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What have you been doing during the past year? When I was younger and kept up more with current trends in music, a much anticipated second album was often referred to as the sophomore release. Critics would compare their expectations to the effort, and then try to write a prediction about the likelihood of continuing success. It was a game that my friends and I all enjoyed - and it has continued into our adult, professional lives. But now, instead of music, we critique the work of our colleagues and try to predict our own success against the perceived trends of our academic disciplines.

Welcome to the sophomore release of the Journal of Service-Learning in Higher Education [JSLHE]. Over the past year, I had the pleasure to work with dozens of researchers and authors, editorial colleagues, and reviewers. We have all been amazed at the diversity and scope of service work in higher education. According the Corporation for National and Community Service (http://www.nationalservice.gov/about/initiatives/honorroll.asp), last year was a dynamic service year with over three million college students engaged in over 100 million hours of service. What have you been doing during the past year? Let me guess: Maybe working with students to design cost-effective, energy-efficient homes? Or participating with students in a public reading on U.S. Constitution day? How about joining with thousands of community members on national days of service to clean our parks and other public green-spaces? What have you been doing during the past year - and how do you know that it worked?

In this second volume of JSLHE we are building on the theme of what we do and how we know it works. There are two primary sections, the first with original manuscripts, and the second, an invited paper from the Center for Engaged Democracy at Merrimack College. Our expectation for this issue is to present ideas and examples that can be useful for the novice and for the experienced service-oriented faculty member. Beyond that, let's keep the serious discussion moving along about what it means to design and implement a theoretically sound service-learning experience. What are the key elements? What are the core competencies?

Noted by Neese et al., a primary goal of success in higher education, is to produce students who understand the value of contributing learned expertise back to the community. In their presentation of service-learning through marketing research class projects, they very clearly provide the back-ground and a blue-print for incorporating service-learning projects.
across the curricula. So often we are asked by our colleagues, "How can I get this into my class?" In their presentation, Neese et al. provides a useful step-wise process that easily translates to a variety of disciplines.

One of the most widely used models of higher-education service-learning implementation, is the pre-service teacher experiences in many of our colleges and departments of education. In the presentation by Brannon, the focus goes beyond the typical classroom experience to the tertiary issues of working with high-need children and their families. It is a typical practice to provide experiential exercises to increase competent interactions with children, but what about the family outside of the classroom? Brannon's approach was to look at building students' self-efficacy when working with the parents of high-need children. Another unique approach to pre-service teacher service-learning is the "virtual tutoring" presented by Vavasseur et al. The application of synchronous video-conferencing, off-site document sharing, screen-sharing and other forms of distributive education practice, demonstrated how multiple forms of teaching can enhance multiple learning outcomes.

How do we know that it works? One of the most frequent questions that I get from colleagues targets the practical assessment of service-learning. Important to the implementation of that question is the follow-up, "What do I want to know?" Moulton and Moulton, in their presentation on service-learning assessment describes and identifies the basic standards when considering effective assessment in service courses. Following that stream, Crone explores the effects of creating a service-learning component discipline specific to social psychology. Using the tenets of a behavioral science approach, Crone notes (among additional findings) positive change in students' attitudes toward civic participation, helping others, and an increased belief that people should give aid to others. Some of the hallmark outcomes sought through service-learning experiences.

Through these pieces of original research, there are common threads and elements that we seek to identify and replicate in study after study and course upon course. What then are the similarities? In the last section of this volume, Brammer, Dumlao, Falk, Hollander, Knutson, Poehnert, Politano, and Werner present their working paper from the Merrimack College Center for Engaged Democracy: Core Competencies in Civic Engagement. This is the conversation in which we are engaged. What is civic engagement? What is service-learning? What are the knowledge, skills and value sets that are needed to create the environment for a successful citizenship experience and how are they used? This presentation is the introduction to a special edition that the Journal of Service-Learning in Higher Education will produce in the fall of 2013. In the next few weeks a call for manuscripts will be issued not for a rebuttal to this piece, but rather as a response, a reply, an addition, or a continuation of the conversation - how do we identify and use the core elements for service in higher education?

What happened over the past year? The trend that I have observed is the marriage of the most successful elements of experiential learning and the production of applied research. Through the challenges of changing technology, increases in class size, and reduced funding sources - higher education professionals continue to imagine and create the elements and practices of service-learning pedagogy that will lead our current student citizens toward successful post-graduate engagement. My most heartfelt gratitude to our editors, authors, readers and reviewers - and to all of you who teach the best by being the best.
Service-Learning Through Marketing Research Class Projects

William T. Neese, J Robert Field, and R. Charles Viosca

Service-learning is becoming increasingly more important in the United States. This method provides educational institutions and their faculty and students a worthwhile and visible way to both give back to the community and achieve learning goals. The concept of “service-learning” is one which blends some form of community service with an academic learning experience. One common theme of most service-learning definitions is that the pedagogy can be used to effectively promote future volunteerism and responsible citizenship (Domegan and Bringle 2010; Weber and Weber 2010). Service-learning is different from simple volunteerism because it is specifically designed to meet established learning objectives. According to Bringle and Hatcher (2009, p.38), service-learning is defined as:

A course or competency-based, credit-bearing educational experience in which students (a) participate in an organized service activity that meets identified community needs, and (b) reflect on the service activity in such a way as to gain further understanding of course content, a broader appreciation of the discipline, and an enhanced sense of personal values and civic responsibility.

ABSTRACT

One goal for higher education that should be taken very seriously is the development of students who learn the value of being productive members of their communities by contributing pro bono expertise to those with a need, but without the expertise or resources necessary to accomplish the task(s) on their own. In an effort to enhance their images, many modern organizations reward employees for such community service. One very promising area for service-learning activity is through marketing research class projects. This manuscript first provides an overview of service-learning including a conceptual framework, and then supports that introduction with examples.
However, according to Furco (2003, p.13): “One of the greatest challenges in the study of service-learning is the absence of a common, universally accepted definition of the term. All service-learning activities, regardless of their overall design and programmatic goals, involve a complex interaction of students, service activities, curricular content, and learning outcomes. Indeed, no two service-learning activities are alike.” Review of the service-learning literature reveals several definitions of service-learning that do not necessarily require the activity to be course-based for credit. For example:

Service-learning programs emphasize the accomplishment of tasks which meet human needs in combination with conscious educational growth….They combine needed tasks in the community with intentional learning goals and with conscious reflection and critical analysis (Kendall 1990, p.20).

In a speech delivered at the 1994 Conference of the National Society for Experiential Education in Grand Rapids, Michigan, Kinsley stated:

So here is a definition: Community Service Learning is an educational process (that word again) that involves students in service experiences with two firm anchors: First their service experience is directly related to academic subject matter; and second, it involves them in making positive contributions to individuals and community institutions (Kinsley 1994, p.41).

Finally, Jacoby (1996, p.5) defines service-learning as:

A form of experiential education in which students engage in activities that address human and community needs together with structured opportunities intentionally designed to promote student learning and development; service-learning combines service objectives with learning objectives with the intent that the activity changes both the recipient and the provider of the service.

Integrating Service-Learning in Courses for Credit

Methods for conducting service-learning projects range from non-credit activity through student organizations, to independent studies with individualized instruction for one or a few students, to course credit specifically designed to fit one class. Although the focus of this article is on incorporating service-learning marketing research projects into courses for credit, there are several common service-learning marketing activities that do not occur in class. One is when American Marketing Association (AMA) student clubs are formally evaluated on their community service by judges at an annual Collegiate Chapters Conference. Student AMA chapters that plan to compete for awards at the annual conference submit a plan that describes specific projects that chapter is planning to conduct in various categories such as community service. That academic year’s actual activities are then presented to AMA by the deadline in a chapter report for judging. This is a planned service-learning activity that directly relates to the discipline-specific nature of that organization, and it is evaluated for merit.

Several authors provide frameworks for incorporating service-learning projects into course requirements (e.g., Brower 2011; Cook 2008; Dixon 2011; Flannery and Pragman 2010; Hall and Johnson 2011; Larson and Drexle 2010; Pless, Maak and Stahl 2011 among others). It is somewhat difficult to derive one comprehensive model for all service-learning projects due to
the multidimensional nature of this pedagogy. For example, service-learning projects that integrate students into communities in developing nations will require extensive travel planning, whereas locally-based projects will not involve as much travel planning. Human subject research requires Institutional Review Board (IRB) approval before the project can proceed, whereas secondary research, helping low income citizens complete tax forms, or teaching at-risk children basic financial principles will not require IRB approval.

The Value of Service-Learning

Service-learning projects are intentionally designed to cause reflection among participants on how the course topic relates to community involvement. A well-designed service-learning project will structure regular discussion of the issues at hand into the course requirements (e.g., written narratives), plus they are formulated through a collaborative process with community entities of some type (Domegan and Bringle 2010; Pless, Maak and Stahl 2011). Thus, faculty and students work with businesses and other organizations to help solve problems and address specific needs through a shared learning experience. Exhibit One illustrates three major factors that typically combine when a successful service-learning project occurs. Although service-learning can certainly occur in high schools and even through other organizations (e.g., religious), the focus of this article is on post-secondary education.

Several authors have empirically investigated the value of service-learning to the constituency groups involved (e.g., Brower 2011; Furlow 2010; Helm-Stevens and Griego 2009a, 2009b; Pless, Maak, and Stahl 2011, and Wilson 2008 to name a few). Some interesting items used in the questionnaire administered by Helm-Stevens and Griego (2009a) include: “I
believe I led by ‘doing’ rather than simply by ‘telling,’” and “I had a sense of ‘usefulness’ during my service learning experience.” Significant intrinsic variables analyzed by Helm-Stevens and Griego (2009b) include the relationships that developed through the project, making a difference in the lives of those involved in service-learning activities, and role modeling. These extrinsic variables exerted an influence on leadership and teaching, and subsequently predicted the students’ perception of their overall service-learning experience. Brower (2011) lists several benefits from service-learning, including enhanced understanding, trust, and self-esteem for both community and student participants, plus sustained change in student character and enhanced capacity for the community organization to be flexible and address future issues. According to Brower (2011, p.65), students develop “cognitive ability to identify, frame, and resolve unstructured problems.” Interdisciplinary service-learning projects have even been developed to help integrate two academic fields of study on one campus (i.e., marketing and environmental studies), disciplines that the authors note often display inherent tensions (Wiese and Sherman 2011).

Universities and their colleges are increasingly being held to assurance of learning standards by accreditation agencies that include learning requirements across the entire hierarchy-of-effects, from cognition through affection to conation (i.e., thinking, feeling, and doing). Based on the results reported by Helm-Stevens and Griego (2009a, b), service-learning outcomes range across the entire hierarchy. Pless, Maak, and Stahl (2011) provide a detailed content analysis of service-learning outcomes that materialized in their study at the cognitive, affective, and behavioral stages in the learning hierarchy. However, several assessment methods reported in the service-learning literature focus only on one aspect of the learning hierarchy. Whereas Dixon (2011) used service-learning in a project management undergraduate course to instill in students the Project Management Institute’s nine Knowledge Areas (i.e., cognition), Hall and Johnson (2011) focused on preparing Information Systems students to interact with end users in the real world (i.e., actual behavior, or conation). Other studies have measured the outcomes of various service-learning projects in different but reasonably compatible terms. Furlow (2010) used the “four Rs” of service-learning to assess the lessons learned by students in her class project, which are Reality, Reciprocity, Reflection, and Responsibility. From the viewpoint of a College of Business, AACSB-International requires activity-based group learning experiences in assurance of learning standards (Schwartz and Fontenot 2007).

**Service-Learning Marketing Research Projects**

Before we begin to specifically discuss service-learning marketing research (SLMR) projects, a brief overview of marketing and marketing research is warranted. According to the American Marketing Association (2007): “Marketing is the activity, set of institutions, and processes for creating, communicating, delivering, and exchanging offerings that have value for customers, clients, partners, and society at large.” This definition views marketing as a broader activity providing long term value to a host of constituency groups rather than narrowly as an exchange of money (short-term) only for the benefit of the shareholder or organization. Marketing textbooks are organized to cover four functional areas that must be managed by organizations operating to satisfy consumer needs across all industries both domestically and abroad. These four variables are known as the *marketing mix* (also called the 4-Ps), and include product, price, place (i.e., distribution channels), and promotion.
The process of determining information needs for a variety of marketing decisions, designing a set of activities necessary to gather that information, collecting the data, analyzing it, and reporting the results is marketing research. Marketing research is used to make better marketing decisions, identify and correct problems with the marketing-mix, better understand customers and competitors, and help determine the value of what the organization offers. Steps involved in the marketing research process are illustrated in Exhibit Two.

Only three papers that discuss service-learning and marketing research were discovered through our literature review (Garver, Divine and Spralls 2009; Gore 2006; Levenburg 2003), and none of them fully explains the application of service-learning marketing research class projects. Addressing that gap in the literature is our primary goal. Marketing courses are particularly well suited for service-learning projects (Berry and Workman 2007; Buff 2011; Domegan and Bringle 2010; Furlow 2010; Geringer, Stratemeyer and Canton 2008; Geringer, et al. 2009; Hagenbuch 2006; Kennett-Hensel 2010; Klink and Athaide 2004; McIntyre, Webb and Hite 2005; Metcalf 2010; Petkus Jr. 2000; Rudell 1996; Schwartz and Fontenot 2007). Many of the topics commonly discussed in marketing classes (e.g., marketing research, competitive market analysis, or target marketing) relate to needs in the business and nonprofit communities. However, we would like to make one point at this juncture: the type of SLMR project described in this manuscript can be incorporated into courses based in many disciplines, particularly social science fields such as Mass Communications, Psychology, and Sociology.

EXHIBIT TWO: Steps in the Marketing Research Process

- Define the Research Problem
- Plan the Research Design
- Determine the Sampling Procedure
- Gather the Data
- Analyze the Data
- Report the Results
It is admittedly doubtful that corporations with in-house marketing research departments need students to conduct business analysis studies on their behalf, but small firms and nonprofit organizations often do not have the resources necessary to gather and analyze information about their target markets. Wilson (2008) reports that service-learning projects “used in an undergraduate marketing course, engaged students in assisting clients to evaluate business and market growth opportunities as well as conducting marketing audits for small, local businesses (p.59).” Nonprofit organizations are often managed by individuals with technical backgrounds in social work, psychology, or nursing, yet they find their organizations confronted with a need to be more marketing-oriented in today’s competitive fundraising environment. Small business owners may have well-developed marketing knowledge, but they may also need data that does not exist at the local level or is too expensive for them to afford. Service-learning is an excellent solution for these local community needs if performed properly. Publicizing successful service-learning activities is an effective method to let the public know ways colleges and universities benefit society with taxpayer dollars.

We base the flow diagram presented in Exhibit Three on our literature review, our personal experiences, and the specific needs that can materialize when using a marketing research service-learning project as a course requirement.
Step 1: Identify the Service-Learning Project

As illustrated in Exhibit One, an overlap among faculty, students, the community, and colleges/universities is how service-learning projects are identified and subsequently implemented. Sources for service-learning projects involving marketing research can be identified both on- and off-campus. On-campus service-learning projects implemented by the authors of this manuscript include surveying alumni for both the dean of the College of Business and the Director of the University Foundation; customer satisfaction surveys for campus food service operations; and evaluating on-campus service providers to identify areas where bottlenecking and critical paths lead to dissatisfaction and service failures, including surveying customers to determine their perceptions of current offerings and ways to improve that university service (e.g., student recreation facilities). Off-campus projects administered by the authors include among others conducting a survey of downtown merchants, employees, and customers as part of a Main Street grant initiative; primary research to develop a promotional campaign for a client targeting college students; primary research to assess target markets and to help determine demand for a local business start-up; primary research to help boost participation and services for a local nonprofit organization; and annual member surveys for a regional tourism promotion agency. Area businesses, non-profit organizations, and campus entities often initiate contact seeking student help with issues they are facing, either through direct contact with faculty members or through an administrator they personally know. A more proactive approach is for faculty members themselves to become involved with community organizations through committee assignments, serving on boards of directors, and other participation in community activity outside of the classroom.

Step 2: Incorporate Requirements in Course Syllabus

The SLMR project must be written in the course syllabus. Both task and time requirements for completion should be described. One might argue that under ideal circumstances, service-learning projects will be identified and planned well ahead of the academic period and incorporated into the course syllabus before the semester begins. However, worthy service-learning projects sometimes materialize after a semester has begun yet early enough to still be a viable class activity. One way to handle this potentiality is to incorporate a generic group project in the syllabus with details to follow, making it clear at the beginning of class that a client-sponsored service-learning project is one possibility. Regardless of whether the SLMR project is known at the beginning of the semester or is an opportunity that materializes at a later date, the instructions should be as specific, clear, and practical as possible. Part of a service-learning marketing research assignment made by one author for a Main Street nonprofit survey is included in Exhibit Four as an illustration.
EXHIBIT FOUR: Syllabus Example for Service-Learning Marketing Research

Retail Management (97.350) Group Project Assignment - Fall 20XX

Students have each been assigned to one of six groups per class. Each group will conduct its research in a specific zone containing downtown merchants which have been divided into six sectors, and each sector will be questioned to determine:

(1) Owner/Manager/Employee Characteristics – interview one or two owner/managers and one or two employees per address = 3 total.

