



## Statewide Capacity Assessment Project Summary (2007-2008 Data)

RaeLyn Axlund, M.Ed.

Tegan Callahan

February 2009

Washington Campus Compact  
c/o Western Washington University  
516 High Street, MS 5291  
Bellingham, WA 98225-5996

**Please use the following citation when referencing any data and/or information found in this report:**

Axlund, R., & Callahan, T. (2009). *Washington Campus Compact Statewide Capacity Assessment Project Summary (2007-2008 Data)*. Bellingham, WA: Washington Campus Compact.



This work was supported by grant funds from the Corporation for National and Community Service. Any opinions or points of view expressed in this report do not necessarily reflect the official position of the Corporation.

## Project Description

---

Washington Campus Compact's (WACC) Statewide Capacity Assessment Project—funded by Learn and Serve America and launched during the 2007-2008 grant cycle—was guided by the following objectives:

- 1) to identify and clearly define key service-learning/community engagement data points;
- 2) to assess the capacity of each WACC member campus to collect service-learning/community engagement data;
- 3) to assess the needs of each WACC member campus in order to effectively collect service-learning/community engagement data (e.g., technology, training, partnerships);
- 4) to gauge the progress of each member campus's service-learning institutionalization efforts; and
- 5) to assess the needs of each WACC member campus in progressing along the institutionalization continuum (e.g., partnership-building, sustainability, marketing).

Data was collected via one-on-one interviews, a self-assessment rubric, and as part of Learn and Serve America grantee progress reports. The interviews with non-Learn and Serve America grantees were conducted by phone and focused on (a) identifying and defining key community engagement/service-learning data points, (b) assessing each campus's capacity to collect service-learning/community engagement data, and (c) assessing the data-collection needs of each member campus (see Appendix A to view the interview protocol). Alternatively, this data was collected from Learn and Serve America grantees as part of required year-end progress reporting and/or in-person interviews.

Each interviewee was encouraged to complete the Self-Assessment Rubric for the Institutionalization of Service-Learning (Furco, 1999) in order to (a) gauge each campus's progress toward institutionalizing service-learning and (b) assess the service-learning institutionalization needs of each member campus (see Appendix B to view the online version of the rubric that was designed for this study).

### Participating Campuses

All Washington Campus Compact member institutions and two Learn and Serve America grantees in Idaho were invited and encouraged to participate in the Statewide Capacity Assessment Project. The following 32 campuses participated in the data-collection capacity/needs portion of the project (via interviews and/or progress reports); all but six of these campuses also participated in the institutionalization status/needs portion of the project (via the online self-assessment rubric). Those who did not participate in this second portion of the project are marked with asterisks.

Antioch University Seattle  
Boise State University  
Cascadia Community College  
Central Washington University\*  
Clark College  
Edmonds Community College

Everett Community College  
Gonzaga University  
Grays Harbor College  
Heritage University\*  
Lake Washington Technical College  
Lewis-Clark State College

Olympic College  
Saint Martin's University  
Seattle Central Community College  
Seattle Pacific University  
Seattle University  
Shoreline Community College  
Skagit Valley College\*  
Spokane Community College  
Tacoma Community College\*  
The Evergreen State College

University of Washington  
University of Washington, Bothell\*  
University of Washington, Tacoma  
Walla Walla Community College  
Washington State University  
Washington State University, Spokane  
Washington State University, Vancouver  
Wenatchee Valley College  
Western Washington University\*  
Whitworth University

Representatives of Eastern Washington University, Northwest Indian College, and Spokane Falls Community College did not participate in the project and are therefore not included in this report.

This report will help inform the development of (a) statewide data-collection programs and support systems, (b) member training and education offerings, and (c) future grant proposals.

## Project Findings

---

### **Objective #1:**

#### **To identify and clearly define key service-learning/community engagement data points**

- There is great variety in each campus's level of defining (or not defining) service-learning indicators.
- A handful of campuses have definitions in place that set a strong criteria relation to service-learning.
- Several interviewees shared that common statewide definitions would *not* benefit them and expressed a concern that uniform/restrictive definitions may not fit unique programs.

Eight key service-learning/community engagement data points were identified by a subgroup of Washington Campus Compact's advisory committee in spring 2007. Interviews with campus representatives reviewed the eight key data points and asked for campus-wide definitions or general understandings of each.

#### **Key Data Point 1: Number of service-learning courses**

Four campus representatives provided solid definitions describing the nature of service-learning/community engagement on their campuses. Most campus representatives who were interviewed acknowledged that the term "service-learning" is used widely and in a variety of ways across their campuses. Many mentioned that there is a definition or shared understanding within a specific community on campus, but no overall, campus-wide definition exists. Some campus representatives also shared that each department uses "service-learning" in a unique way.

#### Examples of Specific Campus-Wide Definitions

Four campuses reported a specific definition for "service-learning" throughout our research: Central Washington University, Clark College, Seattle University, and Whitworth University. These definitions are available as public documents and are summarized below.

*Central Washington University* (<http://www.takeactioncwu.com/>)

Service-learning course criteria:

- The course utilizes academic knowledge to support the needs of the community.
- The course aligns with classroom objectives in a unique service opportunity.
- Service experiences are guided by a faculty member and encourage mentorship.
- The course initiates a relationship between students, their coursework, and the community.
- Course outcomes are directly tied to an out-of-classroom service commitment.

**Service-learning definition:**

Service-learning is a method of education under which students learn and develop through active participation in thoughtfully organized service experiences that meet actual community needs and that are coordinated in collaboration with school and community.

Service-learning is integrated into students' academic curriculum and provides students with opportunities to use newly acquired skills and knowledge to become active partners within their community. Service-learning enhances what is taught by extending student learning beyond the classroom and into the community. It helps foster the development of a sense of caring for others and the ability to understand others' perspectives which is particularly important for effective citizenship and lifelong learning.

**The components of service-learning include:**

- The service component is directly linked to the learning objectives in a course.
- The service project meets a community need and is organized with a community partner.
- Reflection/analysis is the assessment tool to measure students learning.

