant and influential position on campus?	<i>No evidence found</i>	Description of document or policy
4. Vehicles & Transportation Expenses Is there evidence that the university provides vehicles that are dedicated and/or readily available for service-learning? Is there evidence that the university provides funds to cover renting transportation for service-learning if needed?	<i>No evidence found</i>	Description of document or policy
5. Risk Management and Liability Protection Policies (legal) In an effort to manage exposure to litigation, many institutions establish policies regarding student activities. Is there evidence that the institution's policies encourage service-learning activities while protecting the institution?	<i>No evidence found</i>	Description of document or policy
6. Outside Experts Is there evidence that the university utilizes outside experts of service-learning for consulting or training?	<i>No evidence found</i>	Description of document or policy
7. Conferences & Professional Organizations Is there evidence that the university provides funding for attending service-learning conferences?	<i>No evidence found</i>	Description of document or policy
8. Other Is there additional evidence of budget support?	<i>No evidence found</i>	Description of document or policy

Appendix A: Data Collection Tool (Continued)

Standard #2: Organizational Culture and Climate

In partnership, sponsoring and receiving organizations should recognize the value of service through appropriate celebrations, awards, and public acknowledgement of individual and group service.

Wingspread Principles of Good Practice For Combining Service and Learning

A. Reinforcement Of The University Mission and Vision		
1. Mission & Vision Is there evidence that the university refers back to the mission and vision statements when making decisions regarding the decisions about organizational policy?	No evidence found	Description of document or policy
2. Institutional Symbols and Artifacts Is there evidence that the university uses symbols and artifacts on campus to reinforce the institution's commitment to service and justice through the practice of service-learning? <i>(mottos, creeds, quotes, scripture highlighting service, statues, pictures, plaques, etc.)</i>	No evidence found	Description of document or policy
3. Institutional Example Is there evidence that the institution supports encourages, and promotes civic responsibility and community engagement in forms additional to service-learning? <i>(Volunteer efforts, philanthropic activities, United Way, Christmas in October, responding to natural disasters, etc.)</i>	No evidence found	Description of document or policy
4. Media Communications Does the institution feature service and service-learning in its public relations tools? <i>(web page, recruitment brochures, alumni publications, news releases, etc.)</i>	No evidence found	Description of document or policy
5. Other Is there additional evidence of reinforcement of the University mission and vision?	No evidence found	Description of document or policy
B. Celebration and Recognition		
1. Students Does the university celebrate and recognize the service-learning efforts of students? <i>(Recognition events, student newspaper, campus email announcements, awards, scholarships, degrees, certificates, transcripts, etc.)</i>	No evidence found	Description of document or policy

Appendix A: Data Collection Tool (Continued)

B. Celebration and Recognition (continued)		
2. Faculty & Staff Does the university celebrate, recognize, and reward the service-learning efforts of faculty and staff? Is there evidence that service-learning is included in the evaluation of faculty and staff for tenure, rank and promotion decisions? (Recognition events, student newspaper, campus email announcements, awards, sabbaticals, load reduction, financial incentives, etc.)	No evidence found	Description of document or policy
3. Administration Does the university celebrate and recognize the service-learning efforts of administration? (Recognition events, student newspaper, campus email announcements, awards, sabbaticals, load reduction, financial incentives, etc.)	No evidence found	Description of document or policy
4. Community Partners Does the university celebrate and recognize the service-learning efforts and accomplishments of community partner organizations? (Recognition events, public acknowledgements, student newspaper, campus email announcements, awards, etc.)	No evidence found	Description of document or policy
5. Institution Is there evidence that the institution has been recognized for their service-learning efforts at the local, state or federal level?	No evidence found	Description of document or policy
6. Other Is there additional evidence that the institution celebrates and recognizes service-learning?	No evidence found	Description of document or policy
C. Visibility and Organizational Significance of Service-Learning		
1. Internal and External Boards Is there evidence that the Director of Service-Learning serves on key internal or external boards so that he/she can represent the interests of service-learning on campus?	No evidence found	Description of document or policy
2. Service-Learning Presentations Is there evidence that students and staff have been encouraged to give reports on their service-learning experiences to groups on the campus? (Board of Trustees, university administrators, student groups, etc.)	No evidence found	Description of document or policy
3. Leadership and Accountability Is there an individual who is responsible for the efforts and results of the campus service-learning programs?	No evidence found	Description of document or policy
4. Other Is there additional evidence that service-learning is visible and significant in the organization?	No evidence found	Description of document or policy

Appendix A: Data Collection Tool (Continued)

Standard #3: Stakeholder Development and Involvement

An effective program includes training, supervision, monitoring, support, recognition, and evaluation to meet service and learning goals. The most effective service and learning programs are sensitive to the importance of training, supervision, and monitoring of progress throughout the program.