(2) Shopper Characteristics – usable interviews with 70 shoppers on the street in each zone during each day and time period in the table provided:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sunday</th>
<th>Monday</th>
<th>Tuesday</th>
<th>Wednesday</th>
<th>Thursday</th>
<th>Friday</th>
<th>Saturday</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Morning</strong></td>
<td>#?s</td>
<td>#?s</td>
<td>#?s</td>
<td>#?s</td>
<td>#?s</td>
<td>#?s</td>
<td>#?s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(8:30-11:30)</td>
<td>complete</td>
<td>complete</td>
<td>complete</td>
<td>complete</td>
<td>complete</td>
<td>complete</td>
<td>complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lunch</strong></td>
<td>#?s</td>
<td>#?s</td>
<td>#?s</td>
<td>#?s</td>
<td>#?s</td>
<td>#?s</td>
<td>#?s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(11:30-1:30)</td>
<td>complete</td>
<td>complete</td>
<td>complete</td>
<td>complete</td>
<td>complete</td>
<td>complete</td>
<td>complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Afternoon</strong></td>
<td>#?s</td>
<td>#?s</td>
<td>#?s</td>
<td>#?s</td>
<td>#?s</td>
<td>#?s</td>
<td>#?s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1:30-4:30)</td>
<td>complete</td>
<td>complete</td>
<td>complete</td>
<td>complete</td>
<td>complete</td>
<td>complete</td>
<td>complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Evening</strong></td>
<td>#?s</td>
<td>#?s</td>
<td>#?s</td>
<td>#?s</td>
<td>#?s</td>
<td>#?s</td>
<td>#?s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4:30-7:30)</td>
<td>complete</td>
<td>complete</td>
<td>complete</td>
<td>complete</td>
<td>complete</td>
<td>complete</td>
<td>complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Night</strong></td>
<td>#?s</td>
<td>#?s</td>
<td>#?s</td>
<td>#?s</td>
<td>#?s</td>
<td>#?s</td>
<td>#?s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7:30-1:30)</td>
<td>complete</td>
<td>complete</td>
<td>complete</td>
<td>complete</td>
<td>complete</td>
<td>complete</td>
<td>complete</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Students are required to produce and have approved a questionnaire for each group, go downtown, and gather data using that questionnaire. Each team should model its questionnaire according to the attached example. I will finalize one version for the entire project. Keep in mind that we will be using Scantron forms to input the data for analysis, so you will have the questionnaire on a clip-board and the form to complete in #2 pencil as you conduct your personal interviews with owners/managers/employees and downtown consumers. For the teams interviewing downtown merchants and employees, an initial phone call to establish a meeting time convenient to each owner or manager is required.

The attached questionnaire was developed by the Center for Community Economic Development and the University of Wisconsin Cooperative Extension program. Their webpage provides invaluable guidance, and is assigned reading for this project.

http://www.uwex.edu/ces/cced/dma/

The following grid defines the subject for each team:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class Time</th>
<th>Owners/Managers/Employees</th>
<th>Shoppers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>9:00-9:50 a.m.</strong></td>
<td>Team # A 1 – Merchant Zone 1</td>
<td>Team # A 2 – Merchant Zone 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(97.350.01) - A</td>
<td>Team # A 3 – Merchant Zone 2</td>
<td>Team # A 4 – Merchant Zone 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>10:00-10:50 a.m.</strong></td>
<td>Team # A 5 – Merchant Zone 3</td>
<td>Team # A 6 – Merchant Zone 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(97.350.02) - B</td>
<td>Team # B 1 – Merchant Zone 4</td>
<td>Team # B 2 – Merchant Zone 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>11:00-11:50 a.m.</strong></td>
<td>Team # B 3 – Merchant Zone 5</td>
<td>Team # B 4 – Merchant Zone 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>12:00-12:50 a.m.</strong></td>
<td>Team # B 5 – Merchant Zone 6</td>
<td>Team # B 6 – Merchant Zone 6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SCHEDULE OF DUE DATES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Due Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Survey instrument developed by</td>
<td>Friday, September 29, 20XX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey instrument printed by</td>
<td>Friday, October 6, 20XX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey implemented by</td>
<td>Friday, October 27, 20XX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey results available by</td>
<td>Friday, November 3, 20XX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey results presented by</td>
<td>Monday, November 27, 20XX</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Step 3: Obtain Human Subjects IRB Approval**

The Institutional Review Board (IRB) phenomenon began to take form during the early 1970s as universities, teaching hospitals, and academic medical centers sought to redress unacceptable research practices using human subjects such as those used by the Nazis during World War II or by the U.S. Government in the Tuskegee syphilis study (Ferraro et al. 1999;
Jenson, Mackiewicz, and Riley 2003). Title 45 of the Code of Federal Regulations mandates the use of IRBs when grant funding is involved (Hogue 1979; Jenson, Mackiewicz, and Riley 2003; Putney and Gruskin 2002). The goal is to protect human subjects from physical or emotional abuse and ensure that research proposals conform to federal Department of Health and Human Services and Food and Drug Administration guidelines (DeVille 2006). The IRB mandates voluntary subject participation with informed consent, and is particularly sensitive to concerns related to minors (younger than 18 years), pregnant women, prisoners, mentally challenged or disabled individuals, physically handicapped, those who have been institutionalized by the state, and students. Use and support for university IRBs is generally wide-spread and positive among faculty and graduate students, but not without controversy (Ferraro et al. 1999). IRB scrutiny has long been an issue related to freedom to conduct healthcare research (Hogue 1979), and Powell (2002) points out that many lawsuits have been filed against IRBs over the years.

Class assignments that include surveying human subjects require written approval by the university IRB chair, which means the principle investigator (e.g., the faculty member administering the service-learning project) must submit all required documents in a timely manner for the approval process. A cover sheet is normally required for each submission, to include date, investigator names and status (i.e., faculty, student, other), campus department, phone and e-mail addresses, funding agency if any, and review category. The IRB process requires researchers to anticipate that subjects will want to ask questions about the study to better understand its purpose and value, so contact information for the instructor and the sponsoring organization must be provided on the survey cover sheet for every respondent. Survey participants must also be given the opportunity to withdraw their participation from the study at any time during its implementation without penalty. University students used to gather data in class projects can be viewed by an IRB as subjects involved in the study and therefore required to sign informed consent forms. Risk is evident for students assigned to such a project. They might receive a bad grade for non-participation or be subjected to a rude rejection from someone refusing to participate. However, precautions taken by the instructor can effectively meet these IRB standards. Making each student aware of project details prior to the final day of drop/add will be considered in a positive light. The willingness of the instructor to assign an alternative project in the case of a student being unable to perform the tasks demanded by this project is another plus, and whether the class is required or an elective might also be a factor in the approval process.

Ferraro et al. (1999) report that: “Federal regulations classify projects as (a) being exempt from full federal human subjects review procedures, (b) qualifying for expedited review, or (c) requiring a full review (p.277).” If the results of a marketing research survey will be given to the client for use in a grant proposal, reported in a newspaper article, or made publically available in any of a myriad of possible ways, exempt status is not possible. All human subject research requires IRB approval when results will be disseminated in any form outside of the classroom. One project administered by an author of this article was granted an expedited review for two reasons: first, the market survey presented no more than minimal risks to human subjects, and second, it only involved research measuring individual or group characteristics and behavior, including perceptual, cognitive, affective, motivational, demographic, and lifestyle variables. Deception was not used, so subject debriefing was not required. Institutional Review Boards become particularly interested in studies that involve biomedical procedures, personality profiles, and behavior modification programs such as those often found in nursing, exercise science, or childhood education research. The average marketing research survey involves none of these dimensions, nor do they tend to cause discomfort, harassment, physical damage or
wounds, invasion of privacy, or threat to the dignity of subjects. Due to the lack of threatening characteristics typically found in marketing research surveys, full review is normally not necessary. Full reviews are done by all members of the review board, whereas expedited reviews normally only require input from one, two or three IRB members.

Step 4: Assign Groups

Once official approval has been granted by the local IRB, the instructor can proceed to form groups randomly or by some other means. Faculty members who have experience using group projects in their coursework will be aware of several issues that are associated with this step. One issue that must be addressed is whether students will be assigned to a group by the instructor or if they will be allowed to pick their own team members. If students are assigned to groups, how will underperforming group members be handled? One method that can be used is to enable a group to “fire” a member for just cause; an alternative is to require team members to evaluate each other at the conclusion of the project. Specific rules, requirements, and procedures must be detailed for the class as soon as possible. What will the alternatives be for a student who is fired by his or her group in terms of their grade? What grade penalties are possible for students who receive poor evaluations from team members, and how will the instructor assign the penalty? Will under- or non-performing students receive a zero for that part of the class or be allowed to make the work up somehow? Finally, how large will each team be? This could depend on the scope of the project itself, how much time is allocated for presentations at the conclusion of the project, and several other potential factors such as total course enrollment. Based on experience, we suggest that groups should typically range from three to six members. However, exceptions can always exist, so the final decision should be based on the totality of circumstances surrounding that specific SLMR project.

Step 5: Implement the Project

As previously stated, clear expectations between the instructor, students, and client organization must be established. Some clients are unable to precisely determine and/or delineate their organization’s needs related to a market research survey, and it might be difficult for an instructor to set specific goals without first-hand knowledge of the inner workings of that organization. Clients may be unable or unwilling to share certain information about their operations. Meeting with busy clients who are not on the semester timeframe can also be difficult, as can be collecting and analyzing data in a timely manner. This sometimes means that students do not see the fruits of their labor; inadequate feedback reduces the benefits that students receive from the service-learning experience, which is one of the main points of conducting the activity to begin with. Clients can be inexperienced interacting with college students, and might anticipate a level of performance that they would get from a paid consultant without fully realizing that this is a learning experience for students who are not yet professionally qualified. Projects that are one-time opportunities are learning experiences for all parties involved, including the instructor and the sponsoring organization.

Step 6: Monitor and Make Adjustments

Sometimes adjustments are necessary mid-project to address an unanticipated issue or problem. For example, one author hand selected two Honors students to conduct an alumni survey for the Executive Director of the University Foundation. Both of these students were
seniors about to graduate that semester, and the author had worked with each for over two years in various capacities. A clear description of the project and timeline for accomplishing tasks had been developed by the faculty member, Executive Director, and both students to complete the official paperwork required for approval of the independent studies. Unfortunately, these two senior Honors students did not begin the survey in a timely manner. Problems arose when the Executive Director requested a preliminary update on responses and found out the questionnaires had not been distributed approximately three weeks after they were scheduled to be mailed. Given past experience, the author expected these two students to implement the survey without tight control. Closer monitoring could have prevented this problem, plus any associated with client non-participation as well.

**Step 7: Evaluate Students**

Several methods for evaluating service-learning projects are discussed in the literature (e.g., written reflective narratives). Exams are another viable method. Part of the Main Street assignment previously illustrated included reading several articles related to the history and progress of Main Street programs across America, familiarity with the website used to develop the three questionnaires adapted for that survey, plus knowing the content of each questionnaire. One examination was dedicated to this material to measure individual performance. Group performance had two dimensions: total group output and individual member output. Each group was assigned a specific section of town and given a quota for completed questionnaires, and the grade for that group was based on that outcome. Each questionnaire required a signature by the student administering it; individual evaluations were made by the instructor at the end of the project based on these signatures (see Exhibit Five). Finally, team member evaluation forms were required from all students before their final grade was distributed.
Step 8: Report Results to Community Organization

Once the data has been gathered and analyzed, it must be put in report form and presented to the client. Several methods have been used by the authors to perform this task, including but not necessarily limited to: the faculty member writes a report and gives it to the appropriate person at the client organization; the faculty member reports the results at a meeting to the Executive Director and Board of Directors with handouts; key personnel are invited to campus for class or a special session wherein individual students or groups present the results of their work in a Power Point slide show with handouts; a round-table discussion of the study is conducted involving the faculty member, students, and key personnel from the client organization; video tapes of focus group sessions are produced and given to the client; and finally, raw quantitative data is furnished to the client in electronic form for their own analysis. In certain circumstances, the faculty member should stress the need for confidentiality to the student participants.

Step 9: Publicize Project Internally and Externally

A final and very important step in this process is to publicize the service work done by students to various constituency groups, both on and off campus. The authors have experienced this result through the following methods: the client writes a press release to the
local newspaper; the faculty member and/or client writes an article or editorial letter featuring details of the work; the client thanks the faculty member and students in an internal newsletter distributed weekly, monthly, or quarterly to members of the organization (e.g., downtown retailers who are members of the local Main Street nonprofit); the client discusses the work done by students in an interview on a local radio show; a summary of the work is featured in an appropriate section on the university website; and finally, students present their analysis during research week in a campus-wide poster session. There are other channels to publicize SLMR projects as well that have not been experienced by the authors. For example, perhaps the university Public Relations department can assist by preparing and distributing a press release or feature story.

Conclusion

Incorporating service-learning projects across curricula in higher education is both possible and desirable. We know marketing students benefit through service-learning (Joseph et al. 2007; Mottner 2010; Rudell 1996). One very plausible area discussed by few articles other than ours is through the use of service-learning marketing research projects, which can easily fit a variety of courses if well-designed (even in other disciplines). Giving value back to the community through service-learning projects that simultaneously help educate students at cognitive, affective, and conative levels is one way academia can positively contribute to society. With a much larger proportion of households sending their children to college after high school; with more adults returning to college to finish or further their formal education; with the cost of attending school at the university level dramatically increasing, the pressure for higher education to provide more value to students and other constituency groups will inevitably continue to grow. Hopefully, we have provided a useful model with an array of examples that will encourage more faculty members to use marketing research service-learning projects as required course components. In this way everybody benefits, particularly students.
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Using Service-Learning to Increase Pre-Service Teachers’ Sense of Self-Efficacy Regarding Parent Involvement

Diana Brannon

More than ever before, there is a discrepancy between today’s new teachers and the students that they teach. According to The Condition of Education 2010, a report on today’s schools produced by the U.S. Department of Education, 83% of classroom teachers are White, while only 55% of classroom students are White (Aud, Hussar, Planty, Snyder, Bianco, Fox, Frohlich, Kemp, & Drake, 2010). Although the face of the American classroom has changed, little has changed regarding the face of the typical American school teacher. In the early 1990s, Zimpher & Ashburn (1992) described the typical pre-service teacher as a female from a small town or suburban community who attends college less than 100 miles from home and intends to return to small-town America to teach middle-income children of average intelligence in traditionally organized schools.

*The reality of today’s schools is dramatically different than the experiences and expectations of many pre-service teachers. Darling Hammond (2006) explains: In the classrooms most beginning teachers will enter, at least 25% of students live in poverty and many of them lack basic food, shelter, and healthcare; from...*
10% to 20% have identified learning differences, 15% speak a language other than English as their primary language (many more in urban settings); and about 40% are members of racial / ethnic ‘minority groups’, many of them recent immigrants from countries with different educational systems and cultural traditions (p. 301).

The number of children who are English Language Learners (ELL) in today’s classrooms continues to rise. The ELL population has grown almost 105% compared to 12% of the general school population since the 1990-1991 school year. These children are at a distinct disadvantage academically to their English speaking counterparts. There is about a 25 point difference between fourth, eighth and tenth grade students’ average reading scores for students who typically speak a language other than English in the home (Tienda & Mitchell, 2006). Hispanic Americans represent the largest growing ethnic group and are expected to represent 25% of the school population by 2025 (President’s Advisory Commission, 2000). When studying perceptions of new teachers regarding their preparation to teach ELL students, O’Neal, Ringler, and Rodriguez (2008) found that although many teachers felt topics related to teaching ELL students were “woven” into their courses, they did not feel what was covered was ample to effectively prepare them to teach ELL students.

In addition to lacking culturally diverse experiences and knowledge, most pre-service teachers have very limited interactions with the families they serve. This lack of interaction often makes pre-service teachers fear the unknown (Casper, 2011). Pre-service teachers often express concerns about the quality of the teacher–family relationship and the role of parents in education (Baum and McMurray- Schwarz, 2004). Language and cultural barriers only intensify pre-service teachers’ reservations. Lack of teacher training is one of the most frequently cited barriers practicing teachers cite to parent involvement (Gonzalez-DeHass & Willems, 2003).