**Service-learning course criteria:**

- Students in the class provide a needed service to individuals, organizations, schools, or other entities in the community.
- The service experience relates to the subject matter of the course.
- Activities in the class provide a method or methods for students to think about what they learned through the service experience and how these experiences relate to the subject of the class.
- The course offers a method to assess the learning derived from the service. Credit is given for the learning and its relation to the course, not for the service alone.
- Service interactions in the community recognize the needs of service recipients, and offer an opportunity for recipients to be involved in the evaluation of the service.
- The service opportunities are aimed at the development of the civic education of students even though they may also be focused on career preparation.
- Knowledge from the discipline informs the service experiences with which the students are involved.
- The class offers a way to learn from other class members as well as from the instructor.
- Course options ensure that no student is required to participate in a service placement that creates a religious, political, and/or moral conflict for the student.

*Seattle University* (<http://www.seattleu.edu/csce/faculty/s-1/s-1.asp>)

Service-learning definition:

A credit-bearing educational experience in which students participate in an organized activity that meets community needs and reflect on the service activity in such a way as to gain further understanding of the course content and a broader appreciation of the discipline. Through this process of reciprocity, students further enhance their personal development and the leadership skills needed to work for social justice in our diverse world. (Adapted from Bringle & Hatcher, 1996)

*Whitworth University* (<http://www.whitworth.edu/academic/programs/servicelearning/index.htm>)

Service-learning definition:

Service-learning is a teaching approach integrating academic instruction with community service that engages students in civic responsibility, critical and creative thinking, and structured reflection.

Service-learning course criteria:

- Service projects are selected to illuminate an aspect of a discipline's academic theory.
- Student efforts contribute to the community's common good.
- Learning goals for students are clearly defined and appropriately assessed.
- Each class includes creative and critical structured reflection on service-learning.
- Although timing is flexible, students are involved in a minimum of 8-10 hours of service outside of class time.

Based on the above sample definitions and criteria, a service-learning course may be defined as an academic or vocational course that facilitates students in service-oriented experiences based in the community to reinforce course-based learning objectives. A service-learning course often meets the following criteria:

- Provides a meaningful integration of academic knowledge with service in the community
- Provides community partners with volunteers who make serious commitments to agency goals
- Demonstrates the broader relevance of academic coursework
- Includes a relationship between course outcomes and a community-based service commitment
- Facilitates service in the community to address issues and needs that have been identified through collaborative processes with community partners
- Includes methods of reflection that occur throughout a student's service commitment

## **Key Data Point 2: Number of students enrolled in service-learning courses**

This data point is easily defined based on the definition of Key Data Point 1: the number of students enrolled in courses that meet the criteria for being defined as service-learning courses.

### **Key Data Point 3: Number of students who participate in co-curricular service**

Only one campus maintains a university-wide definition of co-curricular service. Other campuses with understandings of service-learning that require course attachments acknowledge that co-curricular service is best understood as traditional volunteering; these campuses also object to the term “co-curricular service learning.”

Generally, the term “co-curricular” was understood as something that happens outside the classroom framework and does not involve faculty. Many would describe student clubs and student government as examples of groups who work within the co-curricular realm. Service performed by these groups would then be considered “co-curricular service.”

#### Examples of Specific Campus-Wide Definitions

*Central Washington University* (<http://www.takeactioncwu.com/>)

Co-curricular service experience criteria:

- Experience provides opportunities to explore potential academic/career interests.
- Experience allows for informal participation resulting in personal and professional development.
- Experience develops content knowledge, skills, and critical thinking.
- Experience highlights the benefits associated with being involved outside of the classroom.

Co-curricular service provides volunteer opportunities to students that are not associated with any particular course. A co-curricular service experience often meets the following criteria:

- Allows students to develop skills and interests
- Provides space for students to organize their own interventions for identified issues of interest and/or gain experience with community agencies that are involved in addressing identified issues of interest

### **Key Data Point 4: Number of community partners attached to service-learning courses**

The key dividing issue in eligibility of a “community partner” was official classification of the agency. No participating campus had an official definition of “community partner” for service-learning courses and, when pressed, representatives usually limited themselves to nonprofit agencies and public service agencies.

Based on the interviewees’ comments, a community partner can be defined as a nonprofit, public service, or for-profit agency that is organized with the intention of addressing community needs and/or leading meaningful social change. A community partner that is attached to a service-learning course often meets the following criteria:

- Willing to work with students and play an active role in the facilitation of service hours completed by students at identified service sites

- Able to offer students meaningful service opportunities
- Willing to support and participate in the service-learning course’s service component design, requirements, etc.

### **Key Data Point 5: Number of faculty members teaching service-learning courses**

No campus representative reported a stipulation on the type of faculty contract that could limit the number of faculty members counted. Therefore, faculty members teaching service-learning courses can be defined as all faculty—full or part time, adjunct, tenured, or tenure-track—who develop and teach a course that fits within the criteria of “service learning” as identified by an institution.

### **Key Data Point 6: Number of service-learning hours completed by students**

Each campus measures service-learning hours in a different way, primarily dependent upon how the campus defines service-learning. For example, if a campus only considers course-based service to be service-learning, then any co-curricular service hours would not be counted. Some campuses mentioned that they track many different types of service (e.g., internship, capstone), but in a fashion allowing them to differentiate the hours for reporting purposes. Approximately half of the campus representatives reported collecting actual numbers, while the others collect estimates (e.g., the minimum number of hours required per class multiplied by the number of students). Furthermore, roughly half of the campus representatives who collect this data said that they only count direct-service time, which may include orientation time at the service site. The other half said that in-class preparation and reflection time is also included. One school took an alternative approach, asking not for hours but for a confirmation of whether or not the agreed-upon commitment to a community partner has been fulfilled.