Wingspread Principles of Good Practice For Combining Service and Learning

A. All Stakeholders (Campus Community and Community Organizations)		
<p>1. Understanding Service-Learning Are workshops and activities provided for the campus community (administration, faculty, staff, and students) and community partners that examine and discuss the philosophy behind the institution's commitment to service-learning? Does the university provide workshops that cover the fundamental concepts of service-learning? Are the workshops required or optional? <i>(Definition of service-learning, reflection, legal and safety issues, diversity, etc.)</i></p>		
<p>2. Understanding the Poor and Disadvantaged Does the university provide workshops designed to understand the poor and disadvantaged. This includes an understanding of general issues and issues as well as issues relating to the specific issues found in the community that surrounds the university. Are the workshops required or optional? <i>(Economics, lifestyle, culture, history, purpose, values, etc.)</i></p>	No evidence found	Description of document or policy
<p>3. Other Is there additional evidence of support that affects all stakeholders?</p>	No evidence found	Description of document or policy
B. Faculty		
<p>1. Faculty Workshops and Training - Pedagogy Are workshops and training activities provided for faculty covering the unique pedagogy involved in service-learning? Are the workshops required or optional? <i>(Critical reflection, spiritual integration, spiritual formation, developing a world-view, diversity, etc.)</i></p>	No evidence found	Description of document or policy
<p>2. Faculty Workshops and Training - Logistics Are workshops and training activities provided for faculty covering the logistical issues involved in service-learning? Are the workshops required or optional? <i>(Legal and safety issues, transportation, grading, accountability, feedback, relationships with community organizations, etc.)</i></p>	No evidence found	Description of document or policy

Appendix A: Data Collection Tool (Continued)

B. Faculty (continued)		
<p>3. Faculty Mentors Is faculty involvement increased through mentoring relationships with others who have had experience in service-learning?</p>	No evidence found	Description of document or policy
<p>4. Faculty Resource Material Does the university provide copies of resource material to assist faculty with their service-learning efforts? Does the institution provide this material in both a hard copy format and a digital format (web accessible)? <i>(Legal and safety issues, transportation, grading, accountability, feedback, relationships with community organizations, etc.)</i></p>	No evidence found	Description of document or policy
<p>5. Scholarship & Service-Learning Members of the faculty are involved in the scholarship of service-learning through presentations and formal publications by service-learning faculty members.</p>	No evidence found	Description of document or policy
<p>6. Other Faculty Support and Involvement Is there additional evidence of institutional support and encouragement for faculty in their service-learning efforts?</p>	No evidence found	Description of document or policy
C. Students		
<p>1. Meaningful Service-Learning Projects Are the students involved with service-learning projects that are meaningful and have real impact?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Reciprocal benefit to all stakeholders Service-learning projects are consistent with the institution's spiritual and faith development goals. ▪ Measurable changes for the community partner and students 	No evidence found	Description of document or policy
<p>2. Student Involvement Are the students more than just workers are; are they also involved in planning the service-learning programming and course projects?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Students serve on advisory boards for the service-learning program ▪ Faculty include students in planning service-learning projects 	No evidence found	Description of document or policy
<p>3. Student Workshops and Seminars Are student workshops, seminars, training and activities provided covering a variety of service-learning topics for awareness (diversity, differences, reflection, spiritual integration, and legal and safety issues).</p>	No evidence found	Description of document or policy

Appendix A: Data Collection Tool (Continued)

C. Students (continued)		
4. Student Surveys Are the students given the opportunity to give feedback regarding their involvement and development in service-learning? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Activities ▪ Attitudes and beliefs 	No evidence found	Description of document or policy
5. Other Student Support and Involvement Is there additional evidence of institutional support and encouragement for students in their service-learning efforts?	No evidence found	Description of document or policy
D. Community Partners		
1. Community Partner Relationships Does the Director of Service-Learning develop and maintain strong connections with community partners. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Community Partners fairs on campus ▪ Community Partner banquet ▪ Speaking engagements in a variety of courses ▪ Assist faculty in finding service opportunities that connect well with various courses? 	No evidence found	Description of document or policy
2. Advice and Direction From Community Partners Are community partners involved in designing the campus service-learning program? Community partners serve on the Service-Learning Advisory Board Do community partners have an ongoing voice in the campus service-learning program?	No evidence found	Description of document or policy
3. Community Partner Training Does the university provide initial orientation and ongoing workshops for community partner organizations that address fundamental concepts of service-learning as well as specific areas concerning the responsibilities of the community partners? <i>(Legal and safety issues, expectations, university calendar, accountability, feedback, evaluations, relationships with faculty and students, etc.)</i>	No evidence found	Description of document or policy
4. Community Partner Mentors Is there an increase in community involvement through mentoring relationships with organizations that have had experience in service-learning?	No evidence found	Description of document or policy
5. Other Community Involvement & Support Is there additional evidence of institutional support and encouragement for community partners in their service-learning efforts?	No evidence found	Description of document or policy