Parent involvement is key to children’s success in school. Parent involvement includes a wide variety of actions including parenting, communicating, volunteering, learning at home, decision making, and collaborating with the community (Epstein, 2008). Parent involvement has many benefits. Involved parents have children who earn higher grades, have better school attendance, increased graduation rates, and higher test scores (Henderson and Mapp, 2002). Parent involvement in schools and their children’s education not only benefits the children, it also benefits teachers and the community. Schools that have effective parent involvement programs enjoy increased parent support, improved teacher moral, and a better reputation in the community (Epstein & Dauber, 1991). Parent involvement also results in an increased sense of community for parents and teachers (Belenardo, 2001).

Unfortunately, there is a disconnect between today’s pre-service teachers’ lives and school experiences and those of their students and families. Service-learning in diverse and economically disadvantaged settings can help pre-service teachers get much needed experience, confront their own biases, learn to view things from other perspectives, provide enlightenment regarding social injustices and discrimination, and encourage cultural appreciation (Chang, Anagnostopoulos, & Omea, 2011). It can also help pre-service teachers gain confidence about teaching children from diverse backgrounds (Bollin, 2007).

Immersing pre-service teachers in diverse and economically disadvantaged settings through well supported service-learning experiences can help dispel many of the myths and misconceptions that pre-service teachers often believe about these populations. Service-learning can also empower pre-service teachers with a knowledge of their ability to be agents of change (Hale, 2008). The more diverse experiences teacher candidates have, the more likely they are to appreciate and show sensitivity to other cultures. These experiences can help
reduce the fear of the unknown or unfamiliar that many preservice teachers face and help teachers see diversity as a resource rather than a problem or obstacle (Kyles & Olafson, 2008).

**Present Study**

The aim of the present study was to provide multicultural service-learning experiences to pre-service teachers from a small liberal arts college in Illinois in order to see if service-learning experiences could be used to increase pre-service teachers’ sense of self-efficacy regarding parent involvement. The project was designed to increase:

- pre-service teachers’ exposure to the economic, social, family, and ethnic issues of high-need schools;
- pre-service teachers’ opportunities to work with students and families at high-need schools;
- professional development for pre-service teachers at high-need schools;
- pre-service teachers’ involvement in encouraging math skills at school and home;
- parents' knowledge of math strategies to use with their young children; and,
- children’s mathematical interactions with their parents or primary caregivers.

**Method**

**Participants**

Nine sophomore and junior pre-service teachers participated in the study. They were native English speakers. Six of them had taken some Spanish in high school. One had taken French.

**Procedure**

A series of four math nights were conducted at various elementary schools in a small district located about 20 miles from Chicago. The district serves a population of students and families who have been classified as “high-need” due to the number of low-income students and students with limited English proficiency. Each math night focused on a different grade level serving kindergarten, first, second, and third grade families. The family nights were held once a month over a semester at various schools throughout the district to provide parent training across the district and to expose pre-service teachers to the wide variety of families in the district.

Each family night lasted for 2 hours and began with a light dinner and a brief presentation for parents. After that, pre-service teachers and parents interacted with their children applying what was learned from the presentation at math centers. At the conclusion of each event children and parents were provided with materials and an at-home activity to help reinforce what was learned and to encourage families to continue working together at home.

Pre-service teachers were asked to fill out a 10 question self-efficacy survey based on a 5 point scale before and after their participation in the parent nights. They also kept reflection journals and were interviewed at the end of the semester about their most memorable experiences, their expectations going into the study, how their expectations regarding families compared to reality, and what they learned.
Parents were asked to complete a brief survey about their beliefs regarding education at the beginning of the evening. This information was shared with students after each event to help provide an opportunity for reflection and discussion. Average scores of parents’ responses were calculated across all four parent nights for our final debriefing meeting.

**Results**

The program resulted in an increase in pre-service teachers’ comfort level working with high-need and ELL parents, as seen in Table 1. Pre-service teachers indicated a significant increase in their knowledge, understanding of issues related to working with high-need families, confidence, and ability to provide suggestions and engagement for the families.

It is interesting to note that pre-service teachers experienced significant gains in many areas. However, there was a non-significant decline in teachers’ comfort level providing parent education and encouraging parent involvement when they begin teaching. This can likely be attributed to a more realistic understanding of the difficulty of attaining and sustaining parent involvement.
Table 1: Pre-Service Teachers’ Survey Results Regarding Working with ELL Parents and High-Need Families During the Math Nights (on a 5 point scale, 5 = Strongly Agree)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Initial Response</th>
<th>Post Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I am comfortable with the thought of working with my students’ parents.</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I know how to teach any parents about their role in their child’s education.</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>4.0 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is my responsibility to help all parents learn how to work with their children.</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I understand issues related to working with high-need families.</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>4.1 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel confident in my ability to communicate with my students’ parents.</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel confident in my ability to provide parents suggestions for working with their child.</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>4.4 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel confident in my ability to involve parents in their child’s education.</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am confident in my ability to work with ELL and high-need families.</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>4.3 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I know easy ways to involve parents in their child’s education.</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>4.6 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am comfortable with the idea of providing parent education and encouraging parent involvement for parents when I begin teaching.</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Note: p < .05

Student Reflections

At the end of each parent night, after the families had left, students shared their thoughts, feelings, questions, and experiences. This provided a time for students to process the experience and learn from the experiences of others. Students were also interviewed at the end of the semester and asked to reflect upon their experiences. Interview responses were analyzed and common themes were identified.

One of the most interesting things that the experience provided was an opportunity for the students to confront their stereotypes of “high-need” families. Addressing stereotypes is essential for pre- and in-service teachers. Teachers who rely on stereotypes risk letting biases work to their disadvantage and the disadvantage of their students and families (Cook-Sather & Reisinger, 2001). Service-learning experiences have been found to be effective in helping pre-service teachers recognize their biases (Chang, Anagnostopoulos, & Omae, 2011; Cooper, 2007). This can be seen in the reflections of several of the pre-service teachers in the study:

I didn’t realize how many parents cared about their children. I just assumed that because they were considered high-needs they wouldn’t show up. But there were, as time went on, more parents who came. And, you can tell that they are really dedicated to their student’s learning. That was one thing that I learned.

Another participant shared a similar sentiment:
I just didn’t think that they would be sitting down with their children. I guess that’s a bad stereotype to say. I just thought that they would be just not doing anything with them. I guess I just thought that they were just going to be not really involved in the process at all, just kind of standoffish.

I learned that the parents are willing to do more with their children and that they just don’t know how to go about doing certain things like the games. They seemed really engaged with their student and making the craft or what not.

Another student addressed her preconceived notions of the school environment:

I was expecting it to look a little bit different. I was expecting it to be more rundown, more in need of a paint job. You know, it was very well kept. The library had a lot of books which was one of the things I always think of in high-needs schools is that the library needs a lot of help. So, I was expecting a smaller library. I was just expecting it to be different.

Several of the pre-service teachers talked about being afraid or intimidated by working not only in an unfamiliar cultural environment, but also by working with parents because of their limited experience. This is not unusual for pre-service teachers. Baum & McMurray-Schwarz (2004) found when surveying pre-service teachers that they were concerned about the quality of the teacher–family relationship, meeting children’s basic needs in school, and the role of parents in education. The pre-service teachers in this study had similar concerns. A common sentiment was shared by this student:

I was apprehensive at first working with parents in general, let alone high-needs parents. But, I realize now that they want to help their children. They just may not know how to go about doing it. There are so many different ways that you as a teacher can help parents and bring parents in. It’s very beneficial, not only to you but to the children and the classroom environment. It may take some of your time but it will be well worth it in the end.

Service-learning experiences have the potential to be much more meaningful than traditional field experiences because they provide opportunities often outside of the realm of traditional field experiences (Pappamihiel, 2007). This was often commented upon by students including a student who shared:

Just being more comfortable with parents and children and working with them together helps. Usually, you know, you are just with the children, like in the classroom, so you don’t know how to include the parents in the conversation. You get to praise the student in front of their parents. I think that it is important because, you know, parents are encouraged by that. So, just getting to see and figure out how to work with both of them at the same time is helpful. That’s a great opportunity most students don’t get.

On-site school personnel are invaluable in making service-learning experiences successful. Supportive personnel can help pre-service teachers address inequalities and learn to navigate environments that are often dramatically different than students have previously
experienced (Chang, Anagnostopoulos, & Omae, 2011). The need for support from others was a common theme:

I think my attitude has changed in the sense I am a little more comfortable in it. Before I really didn’t know what to expect but now I am realizing that you can fall back on other people to help you. That they want to be there as much as you. It is kind of like a team effort I guess.

I learned how to interact with the parents, you know, especially those who don’t speak English. I learned how to use more visuals and talking with the student and the parent together. I also learned how to work with the other teachers or people I was working with to help me communicate with and learn about the parents.

In addition to identifying the importance of finding supportive school personnel, students learned that building relationships with the families helped ease fears, anxieties, and encouraged success. Through building relationships with families, students were able to develop an appreciation for different cultures and the struggles of others. This result is clearly supported by research. Several studies of pre-service teachers involved in multicultural service-learning found that service-learning experiences can help develop pre-service teachers’ appreciation for cultural diversity and result in an interest to work with low-income and diverse students (Baldwin, Buchanan, & Rudisill, 2007; Brown, 2004; Conner, 2010). One example of this from our study is a student who shared:

There was this one lady who had two children and she was telling me how she was going to school at night after work to learn English. She was telling me how her daughter is also like her teacher because she’s teaching her mom how to speak English. So, just how much she’s come from. She just started doing it. I think it was this year or the year before that she started taking classes and we were already able to talk to each other and communicate with each other. The gains that she has made in speaking English are amazing. Her daughter was like, ‘I want to be a teacher now because, you know, now I am helping my mom so much. I just love doing this’. The little girl was in 2nd grade and it was just unbelievable to me. I was amazed. I admired her for doing that. I was like, ‘Wow’. The effort that she put into it. I was thinking, if I was a parent who walked into Mexico and I didn’t speak Spanish at all and everybody around there spoke that language, I don’t know what I’d do. In order to help my children succeed and be able to be a functional part of that society, I would have to learn how to speak that language. But, I had a hard enough time learning it in high school let alone working, having kids, and going back to school to learn it.

Although this experience did build students’ confidence about working with “high-need” parents and their children, it is only the first step towards true cultural awareness and appreciation. Many experiences with a wide variety of types of families are needed to truly empower pre-service teachers to effectively engage families (Baum & Swick, 2008). As one student explained:

I was nervous at the start. I was really apprehensive. I still am to a certain degree, but I think that this experience has helped. I have gained confidence knowing that we are on the same page with a lot of the families. I would have liked to have more experience. So,
I still am apprehensive. I am going to be honest, but it did help me come out of my shell a little bit since I have never had this experience before. Just to know that they’re there and care about their students gave me confidence.

Another student provided insights into the benefits of a variety of experiences:

They're not as scary as I had maybe thought that they were. I think when the parents know you are trying and giving it your best, that makes them feel comfortable. I don’t know, I just feel more comfortable. The more parents you are around, the more comfortable you feel. But, you need exposure, especially when there is that language barrier.

Baum and Swick (2008) conclude that students need prolonged, consistent and meaningful interactions with families to help students have an appropriate understanding of family context and an ample time to reflect about the interactions over time. Reflection provides time for the “transformational learning” that is the aim of any service-learning experience (Carrington & Selva, 2010).

Parent Surveys

In order for students to learn more about the parents’ beliefs about education, we gave a very brief survey including a 5-point scale asking parents to share their thoughts. Survey results were shared with pre-service teachers at the end of each family night. Average scores of parents’ responses were calculated across all four parent nights for our final debriefing meeting (Table 2).

**Table 2 Average Scores for ELL Parent Surveys Regarding Feelings about School Involvement (on a 5 point scale, 5 = Strongly Agree)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ELL Parents’ Responses</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My child’s motivation to do well in school depends on me.</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working with my child at home each night on schoolwork is important.</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents and teachers should work together to help children learn.</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I know how to help my child do well in school.</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would like to learn more about how to teach my child at home.</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Parents consistently expressed a desire to work with their children and an appreciation for the importance of school. However, Table 2 also shows that parents of children even as young as kindergarten still expressed confusion or uncertainty about how to help.

The information from the parent surveys proved very meaningful for the students. Some of the insights shared regarding the survey data shared after the first parent night include:

The parents really do want to help their student. I didn’t really think they would know that school was important. They do. Many of them just don’t know what to do. I didn’t think that they would think working with their child is important. They really seem interested in helping.
This again shows the issue of stereotypes that needed to be addressed throughout the study. Although the attitudes of pre-service students were positively influenced over the term of the semester, this study represents only one small step in encouraging cultural awareness and appreciation. Daniel Solorzano (1997) suggests the need for teacher educators to provide multiple examples and experiences within and about communities of color that can help confront and challenge racial stereotypes. Service-learning can be used for such opportunities.

**Conclusion**

The parent nights were successful in helping pre-service teachers confront their biases and fears. They were an effective way to help begin a discussion about working with parents and families who are different from themselves. As students explained:

*I think that parents sometimes think that there’s this barrier between when the teacher is involved and when the parent is supposed to be involved. Teachers want them to be involved. So, it’s a matter of saying to your parents, ‘I do want you to be involved’. I think that will help break down that barrier. So, I am going to remember that when I become a teacher because I just want to make sure that I tell them in the beginning, ‘I want you to be involved in this process. I want us to be partners.’*

*I am a lot more open to getting parents involved. I would like to get parents more involved in the classroom because I think they want to get involved, they just don’t know how. The biggest thing that I learned with working with ESL and high-need families through the parent night was that I was always under the impression that high-needs families are kind of the families who don’t really get involved in their students’ education because they work so much or they’re just not interested because they had bad experiences with their education. But, what I noticed was that many of them are working hard to try to learn English and taking their kids to activities and working on reading.*

Limited interactions with parents over one semester cannot hope to make long lasting changes in students’ attitudes and behaviors. Participating in a variety of service-learning opportunities throughout their college experience is needed to make long-term changes in pre-service teachers’ attitudes and behaviors that can positively influence pre-service teachers’ behaviors and choices in the future. However, this program provided an initial vehicle for discussion and reflection for our students. It was a way for our students to see their students and families as not only learners, but also teachers (Donahue, Bowyer, & Rosenberg, 2003).
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How Are We Doing? Making Service-Learning Assessment Simple

Michael A. Moulton and Patrice Moulton

So, who says that assessment always has to be difficult and painful or a useless exercise other than to catch dust on the bookshelf? It does not have to be any of the above. This article is written to provide the reader with a simple “menu” mindset when thinking about how to best document the success of latest creative service-learning project. There are a few basic standards to work by when considering assessment that serve as the backbone for many other significantly complicated models. This article will provide you with the ABC’s of assessment and take the pain out of planning the evaluation plan of your next project! A model for planning assessment is proposed with examples and worksheet provided. The point is to learn the basics, learn how to use components that are easily built in as support data for continuation, justification for adjustment, or re-defining future use of limited resources. It is imperative that assessment be simple and meaningful.

The University of Minnesota (2012) outlined its service-learning as a direct experience applying content, ideas and issues discussed in a class through volunteering at a community organization. While Missouri State University (2012) has options for students to earn academic credit in selected courses in exchange for meaningful and productive community service. The definition of service-learning by the national clearinghouse on service-learning suggested,
“Service-Learning is a teaching and learning strategy that integrates meaningful community service with instruction and reflection to enrich the learning experience, teach civic responsibility, and strengthen communities” (2012). Students learn concepts in the classroom and then integrate traditional academic work with community-based service projects. Therefore, service-learning allows educational systems the opportunity to use structured community service activities rather than traditional classrooms to gain further understanding of course content (Anderson, 2002; McDonald, Caso, & Fugit, 2005; Poulin, Silver, & Kauffman, 2006; Roos et al., 2005; Shastri, 2001; Whitbourne, Collins, & Skultety, 2001). Jacobson, J., Oravecz, L., Falk, A., & Osteen, P. (2011) believed that service-learning can assist institutions in meeting community based missions.

Recently, the former UL System President, Randy Moffett stated that, “Many people confuse service-learning with volunteerism, but in reality there is a strong academic component involved with service-learning. College and university students are taking what they learn in the classroom and are applying it in real-world situations while volunteering in their communities.” It can be a bit confusing when trying to wrestle with how to plan, implement, and assess an activity that is, at best, complex and multilayered. What appears to be rather consistent in all the definitions are the marriage of the constructs of instruction to students, service, and community. With these components in mind, regardless of how you line them up, you can begin to think about specific steps (see Figure 1) of approaching assessment of service-learning projects.

**Figure 1. Steps in Developing a Service-Learning Project**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholders</th>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Objectives</th>
<th>Strategies</th>
<th>Assessment</th>
<th>Results</th>
<th>Review</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

The first step is to clearly identify primary stakeholders for your project. Meaning, who will stand to gain from this experience? With this in mind it is hopeful that minimally you will be addressing a group of students and the target population they will serve. You might also consider faculty, department, university, and the larger community at hand. Once you have identified your stakeholders you are ready to consider your overall goal for the project by asking yourself: “What is it that I really want to see happen as a result of successful completion?” You are encouraged to think about this in rather altruistic terms that include the impact expected by pairing your students, a specified module of curriculum knowledge, and a population in need. While you do not need to go as far as “world peace”, it is very appropriate to consider the greater impact of hands on learning through serving such as character building, awareness, partnerships, solving real-life problems to enhance communities, etc.