Service-learning hours can therefore be defined as the estimated or actual number of hours completed by students as part of a commitment within a service-learning class or program, as defined by that particular campus. Service-learning hours can include time spent performing direct service, participating in orientation activities at the service site, preparing for direct service as part of class, and/or engaging in organized and meaningful reflection.

### **Key Data Point 7: Number of staff funded by the institution who lead service-learning efforts**

No campus representative reported a stipulation on the type/classification of staff that would or would not be included as part of Key Data Point 7. Staff can therefore include permanent or temporary, professional or classified staff; student staff; national service members; etc.



### **Key Data Point 8: Number of students per community issue area**

The list of community issue areas reported can be divided into the following thematic areas. Each thematic category has examples of specific community issue areas that were mentioned throughout the course of the interviews.

- Civic engagement and community organizing (e.g., voter registration, community centers)
- Environment and sustainability (e.g., food and food security, global warming)
- Health and human rights (e.g., fair trade, sex trade, domestic violence, healthcare, homelessness, poverty, racism, prejudice, social justice, cultural competency)
- Local-global connection (e.g., ethical consumerism)
- Education and child/youth development (e.g., youth issues, tutoring/literacy)

### **Objective #2:**

#### **To assess the capacity of each WACC member campus to effectively collect service-learning/community engagement data**

- Participating campus representatives are collecting 36 different types of service-learning/community engagement data; using 17 different methods to collect data; storing data in 14 different ways; sharing data with internal audiences using 13 distinct techniques; externally sharing data via eight distinct techniques; and partnering with 12 different data-collection support entities.
- Interviewees were split evenly between collecting real numbers and estimated numbers.
- Most campus representatives collect data on a quarterly/semester basis.
- Participating campuses were distributed along a three-stage data-collection capacity continuum including critical mass building, quality building, and sustained institutionalization. The majority of campuses ranked at stage two or above, signifying a large foundation of data-collection capacity among Washington Campus Compact member campuses.

## **Current Practices**

### Types of Data Collected

Participating campuses reported that they currently collect the following service-learning/community engagement data:

- # of college students serving their communities
- # of college students who complete a service-learning course during college
- % of college students participating in service-learning
- # of hours served by college students
- # of service-learning courses
- # of faculty using service-learning
- # of new faculty using service-learning
- # of community partners
- # of youth serving their communities
- # of people/community members served
- # of event attendees
- Disciplines using service-learning
- Course names
- Nature of programs/services (i.e., internship, course, community action day)
- Service locations
- Project details
- Community organization names
- Attendance/participation in reflection activities
- Student demographics [i.e., students with disabilities, work study, Students in Service (SIS)]

- Faculty status (i.e., adjunct)
- In-kind donations (i.e., time spent by community members to supervise students)
- Amount of educational scholarships earned by SIS members
- Student satisfaction
- Student attitudes toward volunteering/civic engagement
- College students' previous service-learning experience
- Faculty awareness of service-learning/community engagement
- Community partner needs
- Program/event feedback
- Change over time
- Civic engagement learning outcomes
- Impacts on college students
- Impacts on classroom studies/learning course content
- Impacts on quality of college life
- Impacts on civic and social responsibility
- Community impact
- Project outcomes

### Data-Collection Methods

Campuses are using the following data-collection methods:

- Students in Service paperwork/forms
- Registration forms
- Sign-in sheets
- Hour logs
- Washington Campus Compact's Civic Engagement Survey
- Other surveys (web and paper; administered to students, faculty, community partners; standardized/national, "borrowed," self-designed)
- Focus groups (with students, faculty, community partners)
- Reflection papers/journals
- Portfolios/ePortfolios
- Student presentations
- Roundtable discussions
- Informal in-person discussions
- Phone conversations
- Email communications
- Clickers
- Event debrief notes
- Banner

### Data Storage Practices

Campuses are using the following data storage practices:

- Paper files
- Notebooks
- Email communications

- Internal/shared network drives
- Word documents
- Excel spreadsheets
- Access databases
- Service-Learning Pro
- eServe
- PeopleSoft
- Banner
- Self-designed databases
- Multi-campus (multi-institution) shared database systems
- Office of Institutional Assessment

### Techniques for Using Service-Learning/Community Engagement Data

Campuses are currently using their service-learning/community engagement data in the following ways:

#### *Internal Audiences:*

- Showcasing programs in campus, alumni, or residence hall newspapers/magazines
- Showcasing programs through displays in high-traffic areas
- Sharing campus reports
- Sharing stories via websites
- Offering symposium-style presentations
- Communicating amount of in-kind donations received (time donated by community partners as supervisors) to leverage institutional support
- Sharing data with faculty at annual meetings
- Issuing staff/faculty newsletters
- Emailing student program members
- Providing student access to “Student Transcript for Leadership”
- Evaluating/adapting programs
- Identifying staffing needs/faculty development needs
- Strategic planning (with advisory board)

#### *External Audiences:*

- Writing press releases, newspaper articles, web content, etc.
- Sending information to other campus offices for distribution to larger community
- Sharing stories via website
- Publishing annual reports
- Submitting content to Washington Campus Compact newsletter
- Sharing with grantors/funders
- Sharing economic impact with legislators
- Evaluating community partnerships

Supports for Data Collection

Campuses are utilizing the following resources/supports to collect data:

- Student Affairs divisions
- Academic Affairs divisions
- Institutional Research offices
- Offices of Educational Assessment
- Teaching and Learning centers
- Information Technology departments
- Publications/Communications/Marketing offices
- Graduate students
- Student Affairs research analysts
- Technical support staff
- Director of Testing and Assessment Services
- Faculty Fellows programs

**Data-Collection Capacity Continuum**

Data-collection capacities among the participating campuses fall across the following continuum:

- *Stage One: Critical Mass Building* – These campuses lack critical mass and/or need support to build critical mass for service-learning programs to develop and grow in quality ways. They also have few advocates for service-learning and/or offer a few disjointed programs without the institutional support or structure to bring them together in a combined effort. These conditions make it almost impossible for campuses in this category to collect meaningful data at this time.
- *Stage Two: Quality Building* – These campuses have crossed the critical-mass threshold and have some level of centralized service-learning programming. However, campuses in this category do not follow routine data-collection practices and/or do not value data collection as a priority.
- *Stage Three: Sustained Institutionalization* – These campuses are characterized by the presence of critical mass, centralized programming, and use of routine data-collection practices. They are already collecting meaningful data in a routinized manner and can act as leaders/mentors for the other campuses.