Appendix A: Data Collection Tool (Continued)

Standard #4: Academic Integration

In schools, the most effective service and learning programs are linked to the curriculum and require that the faculty become committed to combining service and learning as a valid part of teaching.

Wingspread Principles of Good Practice For Combining Service and Learning

A. Campus-Wide Program Integration		
<p>1. University Academic Catalog Does the catalog discuss the institution's commitment to service-learning and make the connection between service-learning and the institutional mission and vision?</p>	No evidence found	Description of document or policy
<p>2. Program and Major Descriptions Do academic programs and majors highlight their commitment to service-learning (when applicable) in their descriptions found in the school catalog and on the institution's website?</p>	No evidence found	Description of document or policy
<p>3. Academic Validity For the majority of service-learning related courses, is there evidence that there is a direct connection between service-learning projects and the learning objectives for the course or related discipline?</p>	No evidence found	Description of document or policy
<p>4. Academic Recognition Is there evidence that service-learning is documented on the student's transcript? Is there a service-learning certificate option, scholarships, honors programs, or service-learning minors.</p>	No evidence found	Description of document or policy
<p>5. Forms of Service To what degree are students exposed to a variety of service formats throughout their experience at the university?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Community Service ▪ Service-learning as a component of a course (4th credit option) ▪ Service-learning as a course (Capstone course, Internship, Clinical Course) 	No evidence found	Description of document or policy
<p>6. Handbooks Are service-learning handbooks and/or instructional materials provided to assist faculty and students with the structure of the service-learning experience?</p>	No evidence found	Description of document or policy
<p>7. Reporting Structure Does the person responsible for the university's service-learning efforts report directly to the chief academic officer of the institution?</p>	No evidence found	Description of document or policy

Appendix A: Data Collection Tool (Continued)

A. Campus-Wide Program Integration (continued)		
8. Other Is there additional evidence of campus-wide program integration?	No evidence found	Description of document or policy
B. Course-Level Integration When answering the following three indicators, information reported should be based on a <u>majority</u> of the service-learning courses offered.		
1. Course Materials Do syllabi and other course materials (handouts, brochures) provide students with a basic understanding of service-learning as well as clear connection between the service-learning project and the course content (when applicable)?	No evidence found	Description of document or policy
2. Assignments Are reflection assignments (written, oral presentations, journals) related to experience and course contents, goals and objectives? Does reflection and discussion involves a faith perspective with a holistic approach consistent with the institution's mission?	No evidence found	Description of document or policy
3. Course Outcomes Does the course measure changes in knowledge, ideals, opinions, feelings and behaviors from the experience?	No evidence found	Description of document or policy
4. Other Is there additional evidence of course-level integration?	No evidence found	Description of document or policy

Appendix A: Data Collection Tool (Continued)

Standard #5: Faith Integration and Focus

A. Administration and Faith Development		
1. Mission Fit Has the institution clearly defined what "faith development" means at their institution?	No evidence found	Description of document or policy
2. Faith: Connection with Mission & Vision Is there evidence that the university refers back to the faith component within the institution's mission and vision statements.	No evidence found	Description of document or policy
3. Service-Learning Program Vision Is there evidence that the service-learning program's vision is consistent with the institution's faith statement?	No evidence found	Description of document or policy
4. Faith: Media Communications Does the institution feature its faith perspective in their service-learning public relations tools? <i>(Web page, catalog, recruitment brochures, alumni publications, news releases, etc.)</i>	No evidence found	Description of document or policy
5. Faith: Internal Communications Does the institution feature its faith perspective in their service-learning announcements to the campus community? <i>(Student newspaper, campus, catalog, course materials, emails announcements, chapel announcements, bulletin boards, handbooks, etc.)</i>	No evidence found	Description of document or policy
6. Faculty and Staff Hiring Practices Are efforts made to recruit and hire faculty who embrace faith development in their own life? Are efforts made to recruit faculty who understand and embrace their role in student faith development?	No evidence found	Description of document or policy
7. Student Recruiting Does the university communicate its focus on faith development in its student recruiting materials? Is that message consistent with how they have defined faith development?	No evidence found	Description of document or policy
8. Office of Campus Ministries (Religious Life) Does the Director of Campus Ministries work closely with the Director of Service-Learning to assist in the process of integration faith development into the service-learning program?	No evidence found	Description of document or policy
9. Other Is there other evidence that the campus administration supports the faith development of the students?	No evidence found	Description of document or policy