After determining the greater good of your project you will be ready to determine the objectives. It is not necessary to go overboard or to even try to name every possible outcome
wished for. Instead, it is good to simply ask yourself: “What does each stakeholder need to know or do at the end of this project for it to be successful?” Just one or two primary objectives for each of the stakeholders are appropriate. Objectives may be what are called process objectives, meaning those that are relational in nature. Process objectives are often used when a construct is more difficult to measure qualitatively. Examples may include ideas such as quality of academic experience, enhanced relationships, professional development, or perception.

Content objectives, on the other hand, are often learning or fact based. These objectives will often be tied to the learning outcomes of your service learning curriculum. Examples could include unit curriculum objectives, critical thinking, mastery of observable skills, or completion of academic requirements towards a given goal.

Lastly, some objectives may be what are referred to as impact objectives. This type of objective is often related to the longer-term benefits of the shared knowledge through service by students. For instance, objectives such as financial impact, dollars raised in fundraising, student retention or graduation rates.

There is not a formula for the type of objectives chosen, just that you can reasonably tie the completion of the combined objectives (project outcomes) to a successful experience (meeting your goal). At this point you may want to sit back, review your stakeholders and objectives and ask yourself: “If each of these stakeholder groups succeeded in accomplishing the stated knowledge or behaviors would the project be successful? Would the goal be met? Look for gaps and fill in objectives as needed.

Now, some may be wondering…”How would I know? What evidence would show success?” The answer is in thinking about what data or evidence can be at your fingertips by simply carrying out your project. Each objective likely has assessment value easily built in. The question to ask when determining assessment is: What evidence will show that the objective will be complete and successful and are there any methods readily available. “Do ability” is the key to the assessment step. For instance, if the objective is curriculum based, then if you have a grade or a portfolio piece required simply utilize it. If you have meetings with your community partner anyway, build in a 30 minute focus group. If your objective includes retention and your university provides retention data through institutional research request that the report include numbers for your class so you can compare to other classes. The more ambiguous your objective (i.e. awareness, responsibility, sensitivity), the more likely you will need to develop a brief list of specific focus questions to gather some qualitative data either through a focus group or interview. Remember that your outcomes will typically be in the form of data, product, knowledge, behavior, or perception. Below (see Figure 2) is a list of possible assessment methods for your consideration.
The steps in assessment planning are made much easier when you think through the process in a series of logical steps. Each component requires asking and answering a single question (see Figure 3) that when added up the lists of questions comprise the details of your service-learning project.
Figure 3. Service-Learning Steps with Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholders</th>
<th>Who will stand to gain from this experience?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goal</td>
<td>What is it that I really want to see happen as a result of successful completion?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objectives</td>
<td>What does each stakeholder need to know or do at the end of this project for it to be successful?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategies</td>
<td>What specific steps need to be taken, by who, and when to make this project happen successfully?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td>What evidence would demonstrate success?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following assessment worksheet is a sample completed for your consideration based on a project implemented last year by graduate students completing a master's degree in clinical psychology at Northwestern State University. The partnership was between the psychology department, the university counseling center, and the student body community.

The students are required to complete academic courses related to both diagnosis of mental health disorders and assessment. In order to allow students real life experience as part of their training a service-learning activity was planned specifically around the training of assessment of depressive disorders. National Depression Screening Day is hosted by America Mental Health Organization during Mental Illness Awareness Week each October. It is designed to increase awareness to the illness of depression on a national level, educate the public, offer individuals the opportunity to be screened, and refer those in need of treatment to the mental health care system. The graduate program partnered with the university counseling center to hold a depression screening day at the student union with the graduate student providing the screenings under the direction of clinical supervisors and making appropriate referrals to the university counseling center when indicated. The following is provided as a sample of an assessment plan worksheet (see Figure 4) for the National Depression Screening Day service-learning project.
Figure 4. Service-Learning Assessment Plan Worksheet

SAMPLE ASSESSMENT PLAN

PROJECT TITLE: National Depression Screening Day

PRIMARY STAKEHOLDERS:
1. Graduate Students- Department of Psychology
2. NSU Student Body
3. University Counseling center
4. Northwestern State University

PROJECT GOAL: To increase the clinical psychology graduate students involvement with the campus community and participation in national prevention efforts through implementation of professional skills to include screening and referral for National Depression Screening Day for Northwestern State University.

OBJECTIVES:

Stakeholder 1. Graduate Students – Department of Psychology

Objective 1.1 Graduate students will develop and evidence a mastery of DSM IV-R Depressive Disorder Diagnosis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grade from unit curriculum on depressive disorders</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Objective 1.2 Graduate students will utilize knowledge and practice to conduct depression screening effectively in order to make appropriate referrals to the university counseling center.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Performance skill set grade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practice video in portfolio</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Objective 1.3 Graduate students will remain engaged in curriculum and complete graduate program successfully.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graduate student perception survey</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Stakeholder 2 NSU Student Body

Objective 2.1 The NSU student body will be given the opportunity to complete screenings to identify those students in need of referral to the NSU counseling center for assessment and/or treatment.
Assessment | # of students screened | # of students referred for assessment

Stakeholder 3 University Counseling Center
Objective 3.1 The counseling center will provide additional depression assessment, diagnosis, and treatment based on the graduate students screening and referrals to address campus mental health.

Assessment | # of referrals obtaining services | Follow-up focus group between graduate students and counseling center staff

Stakeholder 4 Northwestern State University
Objective 4.1 Increase graduate student retention through increased knowledge, real world application in career field, and enhanced professional relationships with faculty and staff.

Assessment | Retention data for first to second year of graduate school clinical psychology students

STRATEGIES
Strategies are the specific steps needed to accomplish the goal. They are broken down by each objective, are very specific and are accompanied by an identified responsible party and also a due date. When your strategies are strung together, they should represent each step of your project from beginning to end. Specific strategies are not identified for this example since they are very specific in nature to each project.

RESULTS & RECOMMENDATIONS
After completion of the project and assessment it is important to document the results of your project in a simple report format and to use these results to suggest continuation, modifications, or re-direction for the future. These actions provide professional closure to the project.

In order for assessment to be complete, you should at least consider both formative and summative alternatives. Summative evaluation is referred to as data reviewed as an end product or summing up, whereas formative evaluation is intended to help both student and teacher focus on learning experiences needed to move towards mastery of a subject and occur through a process (Aiken & Groth-Marnat 2006). In addition remember that assessment can be completed for any and all stakeholders, it is not complete if you only assess the students involved, the target population that is served is a wonderful source of information. A complete assessment includes moving beyond simply gathering the results and reporting (see Figure 5).
A successful project includes assessment of progress throughout implementation and follow-up upon completion. This continuation of planning is called a continuous planning cycle or “closing the gap”. It simply means that after the project is complete and all results are gathered that you sit with others invested in the success or continuation of service-learning efforts and review all the information to make informed decisions regarding future direction. If your project was a one-time event, then is allows you to document in a way that can be used for faculty, departmental, or university reporting. It may also be used for research presentations or publications. The review may lead to a recommendation for continuation or repeat of the project with improvements or expansion. Other modifications may be made based on lessons learned or the project resources may be re-directed if results do not warrant the use of time, expertise, and funding. Remember that documentation of your efforts and strong assessment data can often lead to justification for additional funding through the university, department, or grants. The information gathered assists in making decisions about allocation of time, energy, people, and funding.
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Pre-Service Teachers Serving Students: Service-Learning Through Virtual Tutoring: A Case Study

Cynthia B. Vavasseur, Courtney R. Hebert, and Tobey S. Naquin

Service-learning in teacher education programs is a growing trend in universities around the world. Coffey (2011) states that the number of higher education institutions using service-learning programs has greatly increased within the last twenty years, and teacher education programs are using them to help teacher candidates achieve an awareness of social and community issues. For some, the rationale for including service-learning within teacher education programs dates back to John Dewey, who believed the best way for the teacher to learn was to provide the candidate with experiences by which they could facilitate their own learning (1938). Later, the Citizen Education Project from the 1950s articulated the need of participation within the community (Daniels, 2011). The current study is intended to enhance the teacher education program at a selected higher education institution in the South by serving as a method for increased learning opportunities, while providing non-traditional learning opportunities for both collegiate teacher education candidates and elementary level students (Karayan, 2005). The model described also provides the chance for candidates to meet and interact with community members outside of their normal environment (Coffey, 2011). Furthermore, it “responds to the call for higher education to improve the quality and productivity of instruction” (Driscoll, 2011, p.66).

ABSTRACT

This study details the experiences from a pilot program aimed at virtually pairing pre-service teacher education candidates with fifth grade students for the purposes of raising achievement and creating meaningful field experiences. Researchers paired the difficulties of traditional field experiences with the difficulties in vocabulary comprehension for at-risk students to reach a solution of service-learning through virtual tutoring. Junior and senior level pre-service candidates majoring in middle school education used videoconferencing to tutor fifth grade students in vocabulary at a nearby elementary school. Results suggest that the pilot program provided increased student achievement for elementary students as well as increased satisfaction concerning field experiences for pre-service teachers.
The rationale for service-learning within the realm of teacher education can be argued from studies which cite positive teacher candidate impacts from such programs. One common problem area in teacher education programs involves providing meaningful field experiences to pre-service teachers. Often, the experience hours completed by candidates involve primarily observation, which while certainly necessary, become less meaningful after observing the same activity multiple times. There is certainly value in learning how to teach by watching others; however, it is necessary for candidates to learn through meaningful interactions with students as well. Candidates want to be able to interact with both teachers and students, not simply to observe them.

Often, a lack of developmentally appropriate vocabulary skills is a factor for students at the elementary level to struggle in reading comprehension. Students are rarely exposed to extensive vocabulary in traditional vocabulary acquisition programs. As a result of the lack of exposure, students fail to develop strong reading skills and a well-developed vocabulary bank. In addition, elementary students often lack individualized attention or mentoring relationships with literacy instruction. This study explores how technology can aid in the progression of reading skills with young learners. Researchers are not in agreement as to how important a role technology plays in the development of vocabulary when delivered on a one-on-one basis (Houge, 2009).

The researchers blended the ideas of service-learning, meaningful field experiences, and vocabulary acquisition through non-traditional means to develop a virtual field experience pilot program. The purpose of this study was to discover the benefits and drawbacks of a virtual field experience in which pre-service teachers tutored fifth grade students on a particular topic. The aim of the researchers was to record first-hand experiences from pre-service teachers, one classroom teacher, and her participating students while participating in a virtual field experience pilot program. Through a non-traditional program, pre-service teachers provided one-on-one tutoring to individual students through videoconferencing. Through a mixed method case study design, this research strove to answer the following:

• Can a service-learning program that pairs pre-service teachers with fifth grade students be an effective medium to “virtually” tutor students in vocabulary acquisition, thereby increasing the students’ achievement?
• What effect does a virtual tutoring and mentoring program have on pre-service teachers as a mean of providing meaningful field experiences?

The following literature review explores the three above areas: service-learning in pre-service teacher education programs, field experiences in pre-service teacher education programs, and videoconferencing as a means for tutoring young students.

**Literature Review**

**Service-learning in Pre-service Teacher Education Programs**

While there are many varying definitions of service-learning, Daniels, Patterson, and Dunston (2011) define it “as a teaching and learning strategy that integrates meaningful community service with instruction and reflection to enrich the learning experience, teach civic responsibility, and strengthen communities.” The major themes that show up in the literature about service-learning concern the rationale, the benefits and challenges, and the components that service-learning should include.

It would seem that any service-learning opportunity would be beneficial to all parties served, but some would argue that there could be disadvantages (*not challenges*) with the
misuse of service-learning (Coffey, 2011). Additionally, Coffey claims that “in order for service-learning to be meaningful, participants must not only provide service, but must also examine the conditions that exist within society that create the need for service organizations” (2011). Authors agree that while there are challenges (not disadvantages) associated with service-learning, “the benefits outweigh the challenges involved” (Anderson, 1998, p.11). Some challenges noted by Anderson, such as the “already overcrowded curriculum,” (p.5) the trouble of organizing school sites to complete service, and relating the service-learning to state and national accreditation standards (1998) are realistic challenges that any service-learning program could face. Despite these challenges, the study completed by Anderson and Pickeral (1998) showed evidence that most teachers are able to overcome these barriers and incorporate successful service-learning activities. In another study, Daniels, Patterson, and Dunston (2011), state that service-learning programs are effective in changing the attitudes and beliefs of candidates and in increasing their awareness of social justice. This same study also showed academic growth of the students who participated in service-learning programs, specifically in the areas of critical thinking and writing skills.

In order for the service-learning program to work effectively, researchers claim that there need to be certain components within the program. Karayan and Gathercoal recommend that all service-learning programs should include distinguishing criteria between service and community learning, some type of “assessment, evaluation and reporting process,” instruments that measure the programs impact on all parties, and acknowledgment that a “relationship between service-learning activities and standards-based reform” are important to the continuation of these activities (2005, p.80). Others go into much greater detail as to what the definition of service-learning should include. For example, Daniels, Patterson, and Dunston (2011) have four very distinct components that are essential to the success of any program: students must actively participate in a program that meets actual needs, the program must be an integral part of their curriculum and allow them time to reflect on what they did, must give students the ability to use learned skills in real situations, and the program must extend what is being learned within the classroom to the community.

The promotion of technology within education has prompted major changes for public schools systems and teacher education programs alike. These changes "have forced educational reform, including the development of a new educational paradigm for online distance education" (Strait, 2004, p.62). Teacher education programs have found barriers when including a service component to online courses. The major barriers for service learning in online courses are: targeting the community in which the candidates provide the service, documenting services provided, and connecting online curriculums to service learning (Gibbons, 2012). However, these issues do not negate the potential that online service learning can provide to students. The advantages of using technology to foster the online service aspect of teacher education programs is that "when combined with pedagogies that foster the development of critical dialogue, personal insight, and active engagement, such technologies can extend learning beyond regional confines and identities to enable individual growth and to increase capacities for understanding and awareness" (Guthrie, 2010, p.1). Additionally, online service learning has the greater potential to substitute the existing problems with traditional service learning experiences. Through their exploration of current online service learning projects, Strait and Sauer believe that this type of service learning experience is an enhancement to current teacher education programs and that it "challenges students to think in new ways, explore new ways of problem solving, and raise critical questions about their learning and service" (2004, p.64). While some challenges of online service learning are still evident, the
potential that this new realm of service has for increased connection between candidate and community is prominent.

Field Experiences in Pre-service Teacher Education Programs

While all states have varying requirements for teacher certification programs, all require a certain number of observation and participation hours in public schools. Certification programs that include field experiences that supplement what students are learning in their methods classes are not a problem and are very beneficial to candidates. However, not all certifications allow candidates to have meaningful field experiences because they often focus only on candidates completing the needed amount of hours. Not only do traditional field experiences deny candidates valuable learning opportunities, they could have potentially damaging effects on that candidate’s future in the public schools. When field experiences are meaningful, they have been found to have positive effects on both candidates and K-12 students. Cochran-Smith and Zeichner summarized many studies on the effects of field experiences on pre-service candidates. One in particular found that “the field experience increased the pre-service teachers’ motivation to become good teachers,” and these candidates also became more aware of their strengths and weaknesses in teaching (2009, p.316). Furthermore, they found from these studies an important aspect of successful field experiences that is often overlooked: “planned, guided, and sustained interactions with pupils” (2009, p.316). In other words, simple observation does not create successful field experiences.

It was John Dewey (1938) who globalized that idea of hands-on experience as a necessity for true learning to take place, but he also argued against the idea that any experience was good experience. Traditional field experiences are normally “largely mechanical and management oriented” (1938, p.313) forcing them to become the bad experiences. Ultimately, traditional field experiences have become about “survival rather than…professional development” (Gallego, 2001, p.314). Gallego (2001) does point out, however, that some field experience programs are changing and improving in a number of different ways. One related advancement is having pre-service teachers engage in activities within the community that not only benefit the candidates, but have a more direct impact on all community members. More research about the direct impact these types of field experiences have on both candidates and the community needs to be completed, but it is certainly a step in the right direction (Gallego, 2001).

Videoconferencing as a means for tutoring young students

Videoconferencing can be an effective and efficient means to assist students with literacy comprehension. Videoconferencing allows for communication to take place from virtually anywhere. Elementary, middle, and high school students are unable to maintain proficient literacy skills due to many factors such as limited language experience, poverty, and lack of motivation (Houge & Geier, 2009). The more exposure to proper communication, whether it be verbal or written, is always beneficial. In a traditional classroom setting, students rarely have the opportunity to share intellectual conversations with others. With the use of videoconferencing, students can be provided a rich repertoire for communication and engagement within traditional activities (Anderson & Rourke, 2005).