Figure 1 shows the distribution of participating campuses in each progressive stage of the data-collection capacity continuum.

**Figure 1: Number of Participating Campus at Each Data-Collection Capacity Stage**

<b>STAGE ONE</b> <i>Critical-Mass Building</i>	<b>BETWEEN</b> <b>Stages One/Two</b>	<b>STAGE TWO</b> <i>Quality Building</i>	<b>BETWEEN</b> <b>Stages Two/Three</b>	<b>STAGE THREE</b> <i>Sustained Institutionalization</i>
3 campuses	6 campuses	8 campuses	7 campuses	8 campuses

### **Objective #3:**

#### ***To assess the needs of each WACC member campus in order to collect service-learning/community engagement data (e.g., technology, training, partnerships)***

- The interviewees named several resources and supports that would be helpful in improving data collection on their respective campuses including (a) access to databases; (b) access to assessment tools/instruments; (c) access to other campus's data; (d) development of indicator/criteria language; (e) training, education, networking, and consultation opportunities; and (f) human resources/financial support.
- Campus representatives also expressed interest in pursuing specific research/assessment topics such as exploring connections between service-learning, personality type, and vocation; further investigating community impacts; and conducting longitudinal qualitative studies.

#### Access to database(s)

- To track and match courses/students with community partners
- To collect service-learning/community engagement data
- Similar to WBRS
- To align with systems already in place
- Tied to Blackboard
- With software templates
- *Note:* Some stage-three campuses do not recommend a statewide database because it would mean comparing apples to oranges and/or they already have systems in place that work well for them.

#### Access to assessment tools/instruments

- Ready-made data forms/instruments
- Online surveys to track hours
- Online surveys to assess civic engagement
- Online surveys for participating students, faculty, community partners
- To track types and numbers of service-learning projects
- Common tools per institution type (i.e., four-year public, community college, etc.)
- Tool sharing among campuses

#### Access to other campus's data

- To compare own campus with others
- To publish statewide data and news/reports from each campus

#### Development of indicator/criteria language

- Standardize criteria (e.g., civically engaged scholar)
- Hear how others define indicators

### Training, educational, networking, and consultation opportunities

- Institute/workshop driven by a question and geared toward layperson
- Workshops for faculty: how to use data in their research and to tell dynamic stories
- Training web interface to access anytime
- How to track civic engagement, get numbers, etc.
- How to use technology in data collection
- Support incorporating service-learning questions into existing surveys
- Summer institute for service-learning veterans to plan statewide data collection and develop tools for less-advanced campuses
- Customized support with tool development, data collection, analysis
- Support with Carnegie Classification application process
- Informational documents, workshops, discussions
- Models of how others are doing campus-wide data collection
- How to talk about service-learning success stories
- How to seek publication opportunities
- Providing support around models

### Human resource/financial support

- General capacity support to collect data
- Full-/part-time positions dedicated to collecting data
- Tech support for database/survey set-up
- Assessment/research fellows
- Grant money for deeper qualitative assessment/joint evaluations

### Expanded assessment topics and/or directions

- Connections between service-learning and Myers-Briggs/personalities
- Connections between service-learning and vocation
- How programs benefit students (job opportunities)
- Community impact
- Qualitative longitudinal study exploring student and community impacts

**Objective #4:**

**To gauge the progress of each member campus's service-learning institutionalization efforts**

- Through analysis of the self-assessment rubric, participating campuses appear to be strongest in working with community partners, and weakest in working with faculty.
- On a scale of one to three (one being weakest and three being strongest), participating campuses collectively scored themselves as follows across each dimension of institutionalization:
  - Community Participation and Partnerships: 1.91
  - Institutional Support: 1.87
  - Philosophy and Mission: 1.85
  - Student Support and Involvement: 1.84
  - Faculty Support and Involvement: 1.75

Each interviewee was asked to gauge the progress of her/his campus's service-learning institutionalization efforts across five dimensions (each comprised of several specific sub-domains that characterize the dimension) using the following three-stage continuum:

- In stage one, "*Critical Mass Building*," the campus is beginning to recognize service-learning and build a constituency for service-learning efforts.
- In stage two, "*Quality Building*," the campus is focused on building quality service-learning activities, beginning to collect data on service-learning efforts and outcomes, and continuing to build a constituency for service-learning efforts.
- In stage three, "*Sustained Institutionalization*," the campus has fully institutionalized service-learning into its culture, policies, and practices.

Figure 2 reflects distribution of self-assessment among participating campuses along the institutionalization of service-learning continuum.

A total score for each dimension (and sub-domain) was calculated using the following equation:

$$\text{Dimension/sub-domain score} = \frac{(\# \text{ of campuses in Stage One} \times 1) + (\# \text{ of campuses in Stage Two} \times 2) + (\# \text{ of campuses in Stage Three} \times 3)}{\text{Total \# of campuses in Stages One, Two, and Three}}$$

Therefore, dimensions (and sub-domains) assigned lower scores have been less developed across participating campuses, and dimensions (and sub-domains) assigned higher scores have been more developed across participating campuses. Figure 3 lists each dimension and sub-domain included in the Self Assessment Rubric for the Institutionalization of Service-Learning with its overall score. Overall, participating campuses appear to be strongest in working with community partners, and weakest in working with faculty.