Appendix A: Data Collection Tool (Continued)

B. Organizational Culture and Climate – Faith Development		
<p>1. Safe Place Is there evidence that students are encouraged to explore their “big questions” in a safe environment? ■ Identity: Who am I? ■ Destiny or calling: Where am I going? ■ Personal faith: What can I believe in? ■ Wholeness: How can I be happy? ■ Mattering: Will my life make a difference?</p>	No evidence found	Description of document or policy
<p>2. Growth Not Just a “Private Matter” Is there evidence that the faculty and staff talk with students about the “big questions” and their faith journey? <i>(in the classroom, student advising sessions, over lunch, etc.)</i></p>	No evidence found	Description of document or policy
<p>3. Faith: Institutional Symbols and Artifacts Is there evidence that the university’s symbols and artifacts on campus include examples that reinforce the institution’s faith perspective? <i>(mottos, creeds, quotes, quotes, scripture highlighting service, statues, pictures, plaques, etc.)</i></p>	No evidence found	Description of document or policy
<p>4. Other Is there other evidence that the campus culture and climate is supportive of faith development?</p>	No evidence found	Description of document or policy
C. Stakeholders – Faith Development		
<p>1. Faith: Faculty and Staff Development Does the faculty development program help faculty in their efforts to assist students with the “big questions”? Is there evidence that the institution provides opportunities for the development of the personal faith journey for both faculty and staff?</p>	No evidence found	Description of document or policy
<p>2. Faith: Student Development Is there evidence that students are provided with development and training opportunities to understand and explore their “big questions”?</p>	No evidence found	Description of document or policy
<p>3. Faith: Training & Development of Stakeholders Program Orientation: Are workshops and activities provided for the campus community (administration, faculty, staff, and students) and community partners that examine and discuss the theology and scriptural support behind a life of service? Are the workshops required or optional? <i>(Foundation in scripture, social justice, diversity, etc.)</i></p>	No evidence found	Description of document or policy

Appendix A: Data Collection Tool (Continued)

C. Stakeholders – Faith Development (continued)		
4. Other Is there other evidence that the institution provides opportunities to the stakeholders for faith development?	No evidence found	Description of document or policy
D. Academic – Faith Development		
1. Big Questions Is there evidence that the “big questions” are incorporated in the service-learning projects and in the related reflections assignments?	No evidence found	Description of document or policy
2. Other Is there other evidence that the institution incorporates faith development in their service-learning program?	No evidence found	Description of document or policy
E. Assessment – Faith Development		
1. Assessment Process Is there evidence that the institution's formal assessment process collects data on a variety of aspects of faith integration in the service-learning program?	No evidence found	Description of document or policy
2. Other Is there other evidence that the institution assesses faith as it relates to service-learning?	No evidence found	Description of document or policy

Appendix A: Data Collection Tool (Continued)

Standard #6: Program Assessment & Development

Planned, formalized, and ongoing evaluation of service and learning projects should be part of every program and should involve all participants.

Wingspread Principles of Good Practice For Combining Service and Learning

A. Assessment of Service-learning		
<p>1. Definition & Purpose Is there evidence that the institution has established a specific definition and purpose of service-learning?</p>	No evidence found	Description of document or policy
<p>2. Data Collection Is there evidence that the institution collects data on a variety of aspects of service-learning at the institution? <i>(Level of student involvement, level of faculty involvement, number of projects completed, impact of projects on the community, impact of service-learning on students, etc.)</i></p>	No evidence found	Description of document or policy
<p>3. Assessment Process Is there evidence that service-learning is included in the institution's formal assessment process through the office of institutional research? This helps to assure alignment to outcomes and goals set forth for the program and the institution. <i>(HLC, Outcomes assessment, NCATE, educational trends, stakeholders, faith integration, etc.)</i></p>	No evidence found	Description of document or policy
<p>4. Improvement Is there evidence that the institution has actively used the information from the assessment process to encourage program development and growth? <i>(feedback loop)</i></p>	No evidence found	Description of document or policy
<p>5. Other Is there other evidence that the institution assesses faith as it relates to service-learning?</p>	No evidence found	Description of document or policy
B. Leadership		
<p>1. Director of Service-Learning Is there an individual who is responsible for the efforts and results of the campus service-learning efforts?</p>	No evidence found	Description of document or policy
<p>2. Advisory Board Has the university established an action team or advisory board comprising of administrators, faculty, community partners, religious leaders, diversity officer, and students to oversee the university's service-learning efforts?</p>	No evidence found	Description of document or policy