Existing literature reveals that one-on-one tutoring is an effective way to remediate student skills if implemented well (Allen & Chaukin, 2004). The one-on-one interaction allows for students to have the attention and specialization of the lessons that they require in order to
progress to becoming academically successful students. Furthermore, the lessons can be tailored to the individuals needs in order to insure growth under the instructor’s guidance. During a tutoring session, the tutor evaluates a student’s performance and adjusts upcoming lessons as needed. Objectives are clearly defined, and activities are created to meet a specific objective (O’Neill & Harris, 2004). Studies found significant improvement in student literacy scores when college students with minimal training provided one-on-one tutoring. Literature explains that effective tutoring program features are effectively measured by intensity, structure, and monitoring performance (Allen & Chaukin, 2004). According to O’Neill (2004), knowledgeable adults who are working and learning outside school systems have a significant amount to contribute to the education of children.

Another point to consider are the findings that some researchers feel that one-on-one tutoring is generally most effectively delivered in person and is considered the most effective method of advancing literacy skills (Houge & Geirer, 2009). In addition, tutoring via videoconferencing reduces time and cost (Doggett, 2008). Past researchers indicated that videoconferencing is a promising medium for increasing the accessibility of one-to-one literacy instruction. Today, videoconferencing occurs with no satellite or long-distance charges. Videoconferencing, also called distance technology, helps students feel part of a real classroom-learning environment, which provides immediate contact, motivation, and clarification (Houge & Geier, 2009).

Methods

Background of the study

Researchers were initially examining two specific problems. First, from the university prospective, the researchers were looking to identify the means of providing more meaningful field experiences to pre-service teachers. Secondly, from the K-12 perspective, classroom teachers were looking for a way to use technology to raise student achievement and motivation. Blending the ideas, the pilot program was designed to provide meaningful field experiences to junior and senior level pre-service teachers while removing the constraints of entering a school, interrupting classes, or classic constraints of time and distance. The program provided a means for pre-service teachers to “virtually tutor” students in a fifth grade classroom who were struggling in the area of vocabulary. In turn, it also provided one-on-one technology based instruction to classroom students.

Case design

Participants were chosen based on convenience sampling. University pre-service teachers participating in a six-hour methods course were given the new program as an option for completing the required fifteen hours of field experiences for their current course. Of the eighteen students in the course, fourteen chose to participate. Those that did not noted that time conflicts with other classes were the reason for not participating. Of those fourteen students, all of whom were junior and senior level majoring in grades 4-8 elementary education, eleven attended tutoring sessions without fail.

The classroom teacher was enrolled at the same university as a graduate student. Her students were chosen to participate based on a pretest given to two sections of fifth grade students. The pretest given was used to determine students’ proficiency with a pre-selected group of on-grade level vocabulary words. After analyzing the data, students with the lowest mean score were chosen to participate in the program. Because of the number of pre-service
teachers, or tutors, available to participate in the study, the lowest performing fourteen fifth grade students were chosen to participate. Parental permission was attained, and fifth grade students were enlisted as the first group to participate.

Participants

Pre-service teachers were part of a community of learners at a comprehensive, regional university primarily serving students from the South. In 2010, 68% of the students enrolled at the university were over the age of twenty, with 94% of the student population being state residents. The College of Education is the largest of the five academic colleges on the campus, encompassing more than 25% of the student enrollment in 2010. The College of Education (COE) offers undergraduate degree programs in a wide variety of teaching areas, including birth to age five education, elementary, middle and high school education, and k-12 education in the areas of art, health and physical science, and music education. The COE also offers undergraduate degrees in psychology. Graduate programs include those in psychological counseling, teaching, and educational leadership. Each year, the College of Education enrolls approximately 500 undergraduate candidates, and approximately 400 graduate candidates, across its twenty-two programs.

The public school that participated in the pilot program is a two star school where 84% of students are eligible for free or reduced lunch. Only 8% of students who attend the school are considered students with disabilities, which includes speech and language impairments. Most fifth grade students who took the state standardized test scored a Basic on the English Language Arts portion. Slightly over 1% scored Advanced and over 25% scored Approaching Basic. More than 96% of classes taught at this school are taught by teachers that are considered highly qualified under NCLB. Class sizes are generally small, with 85% of classes having between 1 and 20 students in them. A very small percentage have over 27 students in a class at a time. The attendance rate of 95% is over the state average. Overall, the school's baseline performance score is 91.1.

Data collection and analysis

Pre-service teachers were chosen through convenience sampling. The first group of participants was 14 junior and senior level students, all majoring in grades 4-8 elementary education. Each of the fourteen pre-service teachers, or tutors, was randomly assigned to a fifth grade student. Due to pre-service teacher and fifth grade student absences, data were collected based on eleven pairings. Based on the amount of time and the schedule of the elementary school, the pilot program took place in eight individual twenty-minute sessions. Sessions were held two times each week, spanning a four-week instructional period. Pre-service teachers and fifth grade student pairings remained consistent throughout the pilot program.

Pre-service teachers prepared a series of eight lessons based on content given by the classroom teacher. The fifth grade teacher provided the material that was to be the content of each lesson based on the current instructional needs of the students. Individual sessions lasted twenty minutes, where tutors and tutees interacted through real-time videoconferencing, audio conferencing, and document sharing. The content of each of the eight sessions remained consistent for all participants; however, the delivery method of content was at the discretion of the pre-service teacher, or tutor. At their own discretion, pre-service teachers were asked to assist students in the knowledge acquisition and comprehension of the content. Lesson preparation and presentation varied among pre-service teachers. Many included document
sharing, presentation sharing, and screen sharing as part of the lessons. Others used traditional dry-erase boards or over sized flashcards as instructional tools. All pre-service teachers adjusted their instruction to meet the needs of their individual student. Often after one instructional tool was used, modifications were made before the next session based on the reaction of the student.

At the conclusion of the study, quantitative data were collected from fifth grade students in the form of posttests in vocabulary acquisition and achievement. These posttest scores were compared to pretest scores to answer the initial research questions. Survey data were collected from both pre-service teachers and fifth grade students to explore the benefits and drawbacks of the program.

**Results**

The purpose of this study was to discover the benefits and drawbacks of a virtual field experience in which pre-service teachers tutored fifth grade students on a particular topic. The aim of the researchers was to record first-hand experiences from pre-service teachers, one classroom teacher, and her participating students while participating in a virtual field experience pilot program.

**Research Question 1:**

Can a service-learning program that pairs pre-service teachers with fifth grade students be an effective medium to “virtually” tutor students in the area of vocabulary acquisition, therefore increasing the students’ achievement?

Pre and Post tests were given to all fifth grade students. Students not participating in the virtual tutoring program showed a 14% achievement growth with typical classroom instruction. Participating students’ average achievement growth was 23%. Achievement increases ranged from 9%-41%, with a mean of 23% (figure 1).
Research Question 2:
What effect does a virtual tutoring and mentoring program have on pre-service teachers as a mean of providing meaningful field experiences?

The eleven pre-service teacher participants ranged in age between twenty and thirty two, with a mean age of twenty-two. Ninety-one percent were Caucasian, and all were female. Most, 82%, held a part or full time job in addition to being enrolled full-time, where all were expected to finish their degree in grades 4-8 education within five semesters. During a post survey, pre-service teachers were asked to comment on twelve items related to service-learning (chart 1).
**Chart 1: Student responses**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Percent Strongly agree-agree</th>
<th>Percent Strongly disagree-disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I have a good understanding of the needs and problems facing the community in which I live.</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have a responsibility to serve the community.</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I learn course content best when connections to real life situations are made.</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The idea of combining course work with service to the community should be practiced in more courses at this college.</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The service aspect of this course helped me to better understand the required lectures and readings.</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The service aspect of the course helped me to see how the subject matter I learned can be used in everyday life.</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The service aspect of the course made me aware of my own biases or prejudices.</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The service aspect of the course showed me how I can become more involved in the community.</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The service that I did through this course was not at all beneficial to the community.</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I plan to enroll in more courses that offer service-learning.</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As a result of my service-learning experience, I would encourage other students to take courses that offer service-learning.</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This pilot program provided challenging, meaningful and educational tasks for me to accomplish</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Changing Opinions**

In addition to those above, pre-service students were asked to reflect upon the program. Many pre-service candidates discussed how their initial impression of the program was not on point. Due to limited success in the past, surrounding service-learning projects and/or classroom field experiences, most thought that the project would not make an impact on their learning.
My first impressions of Colonel Chat were not great at all. I figured it was more pointless, out of class work that the teachers were making us do, and I didn't like the idea of having to communicate over the computer at all; I had never done it before.

After the pilot program, however, pre-service teachers were asked if their participation in the project was a meaningful one. Oh my goodness, so much! This was my first teaching interaction with a student, ever. Although nerve wracking at first, I quickly picked up on what was working and what wasn't by being attentive to the responsiveness of my child. I swear I learned way more about teaching from Colonel Chat than I did in the entirety of my class.

Clearly pre-service teachers enjoyed the experience. In addition, many went on to identify key skills that were attained with this program in contrast with a traditional field experience program. “It (the pilot program) allows you to use a variety of instructional methods and see the reactions of the students.” Others commented on the lack of student feedback given after teaching a traditional lesson. With the virtual tutoring program, pre-service candidates were allowed to receive immediate feedback, and individualize the instructions specifically for the student with whom they were working.

Lastly, one pre-service candidate discussed the fact that she had not entered a classroom in many weeks, and longed for the justification of her choice of professions: Being out of the classroom for a few weeks almost made me forget what was keeping me in the teaching program. After seeing the students enjoy learning something new and seeing the excitement on their faces upon answering my prompts correctly, I was reminded why I'm meant to be a teacher.

Program and bonding with students in the field

Another unique benefit of the pilot program was the ability of each pre-service candidate to build a unique relationship with a fifth grade student. Knowing that a traditional face-to-face meeting never occurred between pre-service candidates and students, it was overwhelming to see the bonds forming between groups. “Not only (did I) get tutoring and teaching experiences from a different perspective, but (I was) also able to build a relationship and truly help a child.” Many did not believe that these types of bonds would form because of the technology that divided tutor and tutee:

I learned that when technology is used correctly it came be so AMAZING. This thing became something so awesome to me. I was able to gain a connection with my student and show him and myself how to use technology with tutoring. The program helped make me a better believer of technology in the classroom.

Responsibility and concerns for learning

Often when teaching an isolated lesson, pre-service teachers feel little or no connection with students actually mastering material. The service-learning virtual tutoring experience allowed pre-service candidates to see learning taking place in real time.

I felt a unique responsibility to my student; I knew that my failures were to his detriment. I felt the responsibility that comes with owning an opportunity to advance learning for a young, bright student.
In addition, many pre-service teachers took views further, commenting that a program such as this had “certainly changed my view on civic responsibility. After realizing and actually being able to see my student’s results, I knew that this program was truly a blessing for everyone involved.” Summarized, the program provided a positive experience for pre-service candidates in relation to service-learning and field experiences:

*Upon completion of the virtual tutoring experience, my desire to help others has greatly increased. Before, I was not the first person to volunteer to tutor students. Now, if I know someone who has a student that needs to be tutored, I am willing to offer my services in order to help that student succeed. As a result of the first-hand experience through this program, I know that as a future teacher it is my responsibility to go above and beyond to ensure that every student’s needs are met. I used to feel that if the students did not understand something, I could only try two or three times to help them. If they did not understand the concept then, I felt there was nothing else I could do. This program has shown me that I need to be enthusiastic and put forth the maximum effort to help students succeed, which will, in turn, increase their motivation as well. Getting a little taste of success through this program has, without a doubt, helped me realize that I have responsibilities as a future teacher and that I need to have the strongest desire to help students succeed.*

**Technical concerns and suggestions**

The isolated suggestions and comments from all participants surrounded technology hardware and software outages. Many stated that “my only changes I would recommend for the program is that it would last longer than the 4 weeks provided; I truly felt that I could have continued!” Others, however, had specific suggestions that will be immediately incorporated into the next step in the program.

*If I could change something about the program, the absolute only thing that I would try to change would be how close the students are sitting to one another, along with the mentors on the other side. I could hear other people’s conversations through my headphones and it interrupted our lesson. Other than that, everything was great!*

Other suggestions that will be taken into account are:

- Initial sessions between students and pre-service teachers should not contain content. This opening session should serve as a “meet and greet” and testing of equipment.
- Programs should be longer than eight sessions. Both students and pre-service teachers were disappointed when the program ended, as relationships were being formed and trust gained.
- A “user’s manual” should be developed to address specific and common technical issues. This manual has been drafted and will be distributed to classroom teachers, principals, and pre-service teachers participating in the next phase of the program.

**Conclusions**

**Reflections from Pre-service Students**

Perhaps more interesting than 100% of pre-service teachers reflecting that the pilot program provided challenging and meaningful field experiences is the excitement seen from pre-service candidates after participating in this pilot program. The program provided a means
for future teachers to build a relationship and have ownership in a student’s learning. In addition, the program provided a means for pre-service teachers to understand concepts, such as differentiated instruction, on a new level.

...[B]eing able to see and hear each other through videoconferencing recreated that personal relationship that you get when you actually are sitting face to face. I also learned how to prepare and modify lessons to meet the needs of my student. On the first day, I shared a document with my student, which had him choose the correct vocabulary word to complete each sentence. Although he understood the concept, I found that he did not fully master the definition of each of the vocabulary terms. Based upon his performance, I had to adjust my instruction for the next lesson. This experience taught me a valuable lesson that I will incorporate into my teaching in the future. I know that I must do whatever I can to meet the individual needs of my student, and this program has provided me with first-hand experience with this concept.

This virtual service-learning opportunity has provided pre-service teachers meaningful and accessible field experience opportunities, with greater convenience for public school teachers. Pre-service teachers do not commute to the partner school, and therefore they do not interrupt instruction in the classroom. As an added bonus, the technology component of the program provided motivation for students, both elementary and collegiate, in a way that other field experiences had not. Participating pre-service teachers experience a teacher in the field who is truly integrating technology for the benefit of her students. The experience of actually tutoring and learning with one student via the Internet has become a distinctly unique experience for the pre-service teachers.

In the elementary fifth grade classroom setting, the program was also successful. Scheduling and technical difficulties were initially a problem; however, these issues became less prominent as sessions went on. Surprisingly, the classroom teacher found that parents were eager for their children to participate, and students were constantly asking when their next sessions will take place. The classroom teacher also noticed students utilizing material learned during the program more frequently than before. Overall, the success of the initial virtual service-learning field experiences pilot program was a success. Additional research needs to be conducted on the benefits of videoconference tutoring in student achievement and growth. A replication of this study would be beneficial to test the validity of the results. The study could also be conducted with varying levels and subject matters within the school environment.
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The Effects of Service-Learning in the Social Psychology Classroom

Travis S. Crone

Service-learning is a pedagogical technique that requires the student to engage in active service that is connected to the concepts of social responsibility and civic participation and related in some form to the course the student is taking (Weber, Weber, & Young, 2010). Students in a service-learning course should be participating in some form of community enrichment, and reflecting on these experiences is thought to be of critical importance (Deeley, 2010). It is believed that through the service-learning experience, both students and the community are recipients of benefits (Deeley, 2010) as service-learning can enrich both the academic and social elements of education (Steiner & Watson, 2006). Even as the benefits of service-learning seem to be many, there has been a call for more knowledge about the benefits of service-learning (Bringle, Phillips, & Hudson, 2004).

Outside of the classroom, service-learning has also been shown to augment relevant abilities such as increased decision-making (Kearney, 2004) and leadership skills (Howard, 2003). Inside the classroom, service-learning has been linked to increased intellectual and academic output for students (Tonkin, 2004). As these findings highlight, recent research has begun to showcase that service-learning can produce strong benefits in different, important areas of a student’s life. As not all service-learning components are created with the same goal in mind (Britt, 2012), the variety of findings seen should not be surprising. Britt (2012) conceptualizes service-learning as the three processes of becoming,
engaging, and doing. The benefits of the project should stem from the form of the service-learning.

**Service-learning framework**

Service-learning that is targeted at the idea of becoming should have effects on how the student views themselves and their abilities. As such, service learning is thought not only to increase a students’ self-esteem, but also their self-confidence (Lisman, 1998). Moreover, service-learning of this type should strive to connect the student and community on a deeper level (Britt, 2012). This connection should drive changes that we see from service-learning. Here, we see service-learning linked to effects such as lower social dominance orientations (Brown, 2011) and increased desire to learn more about the political arena (Dudley & Gitelson, 2003). Showing the longitudinal effects of service-learning, participants report still being more politically engaged six years after college (Denson, Vogelgesang, & Saenz, 2005).