**Figure 2: Number of Participating Campuses at each Stage of the Institutionalization of Service-Learning Continuum**

<b>DIMENSION I Philosophy and Mission of Service-Learning</b>	<b>STAGE ONE <i>Critical-Mass Building</i></b>	<b>STAGE TWO <i>Quality Building</i></b>	<b>STAGE THREE <i>Sustained Institutionalization</i></b>
<b>Definition of Service-Learning</b>	9	13	4
<b>Strategic Planning</b> (1 campus did not report)	12	8	5
<b>Alignment with Institutional Mission</b> (1 campus did not report)	8	10	7
<b>Alignment with Education Reform Efforts</b>	5	18	3
<b>DIMENSION II Faculty Support and Involvement in Service-Learning</b>	<b>STAGE ONE <i>Critical-Mass Building</i></b>	<b>STAGE TWO <i>Quality Building</i></b>	<b>STAGE THREE <i>Sustained Institutionalization</i></b>
<b>Faculty Awareness</b> (1 campus did not report)	9	15	1
<b>Faculty Involvement and Support</b> (1 campus did not report)	7	14	4
<b>Faculty Leadership</b> (1 campus did not report)	5	17	3
<b>Faculty Incentives and Rewards</b> (2 campuses did not report)	13	10	1
<b>DIMENSION III Student Support and Involvement in Service-Learning</b>	<b>STAGE ONE <i>Critical-Mass Building</i></b>	<b>STAGE TWO <i>Quality Building</i></b>	<b>STAGE THREE <i>Sustained Institutionalization</i></b>
<b>Student Awareness</b>	8	12	6
<b>Student Opportunities</b>	11	9	6
<b>Student Leadership</b> (1 campus did not report)	8	14	3
<b>Student Incentives and Rewards</b>	9	13	4

**Figure 2: Number of Participating Campuses at each Stage of the Institutionalization of Service-Learning Continuum (continued)**

<b>DIMENSION IV Community Participation and Partnerships</b>	<b>STAGE ONE <i>Critical-Mass Building</i></b>	<b>STAGE TWO <i>Quality Building</i></b>	<b>STAGE THREE <i>Sustained Institutionalization</i></b>
<b>Community Partner Awareness</b>	9	11	6
<b>Mutual Understanding</b> (1 campus did not report)	4	19	2
<b>Community Agency Leadership and Voice</b> (1 campus did not report)	5	17	3
<b>DIMENSION V Institutional Support for Service-Learning</b>	<b>STAGE ONE <i>Critical-Mass Building</i></b>	<b>STAGE TWO <i>Quality Building</i></b>	<b>STAGE THREE <i>Sustained Institutionalization</i></b>
<b>Coordinating Entity</b>	7	9	10
<b>Policy-Making Entity</b> (1 campus did not report)	6	16	3
<b>Staffing</b> (1 campus did not report)	13	5	7
<b>Funding</b>	10	8	8
<b>Administrative Support</b>	11	9	6
<b>Departmental Support</b> (1 campus did not report)	7	13	5
<b>Evaluation and Assessment</b> (1 campus did not report)	12	9	4

**Figure 3: Institutionalization Dimension (and Sub-Domain) Scores**

<b>Philosophy &amp; Mission</b>	<b>Score</b>
Definition of Service-Learning	1.81
Strategic Planning	1.72
Alignment with Institutional Mission	1.96
Alignment with Education-Reform Efforts	1.92
	<b>1.8525</b>
<b>Faculty Support and Involvement</b>	<b>Score</b>
Faculty Awareness	1.68
Faculty Involvement and Support	1.88
Faculty Leadership	1.92
Faculty Incentives and Rewards	1.50
	<b>1.745</b>
<b>Student Support and Involvement</b>	<b>Score</b>
Student Awareness	1.92
Student Opportunities	1.81
Student Leadership	1.80
Student Incentives and Rewards	1.81
	<b>1.835</b>
<b>Community Participation and Partnerships</b>	<b>Score</b>
Community Partner Awareness	1.88
Mutual Understanding	1.92
Community Agency Leadership and Voice	1.92
	<b>1.90667</b>
<b>Institutional Support</b>	<b>Score</b>
Coordinating Entity	2.12
Policy-Making Entity	1.88
Staffing	1.76
Funding	1.92
Administrative Support	1.81
Departmental Support	1.92
Evaluation and Assessment	1.68
	<b>1.87</b>

### **Objective #5:**

***To assess the needs of each WACC member campus in order to progress along the institutionalization continuum (e.g., partnership-building, sustainability, marketing)***

- The top five needs identified by participating campuses are:
  - Faculty Incentives and Rewards (Faculty Support and Involvement Dimension)
  - Faculty Awareness (Faculty Support and Involvement Dimension)
  - Evaluation and Assessment (Institutional Support Dimension)
  - Strategic Planning (Philosophy and Mission Dimension)
  - Staffing (Institutional Support Dimension)
- Areas where leader campuses can support other campuses include (a) building faculty support, (b) evaluation and assessment, (c) strategic planning and defining service-learning, (d) developing staffing and administrative support, and (e) encouraging student support and involvement.
- Participating campuses suggested a variety of techniques that can be implemented to meet their needs including (a) networking and model sharing, (b) training and workshops, (c) support with communications and marketing, and (d) financial support to sustain programs.

### Specific Domain Needs

In order for Washington Campus Compact members to progress along the institutionalization continuum, an acute awareness of identified general dimension needs must be integrated with an understanding of specific domain needs. Figure 4 provides an alternative way of looking at the service-learning institutionalization data in order to identify the top needs of participating campuses. Each domain is listed in order from lowest score (highest need) to highest score (lowest need).

### Possibilities for Cross-Mentoring and Best-Practice Sharing

Throughout the scope of this research, it became apparent that certain member campuses have assumed leadership roles in terms of service-learning institutionalization and are therefore in a position to share best practices and offer mentorship to other member campuses. Areas in which leader campuses can support other campuses include (a) building faculty support, (b) evaluation and assessment, (c) strategic planning and defining service-learning, (d) developing staffing and administrative support, and (e) encouraging student support and involvement.