Appendix A: Data Collection Tool (Continued)

B. Leadership (continued)		
3. Other Is there other evidence that the institution assesses faith as it relates to service-learning?	No evidence found	Description of document or policy
C. Support Functions		
1. Agency Directory Is there evidence that the university has developed an agency directory listing of community partners?	No evidence found	Description of document or policy
2. Center of Service-Learning Is there evidence that the faculty have utilized the services of the center for service-learning?	No evidence found	Description of document or policy
3. Other Is there other evidence that the institution assesses faith as it relates to service-learning?	No evidence found	Description of document or policy

Appendix B: Expert Panel List

John Eby, Ph.D.
Former Director of Agape Center / Service-Learning
Messiah College
One College Ave. Grantham, PA 17027
jeby@messiah.edu

Regan Schaffer, Ed.D.
Pepperdine University
24255 Pacific Coast Hwy. Malibu, CA 90263
Regan.schaffer@pepperdine.edu

Judy Hutchinson, Ph.D.
Azusa Pacific University
901 E. Alosta Ave. Azusa, CA 91702-7000
jhutchinson@apu.edu

Marcia Shideler
Assoc. Prof. / Service-Learning Program Facilitator
Johnson County Community College
COM 200, 12345 College Blvd., OP, KS 66210-1299
shideler@jccc.edu

Ed Zlotkowski, Ph.D.
Founding Director of Service-Learning Program
Bentley College, English Department
175 Forest St., Waltham, MA 02452
ezlotkowski@bentley.edu

Kent Koth, MA.
Director for Service and Community Engagement
Seattle University
901 12th Ave. P.O. Box 222000 Seattle, WA 98122-1090
kothk@seattleu.edu

Chad Frey
Director of Agape Center / Service-Learning
Messiah College
One College Ave. Grantham, PA 17027
cfrey@messiah.edu

Appendix C: *Strengths and Weaknesses of the Evaluation Tool Documents*

Strengths	Weaknesses
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Great guide for self-assessment ▪ Community partner impact and involvement ▪ Administration support section ▪ The blocking measurement on the rubric ▪ The concepts are strong and supported by literature ▪ The tangible evidence of information ▪ Indicators are thorough ▪ This work is very important to the improvement of faith-based colleges service-learning programs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Weak in outcomes assessment ▪ More faith perspectives and distinction ▪ Questions could be more clear ▪ More training assessment

Appendix D: *Suggestions on the Evaluation Tool Documents and its Implementation Process*

Suggestions
<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Clearly define and establish criteria for what you mean by service-learning.▪ Measure and assess community partners becoming stronger or more independent.▪ Make sure it has a holistic approach to include social justice, reconciliation, and care.▪ Help colleges reflect on their philosophy of service and the theology that forms service-learning.▪ Feature service-learning on campus web page, news releases and all publications.▪ Does faculty relate scholarship to issues identified by community agencies and do they do community based research?▪ Faith integration and perspectives should be a highlighted with more emphasis.▪ Ask for evidence rather than policy or documents for the indicators.▪ Ask if service-learning pedagogy is recognized for rank, tenure and promotion.▪ Add scholarship/research as a critical training and development area.▪ Office of Information Technology can significantly contribute or hinder service-learning efficiency and effective systems.▪ Do they provide opportunities for faculty, students, and community partners to meet and share information and opportunities?▪ Inquire about the placement in the organizational structure and financial support of the service-learning program.▪ Community partner training is critical to success of service-learning programming.▪ Is this a self-assessment or external analysis?▪ Ask if service-learning appears on academic transcripts▪ Is there evidence that the risk management/insurance and college legal counsel are familiar with and encourage student engagement.▪ Explore the campus climate in more depth-examining specifically artifacts from student culture, student government▪ Ask if colleges offer “pure” service-learning courses that are designed to explore service and mission content through service-learning pedagogy.▪ Does the service-learning program go through a regular comprehensive review as a part of accreditation?