Service-learning that is more targeted at the idea of engaging should focus on aspects of social justice and awareness (Britt, 2012). Service-learning has, in fact, been shown to increase the social awareness of students (Batchelder & Root, 1994); and by increasing the number of perspectives a student encounters, service-learning is thought to expand understanding (Gorham, 2005). Engaging at this level can also focus students on a problem as seen in service-learning’s ability to increase students’ understanding of poverty (Seider, Rabinowicz, & Gillmor, 2011). Moreover, service-learning of this nature can drive students to become more involved with policy making (Eyler, Giles, & Braxton, 1997).

Service-learning focused on the practice of doing is centered on activity and reflection (Britt, 2012). Service-learning has been shown to give students the tools necessary for critical reflection and thinking (Deeley, 2010). The ability to reflect can help cause real-world experience to become lasting knowledge (Kolb, 1984), and linking knowledge and experience can increase retention (Johnson, 2003). In addition, Butin (2005) theorizes that service-learning can help create a more direct connection between the cognitive and affective aspects of thought.

Noted in the theories of Dewey (Giles, Jr. & Eyler, 1994), the use of service-learning is not a new pedagogical technique; however, recent years have seen an increase in the number of service-learning related courses in response to increasing civic disengagement among young people (Putnam, 2000). The increase in service-learning projects may be at a disadvantage due to the lack of understanding with regards to the necessary framework needed (Giles, Jr. & Eyler, 1994). Some researchers have even stated that service-learning may not fully express its possible benefits (Steiner & Watson, 2006). Whether service-learning is actually creating a greater understanding of civic needs and responsibility has been called into question as well (Sax, 2004).

**Purpose**

As service-learning researchers work to answer the call for more understanding of the causal effects of service-learning (Deeley, 2010), they are also interested in creating service-learning components that more fully articulate the underlying learning outcomes of the specific courses (Cone & Harris, 1996). One of the keys to this may be in developing service-learning components that directly connect to the overarching theories of the course. By grounding service-learning completely in a related course, an instructor may be able to more fully integrate
the three practices outlined by Britt (2012). By combining these practices, students may be able to see a wider array of benefits from a single service-learning activity.

Purposefully pairing service-learning activities with courses designed to enrich the activities may be the key to further unlocking the potential of service-learning. Social Psychology is a course designed around helping students understand how they are affected by and influence the social world. Service-learning may be paired well with a Social Psychology course as service-learning has been shown to affect prejudice (Myers-Lipton, 1996; Yates & Youniss, 1996) and increase empathy (Boyle-Baise & Efiom, 2000). Both are concepts at the heart of Social Psychology. By purposefully pairing service-learning and Social Psychology, greater effects may be seen.

The purpose of this study is to explore the effects of service-learning in the Social Psychology classroom when the service-learning component is specifically designed to pair with the psychological theories addressed throughout the course. It is the author’s belief that taking part in a service-learning course such as this will increase the participants’ views on themselves both academically and socially. By integrating the service-learning fully with the course, students should see a wider range and deeper effect of the service-learning component.

Method

Participants

Seventy-five students at a Hispanic-serving institution consented to participate in the current study. Students were enrolled in either a traditionally taught Social Psychology course or a Social Psychology course centered on a service-learning component. The sample of students from the traditional Social Psychology course was drawn from three sections of the course taught by two different full-time faculty members. The sample of students from the service-learning Social Psychology course was drawn from one section of the course taught by a full-time faculty member.

Due to incomplete data, ten participants were excluded from the final analysis. Participant age ranged from eighteen to fifty-two ($M = 25$). The self-reported gender make-up of the final sample consisted of 21% male and 79% female. The self-reported ethnic breakdown of the final sample consisted of 37.3% Hispanic, 32% Black, 17.3% Caucasian, 8% Asian, and 5.3% other. The ethnic breakdown of the current sample is almost identical to the ethnic breakdown of the university at large.

Materials

To measure attitudes concerning service-learning and related attitudes, participants completed the Civic Participation scale (Weber, Weber, Sleeper, & Schneider, 2004), the Attitudes Toward Helping Others scale (Webb, Green, & Brashear, 2000), the Self-efficacy Toward Service scale (Weber et al., 2000), the College Education’s Role in Addressing Social Issues scale (CERSI, Weber, Weber, & Craven, 2008), a series of questions assessing civic responsibility (Gottlieb & Robinson, 2006), and the Personal Effectiveness of Community Service scale (Frumkin, Jastrzab, Vaaler, Greeney, Grimm, Jr., Cramer, & Dietz, 2009).

To assess academically-related attitudes, a series of questions using a 7-point Likert scale was used. These questions were both original and adapted from an existing assessment survey developed by the faculty of the department where the research was conducted (Crone & Portillo, in press). These questions assessed areas such as participants’ confidence in their ability to learn from others, their confidence in their ability to teach others, and their confidence
in their ability to apply psychological principles to personal, social, and work issues (see Appendix A).

Procedure

Participants taken from the traditional Social Psychology classroom attended sections of the course that were primarily lecture based. On the last day of the course, participants were given the opportunity to complete the current survey. The primary instructor of the course was given the option of offering bonus credit for participating. No difference in participation rates or on outcome variables was observed between the different traditional courses.

Participants taken from the service-learning Social Psychology course attended a primarily lecture based course with a central service-learning component. During the initial lecture unit of the semester, students were asked to pick a societal issue to be their focus for the semester. Students were advised to pick an issue that was important or meaningful to them. Students picked such topics as homelessness, urban beautification, the global water crisis, and mentoring underprivileged minors.

On the first day of class, students were informed that they would be required to complete the service-learning component to receive the highest grade in the course. The service-learning component required working a minimum of twelve hours at a collaborating organization. The primary instructor of the course had previously constructed a list of preapproved organization with whom the students could work. Students were allowed to work with other organizations with instructor approval.

Throughout the semester, students were required to turn in a series of papers related to the current project. These types of reflection papers become important as reflection can cause increased learning and retention (Johnson, 2003; Kolb, 1984). First, students were required to turn in an action plan outlining the societal issue, the collaborating organization with whom they were partnering, and an initial discussion of how the social psychological perspectives and theories discussed in that unit connected to the societal issue that they chose to examine. Students were asked to evaluate how the social psychological theories not only could help eliminate or alleviate the problem, but also how the basic psychological nature of the individual helped to create the issue. During subsequent units of the course, students were required to write short papers further exploring how different psychological theories of the course applied to their chosen issue. Finally, students were required to write a final report. This report was designed to outline the appropriate linked psychological theories in more detail. Students were guided to integrate their experience through the service-learning experience with the theories discussed in class.

On the final day of the course, students were given the chance to complete the current survey. Students were informed that this was not part of their grade and that no points would be attached to completing this survey. No bonus credit was given in this course for completion of the survey. All grade related assignments were submitted prior to completion of the current survey.

Results

A one-way MANOVA with course type as the factor (traditional versus service-learning) was conducted on the self-reported attitudinal measures from the current study. Analysis revealed main effects on several variables of interest found below.
Civic Participation
Analysis revealed a main effect on the Civic Participation scale, $F(1, 63) = 12.28, p = .001, \eta^2 = .163$. Participants in the service-learning course ($M = 4.33, SE = .15$) reported having more concern about the community and more desire to contribute than participants in the traditional course ($M = 3.69, SE = .11$).

Self-efficacy Toward Service
Analysis revealed a main effect on the Self-efficacy Toward Service scale, $F(1, 63) = 5.14, p = .027, \eta^2 = .075$. Participants in the service-learning course ($M = 4.38, SE = .16$) reported having more belief in their ability to improve their community than participants in the traditional course ($M = 3.93, SE = .12$).

Attitudes Toward Helping Others
Analysis revealed a main effect on the Attitudes Toward Helping Others scale, $F(1, 63) = 6.91, p = .011, \eta^2 = .099$. Participants in the service-learning course ($M = 4.32, SE = .19$) reported having more belief that people should give aid to those that are less fortunate than participants in the traditional course ($M = 3.70, SE = .14$).

College Education’s Role in Addressing Social Issues
Analysis revealed a main effect on the CERSI $F(1, 63) = 9.71, p = .003, \eta^2 = .134$. Participants in the service-learning course ($M = 4.27, SE = .17$) reported having more belief that colleges should encourage more volunteering and offer more service-learning courses than participants in the traditional course ($M = 3.61, SE = .12$).

Table 1: Effects on service-learning related scales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Service-learning Course</th>
<th>Traditional Course</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Civic Participation</td>
<td>4.33 (.15)</td>
<td>3.69 (.11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Efficacy Toward</td>
<td>4.38 (.12)</td>
<td>3.93 (.12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudes Toward</td>
<td>4.32 (.19)</td>
<td>3.70 (.14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helping Others</td>
<td>4.27 (.17)</td>
<td>3.61 (.12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CERSI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: All analyses achieved at least a .05 level of significance.

Civic Responsibility
A series of questions assessing civic responsibility (Gottlieb & Robinson, 2002) revealed participants felt more civic responsibility after the service-learning course. Participants in the service-learning course ($M = 3.14, SE = .15$) report having more of “a good understanding of the needs and problems facing the community in which I live” than participants in the traditional course ($M = 2.72, SE = .11$), $F(1,63) = 5.06, p = .028, \eta^2 = .074$.

Participants in the service-learning course ($M = 3.55, SE = .12$) also reported believing “if everyone works together, many of society’s problems can be solved” more than participants in the traditional course ($M = 3.22, SE = .09$), $F(1,63) = 4.25, p = .043, \eta^2 = .063$. 
Participants in the service-learning course ($M = 3.09, SE = .15$) both report more intention to enroll in more service-learning courses than participants in the traditional course ($M = 2.70, SE = .11$), $F(1,63) = 4.59, p = .036, \eta^2 = .068$, and participants in the service-learning course ($M = 3.09, SE = .13$) report that service-learning should be done in more college courses than participants in the traditional course ($M = 2.81, SE = .10$), $F(1,63) = 6.47, p = .014, \eta^2 = .093$.

**Personal Effectiveness of Community Service**

A series of questions assessing the personal effectiveness of community service revealed that students in the service-learning course ($M = 3.91, SE = .24$) felt they had made a contribution to the community more than participants in the traditional course ($M = 2.98, SE = .17$), $F(1,63) = 10.34, p = .002, \eta^2 = .141$. Participants in the service-learning course ($M = 3.91, SE = .23$) also report feeling more a part of a community than participants in the traditional course ($M = 3.12, SE = .16$), $F(1,63) = 7.98, p = .006, \eta^2 = .112$.

**Table 2: Effects on civic responsibility and personal effectiveness**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Service-learning Course</th>
<th>Traditional Course</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Civic Responsibility</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding of needs</td>
<td>3.14 (.15)</td>
<td>2.72 (.11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belief in working together</td>
<td>3.55 (.12)</td>
<td>3.22 (.09)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intention to enroll in more SL</td>
<td>3.09 (.15)</td>
<td>2.70 (.11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College needs more SL</td>
<td>3.09 (.13)</td>
<td>2.81 (.10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Personal Effectiveness</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Made a contribution</td>
<td>3.91 (.24)</td>
<td>2.98 (.17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More a part of community</td>
<td>3.91 (.23)</td>
<td>3.12 (.16)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: All analyses achieved at least a .05 level of significance.

**Academically-oriented Attitudes**

Analysis revealed that participants in the service-learning course had more positive attitudes about themselves and their abilities in the classroom. Specifically, participants in the service-learning course ($M = 6.21, SE = .17$) reported feeling more confident in their “ability to apply psychological principles to personal, social, and work issues” than participants in the traditional course ($M = 5.74, SE = .12$), $F(1,63) = 5.18, p = .026, \eta^2 = .076$.

Showing more improvement of attitudes concerning academic abilities, participants in the service-learning course both report feeling more confident in their ability to “teach class material to other students” and their ability to “learn class material from other students” ($M = 5.87, SE = .22; M = 6.00, SE = .22$, respectively) than participants in the traditional course ($M = 5.21, SE = .16; M = 5.35, SE = .16$, respectively), $ps < .05$. 
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Table 3: Effects on academically-oriented attitudes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Service-learning Course</th>
<th>Traditional Course</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ability to apply to personal, social, and work</td>
<td>6.21 (.17)</td>
<td>5.74 (.12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to teach other students</td>
<td>5.87 (.22)</td>
<td>5.21 (.16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to learn from other students</td>
<td>6.00 (.22)</td>
<td>5.35 (.16)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: All analyses achieved at least a .05 level of significance.

Discussion

The goal of the current study was to explore if purposefully creating a service-learning component that tied directly to the theories of the course would have a profound effect on participants’ attitudes and beliefs about themselves socially and academically. To accomplish this, participants completed a series of guided reflection papers requiring integration of the social psychological theories of the course with the societal issue they chose to focus on over the course of the semester. Analysis revealed that participants in the service-learning centred Social Psychology class saw improvements in a wide array of areas related to the self and service.

Areas of attitude change related to service-learning

Participants in the service-learning condition self-reported increased attitudes concerning service-learning related measures such as the Civic Participation scales (Weber et al., 2004), the Attitudes Toward Helping Others scale (Webb et al., 2000), and the Self-efficacy Toward Service scale (Weber et al., 2000). Further validating previous research (Weber & Weber, 2010), participants in the service-learning course reported feeling more concern for their community, an increased belief that people should give aid to others, and more belief in their ability to improve the community. Importantly, this further exemplifies service-learning’s ability to show students that they can make a difference in their community (Ehrlich, 1999).

Participants in the service-learning condition also reported a desire for institutional change. As seen in their belief that colleges should offer more courses with service learning and that graduates should have a better understanding of how to solve social issues, participants in the service-learning condition report that the idea of social responsibility should be addressed and emphasized during one’s college tenure. Participants’ attitudes echo suggested American Psychological Association learning outcomes for all psychology majors regarding sociocultural awareness and personal development (American Psychological Association, 2007).

More than simply causing individuals to value service more, the current service-learning component seems to have increased participants’ understanding of the needs around them. Participants in the current study report having a greater knowledge of the problems facing the community of which they are a part. Participants also espoused an increased belief that these problems can actually be solved if individuals would work together. Through these attitude changes, students seem to connect to community on a deeper level (Britt, 2012). Perceptions
such as these may also drive students to become more politically active (Denson et al., 2005) and more policy minded (Eyler et al., 1997).

Service-learning has previously been shown to help create a civic identity in students (Youniss, 2009). Evidence of this can be seen in the current study by examining their feelings of personal effectiveness. Not only did participants in the service-learning condition report feeling more like they had made contributions to the community, participants reported feeling more a part of the community. This finding taken together with those described above helps create a picture of students who understand the issues of a community, are able to work with others to solve the issue, and belief in their ability to actually cause change.

Areas of attitude change related to academics

As predicted, attitudes related to academic abilities increased in the service-learning course. Previous research has highlighted that service-learning can boost academic and intellectual performance (Tonkin, 2004). Reflection is thought to be of key importance in this process by fostering critical thinking skills (Deeley, 2010; Kolb, 1984). One of the key drives of the current study was to help create an environment where students are better able to apply theories learned in the classroom to situations in their own lives. Supporting the idea that service-learning can promote these connections, participants in the service-learning condition report more confidence in their ability to apply the theories of the course to real world events. Anecdotally, from reading these reflection papers, it does seem that students are much more adept at making these connections. However, as there is not an adequate comparison group, an analysis of content is not currently available. Future research should strive to specifically test whether students are better at connecting theories to outside of the classroom events after taking part in service-learning.

Participants in the service-learning condition also saw increased attitudes related to how they perceived teaching and learning from others. Participants in the service-learning condition both report more confidence in their ability to teach others and to learn from others. Service-learning is thought to expand the number of perspectives students are able to see and understand (Gorham, 2005) while also decreasing prejudice (Myers-Lipton, 1996; Yates & Youniss, 1996) and increasing empathy (Boyle-Baise & Efiom, 2000). These elements can add together to create an experience where students are more able to understand the needs of others and how to reach them. At the same time, students seem to be more open to others teaching them. This may be tied to the fact that students had been engaged in areas where others at their collaborating organization had more expert knowledge that was shared.

It is also important to note that only improvements or increases in attitudes were seen in the current study. Participants in the service-learning condition did not fare worse than participants in the traditional course on any measure included in the study. While it may be too large a jump to say that service-learning has no drawbacks on student performance in the classroom or deleterious effects on attitudes, the current research highlights the large number of positive benefits that can be seen from participating in service-learning.

Limitations and future directions

Due to the nature of the current project, some limitations do exist. The major drawback of the current project stems from the service-learning component occurring in only one professor’s course. While the sample of traditional students was drawn from multiple professors’ courses, this was not possible for the service-learning component. It is possible that the benefits seen in
the current study could have stemmed from the professor’s course specifically. To alleviate this issue, future research should strive to have multiple professors utilizing the service-learning outlined in the current study.