As can be seen in Figure 2 (pages 15-16), there are campuses who self-assessed as having excelled within the “highest need” domains and can therefore act as mentors and/or trainers for other campuses. These campuses offer specialized skills in the following areas:

- Building faculty awareness, incentives, and rewards
- Evaluation and assessment
- Strategic planning and defining service-learning
- Staffing and administrative support
- Student leadership, opportunities, incentives, and rewards

**Figure 4: Institutionalization Domains by Score (Highest Need to Lowest Need)**

<b>Dimension</b>	<b>Domain</b>	<b>Score</b>
Faculty Support and Involvement	<b>Faculty Incentives and Rewards</b>	<b>1.50</b>
Faculty Support and Involvement	<b>Faculty Awareness</b>	<b>1.68</b>
Institutional Support	<b>Evaluation and Assessment</b>	<b>1.68</b>
Philosophy and Mission	<b>Strategic Planning</b>	<b>1.72</b>
Institutional Support	<b>Staffing</b>	<b>1.76</b>
Student Support and Involvement	<b>Student Leadership</b>	<b>1.80</b>
Philosophy and Mission	<b>Definition of Service-Learning</b>	<b>1.81</b>
Student Support and Involvement	<b>Student Opportunities</b>	<b>1.81</b>
Student Support and Involvement	<b>Student Incentives and Rewards</b>	<b>1.81</b>
Institutional Support	<b>Administrative Support</b>	<b>1.81</b>
Faculty Support and Involvement	Faculty Involvement and Support	1.88
Community Participation and Partnerships	Community Partner Awareness	1.88
Institutional Support	Policy-Making Entity	1.88
Philosophy and Mission	Alignment with Education-Reform Efforts	1.92
Faculty Support and Involvement	Faculty Leadership	1.92
Student Support and Involvement	Student Awareness	1.92
Community Participation and Partnerships	Mutual Understanding	1.92
Community Participation and Partnerships	Community Agency Leadership and Voice	1.92
Institutional Support	Funding	1.92
Institutional Support	Departmental Support	1.92
Philosophy and Mission	Alignment with Institutional Mission	1.96
Institutional Support	Coordinating Entity	2.12

#### Potential Methods of Support Identified

Finally, through the interviews, participating campuses suggested a variety of techniques that could be implemented to meet their needs including (a) networking and model-sharing, (b) training and workshops, (c) support with communications and marketing, and (d) financial support to sustain programs.

- Networking and model-sharing:
  - Opportunity to come together to identify common vision
  - Models of how to institutionalize service-learning
  - Models of faculty/department applications of service-learning
  - Peer interactions/ideas from leading institutions
  - Best practices/knowledge
  - Basic start-up resources and information
  - Peer mentoring: how to make service-learning work without staff and resources
  - Site visits/exchange program
  - Move from competitive showcasing to collaborative dialogue

- Training and workshops:
  - Low-cost, half- to full-day institutes providing networking, trend updates, etc.
  - How to engage faculty: reflection, relationship-building, etc.
  - How to engage nontraditional students/find different models that work for them
  - How universities can move into the global arena effectively
  - How to build up endowments
  - Risk management: Are we doing it effectively?
  - Re-entry reflection/reflection in general
  - How do we train community-based organizations? How do they train us?
  - Legal/liability issues
  - Help connecting service-learning to student development and academic success
  
- Communications and marketing:
  - To increase visibility
  - How to present your case for institutionalization
  - Support in building awareness/ethic toward importance of service-learning
  - How to approach community organizations/effective communication
  
- Financial support/hard funding to sustain programs



## Statewide Capacity Assessment Project Interview Protocol

---

### **Project Overview:**

The purpose of the Washington Campus Compact (WACC) Statewide Capacity Assessment Project is to explore each member campus's current and potential capacity to (a) collect service-learning/community engagement data and (b) institutionalize service-learning at the college/university-level. This study also seeks to identify intentional capacity-building systems (i.e., training programs, technological support, expanded partnerships) that may support member campuses with their service-learning/community engagement data-collection and institutionalization efforts.

This portion of the Statewide Capacity Assessment Project (the one-on-one phone interviews) addresses the following broad questions:

- (1) How do the definitions of key service-learning/community engagement indicators vary across WACC member campuses?
- (2) In what ways do member campuses currently collect service-learning/community engagement data? What data does each campus collect; and how does each campus collect, store, and utilize the data?
- (3) What is the current capacity of each member campus to collect service-learning/community engagement data?
- (4) What would it take to improve the capacity of each member campus to collect service-learning/community engagement data?

### **General Instructions:**

- Send an email reminder to each interviewee a day before the scheduled phone interview.
- Start and end the interviews on time; pace the questions.
- Jot down notes during the interview; type a summary of the interviewee's response to each question after the interview is complete.

- Send an email to each interviewee after the scheduled interview is complete to thank her/him for participating, request that she/he submits current data-collection tools, and encourage her/him to participate in the follow-up survey.
- Compile data-collection tools.

### **Probes to Use throughout the Discussion:**

- What does [word] mean?
- What do you mean when you say that?
- You were talking about \_\_\_\_\_. Can you tell me more about that now?
- Can you give me an example?
- Would you explain further?

### **Introduction and Opening Remarks:**

My name is \_\_\_\_\_, and I am working with Washington Campus Compact to assess the capacity and needs of each member campus to collect service-learning/community engagement data. We will spend the next 30 to 45 minutes talking about how [insert campus] defines key service-learning/community engagement indicators; your current data-collection practices; and the resources and supports that you think would be helpful for your campus's data-collection efforts.

After the interview, you will receive an email from me asking you to (a) send any current data-collection tools that you are willing to share with WACC and (b) complete a brief survey to gauge the level to which service-learning has been institutionalized on your campus.

We hope to use the information and ideas that you share to identify capacity-building systems that may support all WACC member campuses in their data-collection efforts. The information you share as part of the interview and survey will be used for internal purposes only.

Do you have any questions before we begin?