Another limitation of the current study is the lack of academic performance data. As samples were drawn from different courses with different assignments and grading schemes, it seemed inappropriate to compare students’ final grades. Future research should have researchers match assignments through a course so that increases in academic performance can more readily be apparent.

The final limitation of the current study is the lack of longitudinal data. The current study only reports the effects after a semester of service-learning. To further understand the magnitude of change that service-learning can create, a pre/post-test design should be utilized. An interaction between the specific course and the service-learning component may be seen in future research.

Conclusion

The current study sought to understand the effects of service-learning in the Social Psychology classroom. The service-learning component was developed to specifically challenge students to apply social psychological theories to societal issues of their choosing. Analysis revealed that students taking part in service-learning showed increases in attitudes related to service, academics, and their own abilities.

As Britt (2012) highlights, there are three main paths for service-learning: doing, becoming, and engaging. The structure of the service-learning component helps dictate the type of effect one can expect from a particular service-learning component. The current study sought to highlight that a purposefully constructed service-learning component deeply rooted in the theories of the course should be able to broaden the types of effects seen. Effects of the doing, becoming, and engaging styles can all be seen in the current study. It does seem that a service-learning project that fully articulates the learning outcomes of a course (Cone & Harris, 1996) is better able to see wide-reaching personal change for students.
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The question, it seems, is how do we do it well? How do we promote and institutionalize academic practices that are meaningful, sustainable, and relevant to the key stakeholders – institutions and communities – that partake in such practices? How do we overcome what I have described as an “engagement ceiling” such that we begin to work with and through new paradigms and new frameworks towards a second wave of theory and practice?

One answer, I believe, is the hundred or so academic programs – majors, minors, and certificates – around the United States. Programs such as Providence College’s major in Public and Community Service Studies, Allegheny College’s minor in Values, Ethics and Social Action, Indiana University’s certificate in Political and Civic Engagement, or Merrimack College’s master’s degree in Community Engagement. Such academic homes provide a safe space where students, faculty, administrators, and community partners can work through the complex and contested issues arising from community-based teaching, learning, and research. This is not to say that such discussions and actions do not occur at the thousands of institutions engaged in such work. Rather, academic programs provide a unique opportunity – much like any disciplinary program – to deeply, critically, and systematically investigate and teach and research and build upon what it means to be an engaged citizen.

And yet, amidst all this turmoil, the signals have never been clearer that higher education must be more than just a delivery platform for a certificate of competence and workforce preparation. The US Department of Education, in collaboration with the Association of American Colleges and Universities (AAC&U), has declared that we are at a “crucible moment” where we must make “democracy and civic responsibility…central, not peripheral” in our institutions of higher learning. The Lumina Foundation is piloting a “degree qualifications profile” where “civic learning” is one of just five key “areas of learning” across all types of postsecondary degree programs. Indeed, students, faculty, and the general public all view community-engaged practices as part and parcel of the mission and vision of the “place-based” campus.

It is against this backdrop that I am extremely pleased to introduce this first Working Paper in the Center for Engaged Democracy’s Policy Papers series. It is an important document carefully developed by a national working group of scholars and practitioners over the course of the last year. It is important for three specific reasons.
First, and most obviously, this is the first-ever attempt to examine and document and synthesize what “core competencies” in civic engagement might look like for academic programs. While such discussions have been longstanding at the national level and across general education requirements, no one has yet attempted this work for academic programs. This is thus a “stake in the ground.” It is an attempt to speak cogently, systematically, and clearly about the student outcomes of civic engagement in this moment of accountability in higher education.

Second, the synthesis of reviews of the literature, national reports, and actual academic programs unearths several key results worth pursuing in future research. I am struck, for example, by the finding (easily hypothesized, but, until now, impossible to prove) that the really difficult and volatile and complex issues we grapple with in the day-to-day of civic and community engagement – e.g., racial and ethnic bias, socioeconomic gaps and inequities, gendered and sexualized stereotypes and practices – are notably muted or absent in national reports but front-and-center in specific individual programs. The fact that academic programs focus on the importance of contextualizing particular issues while national reports highlight notions of (universal) ethics allows us to begin to ask sharp questions about our audiences, our communities, and our goals. Similarly, it is intriguing that the actual practices of community and civic engagement are more often than not framed as the means towards specific goals in academic programs, yet as the goals themselves in the national reports. What, again, does this say about why we engage with communities, and for whom?

Finally, I want to suggest that, in its own small way, this Policy Paper attempts to foster an epistemic pluralism as we in higher education attempt to work through and work out the key knowledge, skills, dispositions, and practices for programs in civic and community engagement. By this I mean that this Policy Paper has taken on the incredibly difficult task of articulating the multiple means of how we think about the practices and outcomes of civic and community engagement. Exactly because we are speaking about the actions, beliefs, and values of citizens in a pluralistic society, there is no unanimity or uniformity to our expected outcomes, pedagogical methods, or normative standpoints. But this does not mean chaos rules. It simply means that there are frameworks within which contested notions of complex phenomenon can and should be analyzed, engaged, and appropriated. This is exactly what dozens upon dozens of academic programs around the country are doing, and what this Policy Paper attempts to support through such an articulation. It is thus with gratitude that I thank the committee that took on this difficult task and look forward to the discussions that I hope it will foster.

Respectfully,

Dan W. Butin, Ph.D.
Associate Professor and Dean, School of Education, Merrimack College
Executive Director, Center for Engaged Democracy
In the Fall of 2011, the Center issued a call for a national working group to develop a draft set of “Core Competencies” in civic engagement for academic programs. (We take the phrase of “civic engagement” as a pragmatically necessary compromise to the multiplicity of phrases and terms signaling academic programs engaged in community-based models of teaching, learning and research.) Such a set of competencies was viewed as an important step for fostering dialogue in multiple venues (e.g., academic programs, regional and national conferences, disciplinary associations and national organizations committed to civic engagement) around what constitutes viable and legitimate program and student outcomes. A committee was formed to lead this initiative and has been actively working on this initiative throughout the 2011-12 academic year. Committee members include (in alphabetical order): Leila Brammer, Rebecca Dumlao, Audrey Falk, Elizabeth Hollander, Ellen Knutson, Jeremy Poehnert, Andrea Politano, and Valerie Werner.

We believe that an academic field of study needs to have a clearly defined set of core competencies. We hope that by researching the learning outcomes espoused by individual departments and programs, relevant professional associations, and information gleaned from scholarly literature, we can articulate the common core competencies of the field. These core competencies may be useful to newly developing higher education programs in civic engagement as well as to existing programs with less clearly articulated competencies. We offer our work with the hope that it will be of true value to programs, but not with the expectation that it will become a one-size-fits-all model. We recognize that each major, minor, and certificate program will have its own emphasis. Some programs may have more of a political or philosophical leaning; others may emphasize human and social services, for example. Each program exists within a unique context that will also impact its focus and approach.

A set of clearly articulated core competencies offers all of us a foundation or starting point for identifying those competencies that are most relevant or important to our particular programs. Additionally, it helps to define civic engagement as a scholarly field of study, and we believe that is a gain for all of us.

We have tried to take a comprehensive approach to identifying core competencies. This multifaceted approach has included syntheses of the following:
1. Search and review of the scholarly literature (Section 1)
2. Review of measurement scales (Section 2)
3. Review of existing academic programs (Section 3)

Additionally, you will also find sidebars of mini-case studies of a few campuses’ approaches to learning outcomes, including information about how the learning outcomes were derived and how they are assessed. The three campuses we looked at were chosen to represent a variety of types of institutions as well as have geographic diversity.

You will see that each section of the report has categorized the core competencies into three or four major areas, including civic knowledge, skills, practice, and disposition. Each section of the report was developed by one or more different researchers from the Core Competencies Committee and thus reflects their own analysis and perspective on the data gathered and reviewed. We have not attempted to remove the differences in categorization from section to section, but we do note the differences and discuss them where appropriate.

In addition to this report, you can find many of the original data sources and syllabi gathered for this study online at www.merrimack.edu/democracy. This paper has been developed for dissemination and discussion at the Center for Engaged Democracy’s Third Annual Summer Research Institute (held June 23-24 at Merrimack College). We would like to receive feedback both at the conference and following the conference to strengthen this document and to understand how the Center for Engaged Democracy can continue to be a resource for majors, minors, and certificate programs with respect to core competencies. Please feel free to contact democracy@merrimack.edu.
This literature review includes analysis and synthesis of information gleaned from journal articles and texts focused on learning objectives in civic-engaged courses and curricula. It includes information relevant to the areas of learning in civic knowledge, skills, dispositions, and practices/action. (See the reference list at the end of this section.) The author of this section of the text focused on a consideration of best practices in civic engagement teaching and learning.

**Chart 1: Summary of Literature Review**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CIVIC KNOWLEDGE</th>
<th>CIVIC SKILLS</th>
<th>EXPERIENCES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Efficiency, equity, social justice</td>
<td>Critical reasoning about causes and morality</td>
<td>Community service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusiveness, collaboration, building constituency</td>
<td>Democratic decision making</td>
<td>Social organizing for change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value of government, civic institutions, business, community participation, public work</td>
<td>Social organizing – Coordinated interactions - Interactive participation</td>
<td>Community planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self Identity: Interests or beliefs of the self with active citizenship</td>
<td>Active citizenship practices</td>
<td>Public management or administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible citizenship included human rights</td>
<td>Cooperation, Consensus building</td>
<td>Relationship building across networks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political and legal systems and processes</td>
<td>Policy formation and analysis</td>
<td>Process of engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical review of policy</td>
<td>Inquiry/Research/methods</td>
<td>Project planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Affairs</td>
<td>Communication skills: intergroup communication, negotiations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity/Pluralism</td>
<td>Assessing the feasibility of change from social action and commitment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Globalization and interdependence</td>
<td>Management/Leadership</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiplicity vs. cosmopolitan citizenship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representative government</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountable government</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freedom of speech</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equality before the law and social/environmental justice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Civic Skills

Also identified in this review of the literature are the needs for students to develop research skills and learn critical reasoning about causes of injustice and human morality. Students need to be able to imagine possibilities or alternatives for a different future (Oldenquest, 1980; Jansen, Chioncel, & Dekkers, 2006). Crucial to democratic decision-making and active problem-solving are skills used for inquiry, critical thinking, and the ability to communicate effectively across differences which requires listening and negotiation skills. Such skills include the capacity to explain views that are different from one’s own; understanding bias; identifying interdependencies within broader structures and systems; building inclusiveness and collaborative participation on community issues; coalition building on fundamental social values; and identification of critical social issues (Morse, 1998; Jansen et al., 2006; Flanagan & Levin, 2010). In describing specific examples of student engagement, Redlawsk, Rice, and Associates (2009) identify a wide range of specific research skills that students ought to develop, such as designing and implementing surveys and questionnaires, community asset mapping, and impact analysis.

Other citizenship skills discussed in the literature include networking (Flanagan & Levin, 2010), negotiating, and effecting change (Dudley et al., 1999). Redlawsk, Rice, and Associates (2009) discuss learning how to build teams, including resident involvement (neighborhood associations), municipal, county and state government, community agencies, or private sector organizations, such as banks; and creating professional networks. They also mention skills such as project development, professionally presenting findings, and responding to challenging questions. Other civic skills mentioned in their project descriptions include advocacy, leadership, infrastructure planning, resource development, training & development, evaluation, and marketing.
Disposition

Citizenship is the act of group participation and bridging of differences that allows for new ideas, possibilities and solutions. It is a contextualized social practice and a form of group loyalty built on the principles of social morality (Oldenquist, 1980). The social cohesion required brings into play the tension between individual freedom and social order within the moral perspective. Engaged citizenry that respects ideals such as social justice, equal opportunity, and legal equality recognizes that social cohesion must not be based in the question, “how do we justify us?” but rather, “how do we live with others?” (Jansen et al., 2006). It requires we shift from the concept of ‘deficient groups at risk’ to the quality of the public sphere and need for active citizens re-inventing public places.

The tension between individual freedom and social order participating in civic engaged learning should allow students the opportunity to transcend the notion of ‘individual’ while at the same time giving an identity and meaning to their own being (Dudley et al., 1999). Self identity of this kind fosters a sense of ownership of issues of import, group membership and group beliefs. The development of efficacy and agency within an individual grows out of active participation and responsibility to both the self and others (Haste, 2004).

Practice/Action

The articles reviewed discussed types of engaged learning experiences, including community service such as working in soup kitchens or homeless shelters; social organizing for change with community groups; community planning that often accompanies social organizing experiences; public management or administration within non-profits or government agencies, especially as it relates to policy work; relationship building across networks; and project planning.

According to Redlawsk, Rice, and Associates (2009), engaged learning in government placements provides students with a greater awareness of application (what is learned and what is experienced) and understanding the role of government in addressing societal issues. It also provides opportunities to participate in network building between government, citizens, community organization and the university, and in gaining an understanding of governmental divides (federalism).

Several examples that they cite are:

- University of Vermont: Students work as policy researchers for state legislatures.
- East Central University: Students working with community residents on projects that include coequal relationship designed to bridge racial differences.
- State University of New York Buffalo: Students and community members collected soil samples for lead testing in an area neglected by the state and were able to expand the original area designated as a Superfund clean-up site.
- Indiana University – Purdue University Indianapolis: Defining civic engagement as “active collaboration that builds on the resources, skills, expertise, and knowledge of the campus and community to improve the quality of life in communities in a manner that is consistent with the campus mission.” Civic engagement has no geographical boundaries and includes the university working in all sectors of society [non-profit, government, and business], as well as the local, regional, national, and international settings. The primary purpose of service-learning is for students to experience the work/needs of the government body they are working with and evaluate the program itself.
- CommUniverCity San Jose: Based on 3 partnerships between San Jose State University, the City of San Jose and the Five Wounds/Brookwood Terrace (FWBT) area made up of a community of neighborhoods. This requires interdisciplinary work amongst faculty. Work is driven by government/community need and not faculty-driven interests.
Longo and Shaffer (2009) discuss the importance of positional or technical expertise leadership versus the capacity of ordinary people to define and solve problems collectively. Their mantra is “we are the ones we’ve been waiting for.” Longo and Shaffer propose that educational programs should be based on the concept that all participants could be contributors and leaders. There is an acknowledgement of the potential for leadership in all group endeavors. Key principles in this model include:

- Thinking comprehensively about leadership which involves several related aspects - 1) breaking down the leader-follower dichotomy; 2) strong people do not need strong leaders (Ella Baker); 3) leadership education creates space for all stakeholders in higher education [students, faculty, staff, community partners] who will use their assets toward public problem solving and further development of leadership capacity.
- Relational leadership education which should include - 1) longer commitments from faculty and students to neighboring communities that allows for deeper relationships between all participants and better university/community partnerships; 2) projects should be more involved than just volunteering.
- Leadership education should be public, meaning students must have opportunity to link theory and practice, and understand that knowledge alone is powerless if people do not act on it.

Keckes and Kerrigans (2009) review best practices for enhancing students’ civic engagement through capstone experiences. Two examples of educational institutions of capstone courses providing students with engaged learning experiences are:

Wagner College in Staten Island, New York: All graduate degrees require a capstone course. Business students working in partnership with the Staten Island Economic Development Corporation did a community needs assessment by surveying community members, including political figures, property and business owners, school personnel, and residents. Short and long term goals were created, key issues were identified, and specific agencies responsible for implementation of changes were identified. Students held a press conference and presented finding at two professional meetings.

Brown University: The Swearer Center for Public Service provides the administrative leadership for sixty independent study capstone projects. Students apply for fellowships that provide funding for the exploration and implantation of new ideas in the civic sector. Example: Student Jessica Beckerman, class of 2006, used funding to organize and coordinate a team of Brown students, alumni, and Malian students to work on the Mousso Ladamous Project with a mission to pioneer lasting social change and economic development in resource poor communities in Mali, Africa, by using a women’s peer education model.

Musil (2009) discusses the work of Andrea Leskes and Ross Miller on purposeful pathways, helping students achieve key learning outcomes (2006). A model entitled the “Civic Learning Spiral” was created for civic learning that is designed to establish the habit of lifelong engagement as an empowered, informed and socially responsible citizen. The spiral highlights the six interactive/integrative principles that co-exist simultaneously: self, communities and culture, knowledge, skills, values, and public action. Examples provided of educational programs using this model are:

1. Rutgers University: Ethno-autobiographies that emphasize the self and community, and cultures - with students learning about the history of other people’s ethnic groups, and an appreciation of other perspectives.
2. University of Delaware: Over the course of four years, a series of developmental outcomes are taught to students in dialogic deliberative skills using engaged methods.
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Over the last twenty years, considerable national discussion has centered on what civic competencies students need to acquire as part of their college education. Most recently, the Association of American College and Universities (AAC&U), in concert with other organizations and individuals, and with the United States Department of Education, have articulated student civic engagement competencies in a report entitled A Crucible Moment: College Learning and Democracy’s Future (The National Task Force, 2012). We examined this report, and earlier AAC&U reports and programs such as the Value Rubrics (Rhodes, 2010), College Learning for the New Global Century (The National Leadership Council, 2007), the Core Commitments program (Association of American Colleges and Universities, 2012), and the Shared Futures Initiative (Musil, 2007). We also reviewed documents obtained from The American Democracy Project (ADP) of the American Association of State Colleges and Universities (AASCU) (American Democracy Project, 2012), the American Association of Community Colleges (AACC) (Gottlieb & Robinson, 2002), the Higher Education Research Institute (HERI) (Astin et al., 2006), the Bonner Foundation (2011; Meisel, 1996), and the Lumina Foundation (Adelman et al., 2011). We studied select national surveys including the Wabash Studies (Center of Inquiry, 2011), questions about global learning in an AAC&U report, the Shared Futures Survey (Musil, 2007) and civic engagement questions added to the United States Decennial Census (National Conference on Citizenship, 2012). Finally, we examined a chart of civic competencies compiled as part of a broad-based literature review of civic engagement. (See Section 1).