## Interview Questions:

1. I'd like to start our conversation by gaining a general understanding of the organizational structure of service-learning and community engagement on your campus. How would you describe this at [insert campus name]?
  - Is there a service-learning/community engagement office?
  - If there is an office, is it housed in Academic Affairs or Student Affairs?
  - Do students in your campus participate in curricular and co-curricular service? Is one more prevalent than the other?
  - Who coordinates service-learning/community engagement efforts on your campus?
  - What is your role?

*The next set of questions has to do with overall service-learning/community engagement data-collection practices on your campus.*

- \* 2. How does your campus collect service-learning/community engagement data (i.e., the number and quality of service activities taking place; impacts on students)?
  - What kinds of data do you collect?
  - What methods are used to collect the data (i.e., surveys, focus groups, informal email communications)?
  - Who collects the data?
  - From whom is the data collected (i.e., students, faculty, community members)?
  - How often is data collected?
  - Are your numbers estimates or real?
3. How is service-learning/community engagement data stored on your campus (i.e., filing cabinets, database)?
  - Do you use a specific database? Would you recommend it to your colleagues at other campuses?
4. In what ways do you use the service-learning/community engagement data that is collected on your campus?
  - Do you share the data with your internal campus community?
  - Do you share the data with your external community?
  - How do you communicate your findings (i.e., press releases, newsletter articles, informal conversations)?

5. What types of resources and/or supports do you have in place to collect and use service-learning/community engagement data?
  - Is there an Institutional Research (IR) office on your campus? If so, do you collaborate with the office? How?
  - What other specific resources/supports do you have to collect data?

***The next question focuses on how a pre-identified set of key service-learning/community engagement indicators are defined and measured on your campus.***

- \* 6. A sub-group of WACC's advisory committee identified a set of eight (8) key service-learning/community engagement indicators. I'd like to go through these indicators to explore (a) whether or not your campus measures each and (b) how your campus defines each indicator.
  - (a) # of service-learning courses
    - Is there a specific definition or set of criteria used to identify service-learning courses? What is the definition and/or criteria?
    - Are only specific departments included in the identification process?  
[Note: If it is a community college: ask specifically if only academic programs are included, or if Adult Basic Education, English Language Learner, etc. programs are included as well.]
    - Who decides which courses are considered to be service-learning courses (i.e., a service-learning professional/coordinating body, faculty members, students, or someone else)?
  - (b) # of students enrolled in service-learning courses [Note: Not crucial to define this one.]
  - (c) # of students who participate in co-curricular service
    - Is there a specific definition or set of criteria used to identify co-curricular service-learning activities? What is the definition and/or criteria?
    - Who decides which activities are considered to be service-learning activities (i.e., a service-learning professional/coordinating body, students, or someone else)?
  - (d) # of community partners attached to service-learning courses
    - Is there a specific definition or set of criteria used to identify community partners? What is the definition and/or criteria?
  - (e) # of faculty members teaching service-learning courses
    - Are adjunct faculty members included?

- (f) # of service-learning hours completed by students
  - Does this include curricular and co-curricular service-learning?
  - How are the hours calculated? Are they actual numbers or estimates?
  - Do you count time spent on program development? Reflection?
  
- (g) # of staff funded by the institution (i.e., not grant or federally funded) who lead service-learning efforts [Note: Not crucial to define this one.]
  
- (h) # of students per community issue area (i.e., poverty, environment) [Note: Not crucial to define this one.]
  - Are there any specific community issues that are addressed via your campus's service-learning efforts?

*We're nearing the end of our conversation.*

- \* 7. What, if any, kinds of resources and/or supports do you think would be helpful in improving service-learning/community engagement data collection on your campus?
  - Fast forward to the end of the 2008-2009 academic year. What one to three data-collection resources and/or supports do you think would be most helpful to [insert campus name]?
  - Pretend that you have been asked to design a statewide program to improve data-collection practices among all WACC member campuses. What would your program include?
    - What types of training or educational opportunities would you provide?
    - What types of technical systems or supports would you provide?
    - How would you build buy-in for folks to participate in the program?
  
- 8. Reflecting back on the discussion we've had over the last [insert approximate number] minutes, is there anything that we have missed?

**Closing Remarks:**

We have come to the end of the interview. I would like to thank you, once again, for participating in this important project.

As I mentioned earlier, I will send you an email later today encouraging you to both send me your current data-collection tools and complete a brief follow-up survey.

## Appendix B

### WACC Statewide Capacity Assessment Survey

#### Welcome!

Thank you for participating in Washington Campus Compact's (WACC) Statewide Capacity Assessment Project! We truly appreciate your willingness to participate in both a one-on-one phone interview and this survey.

The purpose of this component of the Statewide Capacity Assessment Project (this survey) is to (a) gauge the level to which service-learning has been institutionalized among each WACC member campus and (b) identify capacity-building systems that may support member campuses with their service-learning institutionalization efforts. It should take you about 20 minutes to complete the survey from start to finish.

Please contact RaeLyn Axlund, WACC research and assessment director, at raelyn.axlund@wwu.edu or 360.650.2325 if you have any questions about this survey or the Statewide Capacity Assessment Project overall.

#### Tell Us About Yourself

##### 1. What is your name?

##### \* 2. Please select your campus from the drop-down menu below.

The remainder of this survey involves going through each component of Andy Furco's "Self-Assessment Rubric for the Institutionalization of Service-Learning in Higher Education" (1999), which includes five overall dimensions:

- (1) Philosophy & Mission of Service-Learning;
- (2) Faculty Support for & Involvement in Service-Learning;
- (3) Student Support for & Involvement in Service-Learning;
- (4) Community Participation & Partnerships; and
- (5) Institutional Support for Service-Learning

Each dimension includes a set of descriptive components. For example, "Community Participation & Partnerships" includes (a) community partner awareness, (b) mutual understanding, and (c) community partner voice and leadership. You will be asked to identify the statement that best describes the current nature of each component at your campus.

#### DIMENSION I: Philosophy & Mission of Service-Learning

##### 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, select the statement that best represents the CURRENT status of the development of a definition, philosophy, and mission of service-learning.

# WACC Statewide Capacity Assessment Survey

## 1. 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.
- There is an operationalized definition for service-learning on the campus, but there is some variance and inconsistency in the application of the term.
- 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.

Comments

## 2. Strategic Planning

- The campus does not have an official strategic plan for advancing service-learning on campus.
- 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.
- The campus has developed an official strategic plan for advancing service-learning on campus, which includes viable short-range and long-range institutionalization goals.

Comments

## 3. 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.
- 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.
- Service-learning is part of the primary concern of the institution. Service-learning is included in the campus' official mission and/or strategic plan.

Comments

## 4. 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.).
- 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.).
- 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.).

Comments

## DIMENSION II: Faculty Support for & Involvement in Service-Learning

# WACC Statewide Capacity Assessment Survey

## 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 a campus (Bell, Furco, Ammon, Sorgen, & Muller, 2000).

DIRECTIONS: For each of the four categories, select the statement that best represents the CURRENT status of faculty involvement in and support for service-learning on your campus.

### 1. Faculty Knowledge and Awareness

- Very few members know what service-learning is or understand how service-learning is different from community service, internships, or other experiential learning activities.
- An adequate number of faculty members know what service-learning is and understand how service-learning is different from community service, internships, or other experiential learning activities.
- A substantial number of faculty members know what service-learning is and can articulate how service-learning is different from community service, internships, or other experiential learning activities.

Comments

### 2. 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.
- While a satisfactory number of faculty members is 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.
- A substantial number of influential faculty members participates 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.

Comments

### 3. Faculty Leadership

- None of the most influential faculty members on campus serve as leaders for advancing service-learning on the campus.
- There are only one or two influential faculty members who provide leadership to the campus' service-learning effort.
- A highly respected, influential group of faculty members serves as the campus' service-learning leaders and/or advocates.

Comments

## WACC Statewide Capacity Assessment Survey

### 4. Faculty Incentives & Rewards

- In general, faculty members are not encouraged to engage in service-learning; few if any incentives are provided (e.g., minigrants, 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.
- Although faculty members are encouraged and are provided various incentives (minigrants, sabbaticals, funds for service-learning conferences, etc.) to pursue service-learning activities, their work in service-learning is not always recognized during their review, tenure, and promotion process.
- 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 (minigrants, sabbaticals, funds for service-learning conferences, etc.) to pursue service-learning activities.

Comments

## DIMENSION III: Student Support for & Involvement in Service-Learning

### 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, select the statement that best represents the CURRENT status of student support for and involvement in service-learning on your campus.

#### 1. Student Awareness

- There is no campus-wide mechanism for informing students about service-learning courses, resources, and opportunities that are available to them.
- 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).
- 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.

Comments

#### 2. Student Opportunities

- Few service-learning opportunities exist for students; only a handful of service-learning courses are available.
- Service-learning options (in which service is integrated in core academic courses) are limited to only a certain groups of students in the academy (e.g., students in certain majors, honors students, seniors, etc.).
- 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.

Comments

## WACC Statewide Capacity Assessment Survey

### 3. 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.
- There is a limited number of opportunities available for students to take on leadership roles in advancing service-learning in their departments or throughout the campus.
- Students are welcomed and encouraged to serve as advocates and ambassadors for institutionalizing service-learning in their departments or throughout the campus.

Comments

### 4. Student Incentives & Rewards

- The campus has neither formal mechanisms (e.g., catalogued list of service-learning courses, service-learning notation on students' transcripts, etc.) or informal 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.
- While the campus offers some informal 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 formal incentives and rewards (catalogued list of service-learning courses, service-learning notation on students' transcripts, etc.)
- The campus has one or more formal 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.

Comments

## DIMENSION IV: Community Participation & Partnerships

### DIMENSION IV: COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION AND PARTNERSHIPS

An important element for 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, select the statement that best represents the CURRENT status of community participation and partnership on your campus.

### 1. 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.
- 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.
- 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.

Comments



## WACC Statewide Capacity Assessment Survey

### 2. 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.
- 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.
- 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.

Comments

### 3. Community Partner Voice & Leadership

- Few, if any, opportunities exist for community agency representatives to take on leadership roles in advancing service-learning on 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.
- 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.
- 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.

Comments

## DIMENSION V: Institutional Support for Service-Learning

### 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 seven categories, select the statement that best represents the CURRENT status of your campus' institutional support for service-learning.

### 1. 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.
- 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).
- The institution maintains coordinating entity (e.g., committee, center, or clearinghouse) that is devoted primarily to assisting the various campus constituencies in the implementation, advancement, and institutionalization of service-learning.

Comments

# WACC Statewide Capacity Assessment Survey

## 2. 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.
- 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.
- 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.

Comments

## 3. Staffing

- There are no staff/faculty members on campus whose primary paid responsibility is to advance and institutionalize service-learning on the campus.
- There is 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.
- 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.

Comments

## 4. Funding

- The campus' service-learning activities are supported primarily by soft money (short-term grants) from sources outside the institution.
- 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.
- The campus' service-learning activities are supported primarily by hard funding from the campus.

Comments

## 5. 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.
- 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.
- 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.

Other (please specify)

## WACC Statewide Capacity Assessment Survey

### 6. Departmental Support

- Few, if any, departments recognize service-learning a formal part of their formal academic programs.
- 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.
- 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.

Comments

### 7. Evaluation & Assessment

- There is no organized, campus-wide effort underway to account for the number and quality of service-learning activities taking place.
- An initiative to account for the number and quality of service-learning activities taking place throughout the campus has been proposed.
- 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.

Comments

## Final Reflections

**1. Reflecting back on all of the service-learning components mentioned in this survey, what, if any, kinds of resources and/or supports do you think would be most helpful for your campus as it progresses along the institutionalization continuum?**

**2. Please share any additional comments you have about this survey, your campus, and/or WACC's Statewide Capacity Assessment Project overall.**

Thank you for completing WACC's Statewide Capacity Assessment Survey!