Our purpose for this work was to determine the commonalities and differences among the national reports and programs with regard to four major categories of student civic learning: civic knowledge, skills, dispositions (e.g., values, inclinations), and practice/action. We offer our findings below. In addition, because the Census report (National Conference on Citizenship, 2012), the U.S. Department of Education Shared Futures survey (Musil, 2007), and the Wabash studies (Center of Inquiry, 2011) ask very specific questions about behaviors and attitudes, we detail them in a separate section. Next, we share two charts that compare/contrast the key themes across the majority of these national documents and the national surveys. In the end, we offer our insights about commonalities and differences from the reports and point out the usefulness of the national reports and measures for administrators and educators in varied college and university settings. We recognize that our work is just a first step, but hopefully can provide a useful base for on-going discussion and potentially additional research by other scholars and practitioners interested in ways that college students might learn about and practice civic engagement.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CIVIC KNOWLEDGE</th>
<th>SKILLS</th>
<th>DISPOSITION</th>
<th>PRACTICE/ACTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>AACC</strong></td>
<td>Information gathering, evaluating and presenting</td>
<td>Identifying group interests and goals as well as</td>
<td>Participating in government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding issues, history, and contemporary</td>
<td>skills using library, internet</td>
<td>persona interests and goals</td>
<td>Writing letters to newspapers and members of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>relevance</td>
<td>Establishing correlational or cause-and-effect</td>
<td>Responsibility to serve community</td>
<td>government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding fundamental laws and the role of</td>
<td>relationships</td>
<td></td>
<td>Getting others involved in civic action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>decision-making</td>
<td>Defending a position or argument</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identifying implications, rights and responsibilities</td>
<td>Influencing policies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding needs and resources in community</td>
<td>Collaborating</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>where live</td>
<td>Listening to others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognizing own biases or prejudices</td>
<td>Working with diverse others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ADP</strong></td>
<td>Oral and written expression of positions</td>
<td></td>
<td>Range of civic experiences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>Working and listening to others with whom you</td>
<td></td>
<td>Local, international, service, internships, service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td>may disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td>learning, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Events</td>
<td>Organizing for a goal</td>
<td></td>
<td>Opportunities for reflection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elements-Democracy</td>
<td>Social networking for social purposes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bonner</strong></td>
<td>Community-building</td>
<td>Diversity</td>
<td>Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International understanding</td>
<td>Advocate for social justice</td>
<td>Spiritual Exploration</td>
<td>Service Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Systematic insight into social and environmental</td>
<td>Active Citizenship/Public Policy and Service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>issues</td>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Crucible Moment (AACU)</strong></td>
<td>Critical inquiry, analysis and reasoning</td>
<td>Respect for freedom and human dignity</td>
<td>Integration of knowledge, skills, values to inform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Familiarity with key democratic texts &amp; universal</td>
<td>Quantitative reasoning</td>
<td>Empathy</td>
<td>actions w/others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>democratic principles</td>
<td>Gathering and evaluating multiple forms of</td>
<td>Open-mindedness</td>
<td>Moral discernment &amp; behavior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical &amp; sociological understanding of</td>
<td>evidence</td>
<td>Tolerance</td>
<td>Navigation of political systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>democratic movements, U.S. &amp; abroad</td>
<td>Seeking, engaging and being informed by</td>
<td>Justice</td>
<td>Public problem solving with diverse partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understand sources of identity &amp; influence on civic</td>
<td>multiple perspectives</td>
<td>Equality</td>
<td>Compromise, civility, mutual respect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>values... and responsibilities to public</td>
<td>Written, oral, and multimedia communication</td>
<td>Ethical integrity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diverse cultures, histories, values &amp; contestations</td>
<td>Deliberation and bridge building across</td>
<td>Responsibility to a greater good</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>that shape U.S. &amp; world societies</td>
<td>differences; Collaborative decision making</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple religious traditions and alternatives views</td>
<td>Ability to communicate in multiple languages</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of political systems &amp; ways to make change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lumina</strong></td>
<td>Explain diverse positions on contested issue</td>
<td>Develop civic insight</td>
<td>Experiential or field based learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sources of Evidence, both academic &amp; journalistic for</td>
<td>Develop and justify position on public issue,</td>
<td>Contribute to the Common Good</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>positions</td>
<td>relate alternative choices</td>
<td>Engage diverse perspectives</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Collaborate to develop and implement an approach</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>to a civic issue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Chart 2: National Reports of Core Competencies for Civic Engagement**
Categories of Student Learning

As we reviewed the documents and programs, four categories of student learning emerged using somewhat different wording but similar conceptualizations. We used these four categories to guide our analysis: civic knowledge, skills, dispositions (values, inclinations), and practice/action.

Interestingly enough, Stokam er’s (2011) Epistemological Model of Civic Competence explicates three identical categories: knowledge, skills, and dispositions. Her fourth category, identity, included both “efficacy” and “action.” Her conceptualizations were part of a dissertation and were based upon a series of other publications about civic engagement. So there appears to be great consistency in using these four categories of student learning when considering civic engagement competencies.

Civic Knowledge

Stokam er (2011) defines knowledge as “awareness and understanding of various subjects, how these topics relate to democratic society and the systems and processes of democratic decision-making and governance.” Almost every report we examined pointed out that students should have knowledge of political systems, history, and international understanding to include globalization and interdependence (Adelman et al., 2011; American Democracy Project, 2012; Gottlieb & Robinson, 2002; Meisel, 1996; The National Task Force, 2012).

Knowledge of diverse cultures is a theme in both the literature review and the AAC&U reports (The National Task Force, 2012; Rhodes, 2010; Musil, 2007; The National Leadership Council, 2007) as is self-identity. Two reports stress knowledge of current events: American Democracy Project, (2012) and the literature review. Three reports included knowledge about the sources of evidence: Lumina (Adelman et al., 2011), AACU (The National Task Force, 2012), and AAC&U (Gottlieb & Robinson, 2002). Social/environmental justice is cited in two reports: Bonner, (2011) and the literature review.

Civic Skills

Civic skills refer to the well-honed abilities to do a repeated task or set of tasks well, particularly in ways that influence communities. The reports we reviewed converge on the importance of developing student skills of critical analysis and inquiry/research, in being literate and understanding information, in using oral, written and mediated communication, in building bridges across differences, and in collaborating to achieve public outcomes. In addition, problem-solving and creative thinking skills are mentioned in the AAC&U reports (The National Task Force, 2012; Rhodes, 2010; Musil, 2007; The National Leadership Council, 2007). The AAC&U report (Gottlieb & Robinson, 2002) notes the importance of persuasion skills and related civic actions.

Lumina’s document (Adelman et al., 2011) and the literature review cite policy formation and analysis as important for students. Bonner (2011) and the literature review use the term “leadership”; one of the Wabash scales (Center of Inquiry, 2011) measures “socially responsible leadership.” The Bonner report (2011) uses the term “advocate for social justice”; only AAC&U (The National Task Force, 2012) calls for know-
ing multiple languages. The American Democracy Project [2012] calls for “social networking for social purposes.” The literature review cites “assessing the feasibility of change from social action and commitment, negotiation, democratic decision making.”

Civic Dispositions, Inclinations, and Values
Civic dispositions can be considered a combination of values, attitudes and preferences that guide thinking and can create the potential for action. Just about every report we examined wants students to come away with a desire to contribute to the common good and to engage diverse perspectives as valuable ways to inform one’s own views. The Crucible Moment document [The Task Force, 2012] and the literature review add language about ethical integrity or morality and the importance of related reasoning. The Crucible Moment [The Task Force, 2012] also stresses respect for freedom and human dignity, empathy, open-mindedness, tolerance, justice, and equality. Bonner [2011] adds spiritual exploration to the list. The Census questions [National Conference on Citizenship, 2012] measure trust in people and in institutions.

Practice/Action
The commonality found in student practice/actions for civic engagement involves applying skills to public problem solving; this is a stated or implied kind of action in every single report. Bonner [2011], ADP [2012], the Census [National Conference on Citizenship, 2012] and the literature review use the terms “service”, “service learning” or “volunteering”. The AAC&U [The Task Force, 2012] adds “compromise, civility, mutual respect, navigation of political systems, integration of knowledge, skills and values to inform actions with others”. The American Democracy Project [2012] adds “opportunities for reflection”, which is an often-touted practice in service learning more generally [National Service Learning Clearinghouse, 2009]. The literature review cites community planning and public management or administration as desirable student outcomes.

Scales and Measurements for Civic Engagement
While much of our analysis centered on the national reports listed above, we also determined that it would be useful to look at select surveys that gather national level data about the civic participation and civic learning across the country. Our purpose for looking at these measures- and any available related reports about the gathered data- was to see whether these information sources were consistent with or different than the content found in the national reports.

Census Measures
The United States government regularly collects data regarding the nation’s people and the economy. One part of the Census [National Conference on Citizenship, 2012] is intended to help identify levels of civic responsibility and civic participation by different groups as a potential indicator of the civic health of the nation. The Census [National Conference on Citizenship, 2012] measures action by asking about volunteering, attendance at public meetings, working with neighbors to make improvements, donations, voting, service in civic groups, social networks and reading and use of media to learn news.

Wabash Studies
This longitudinal national study of liberal arts education is intended to discover what teaching practices, programs, and institutional structures support liberal arts education and to develop methods of assessing liberal arts education [Center of Inquiry, 2011]. Seven outcomes (e.g. critical thinking, need for cognition, interest in and attitudes about diversity, leadership, moral reasoning, and well-being) guided the initial study, which was conducted on the campuses of forty-nine different educational institutions.
The on-going sets of Wabash studies rely on a series of in-depth scales that measure critical thinking, attributes of socially responsible leadership, contributions to arts, humanities, and sciences, involvement in politics and social issues, among other topics. More information about the scales is available at http://www.liberalarts.wabash.edu/study-instruments.

U.S. Department of Education Survey on Shared Futures
A national, collaborative research project sponsored by the U.S. Department of Education surveyed college students about their thoughts and experiences on varied civic, social, cultural, and global issues to find ways that colleges can prepare students for citizenship in a world of global change (Musil, 2007). Questions asked students about how they thought about other people, whether they analyze their own reasoning, and about the influence of society on their own behavior. Other questions asked students to assess their skills in communication, culture, cooperative word practices, problem-solving, perspective-taking, and discussing and negotiating controversial issues. Another set of questions asked about the importance of various roles for responsible citizenship and on their own involvement in different types of civic action.

Analysis of Commonalities and Differences
We found much more consensus than difference across the national reports. Language used in the documents is broad in scope and stated in ways that are carefully apolitical. Words like “advocacy” and “social justice” are mostly eschewed in the national reports. Economic or other inequalities are rarely mentioned in most of the reports. On the other hand, there is a heavy and unapologetic emphasis on diversity and the need to find common ground. The ability to bring people together to make change at any level (e.g. local to global) is a given, as is educating students to have the desire to do so.

Sometimes all these factors are combined. For instance, AAC&U Shared Futures Initiative zeros in on ways to address global learning and assumes “that we live in an interdependent but unequal world and that higher education can prepare students to not only thrive in such a world, but to creatively and responsibly remedy its inequalities and problems.” (See http://www.aacu.org/SharedFutures/index.cfm). Understanding of societal issues and the ability to sort out evidence for positions is consistently stressed in the reports, as is the ability to communicate positions both orally and in written forms. In addition, several of the reports, as well as the scales, mention the importance of critical thinking and taking leadership roles. Notably, these skills are commonly associated with a liberal education, whether or not they are acquired through, or applied to, civic engagement.

We found no mention of voting, except in the Census questionnaire (National Conference on Citizenship, 2012), although the literature review has a category for “active citizenship practices”. Only the literature review mentions public management or administration, and no one mentions running for public office. Only Bonner (2011) specifically mentions developing “systemic insight,” but AAC&U’s Crucible Moment (The Task Force, 2012) does identify the importance of knowing about political systems and ways to influence change.

Notably, we found that the national scales and measures were largely consistent with information found in the national reports. Thus, the civic-related questions in the Census (National Conference on Citizenship, 2012), in the Wabash studies (Center of Inquiry, 2011) and in the Shared Futures Survey (Musil, 2007) can help scholars and practitioners further understand different factors that contribute or detract from various aspects of the civic engagement of college students. Consequently, these national measures take us one step toward further identifying which educational practices and programs are connected to civic learning and participation. Such information could be highly valuable both to educators and community practitioners interested in promoting civic learning and community-related action.
### Chart 3: National Measures of Core Competencies for Civic Engagement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CIVIC KNOWLEDGE</th>
<th>SKILLS</th>
<th>DISPOSITION</th>
<th>PRACTICE/ACTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Census</td>
<td>Balance of Power</td>
<td>Leadership of organizations</td>
<td>Volunteering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Votes needed for an override of Presidential veto</td>
<td>Trust in people</td>
<td>Public Meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Trust in institutions</td>
<td>Work with neighbors to make improvements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Donations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Voting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Service in civic groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Social networks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reading and media re: news</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared Futures</td>
<td>Implies need to understand diversity as a part of citizenship</td>
<td>Implies leadership, communication, considering diverse perspectives</td>
<td>Volunteering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sign petitions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Join boycotts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Write to government or news</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Contribute money or organize group to fundraise for cause</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Write articles or educate others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wabash</td>
<td>Attributes of socially responsible leadership</td>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>Contributions to arts, humanities, &amp; sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Moral reasoning</td>
<td>Involvement in politics &amp; social issues</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Summary

In sum, the national reports offer considerable guidance for educators and administrators at both large and small institutions about important foci for engaging students in civic learning and encouraging them to demonstrate greater civic responsibility. The scales and measures available from the United States Census [National Conference on Citizenship, 2012], the Wabash studies [Center of Inquiry, 2011], and through AAC&U’s Shared Futures project [Musil, 2007] offer tools to use to see whether students are actually accomplishing civic learning and applying that learning through their practices in local and global communities.

### References
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As part of the larger project to determine the student core competencies for civic engagement, competencies or student learning outcomes from twenty-nine colleges and universities that offer minors or majors or student affairs programs in community engagement were gathered and analyzed. Of course, each program develops and defines the thematic areas in different ways, and, not surprisingly, many student learning outcomes reflect more than one theme, which will be evident in the following analysis.

In comparison to the national conversations about student civic engagement, many program student learning outcomes clearly reflect themes identified in the literature and the review of the national competencies, but the analysis also reveals themes that diverge from the literature and national reports. The analysis also demonstrates a difference in how concepts are operationalized; for example, some elements that were discussed as knowledge areas in the literature and national reports are developed in the student learning outcomes as skills. The program student learning outcomes vary in the ways they define themes; those variations and commonalities and differences between the themes and the national conversations are identified and discussed in the analysis.

### Methodology

Outreach began with a list of programs compiled by the Center for Engaged Democracy at Merrimack College. The list included 68 major, minor, certificate and other undergraduate programs focused on civic and community engagement, broadly defined. As the process moved forward additional programs were added to the list as they were discovered or suggested. A small number of programs had learning outcomes or core competencies clearly posted on their websites. In the majority of cases, core competencies were not readily available on-line. Those programs received one or two rounds of emails explaining the project, inviting them to contribute their core competencies if available. Of the programs we reached out to:

- Learning outcomes were collected from 23 programs:
  - 4 of which were majors
  - 10 of which were minors
  - 5 of which were certificates
  - 4 of which were not majors, minors or certificates
- Learning outcomes were not collected from 45 programs:
  - 10 responded that they did not have learning outcomes
  - 31 never responded
  - 2 were suspended or no longer existed
  - 2 were currently developing learning outcomes and offered to provide them when available

Appendix A lists the programs from which we have gathered learning outcomes. In addition to the 23 programs which sent us learning outcomes, six programs had items on-line that seemed similar to core competencies, but weren’t labeled as such. None of those programs responded to inquiries for more information. The list in Appendix A only includes programs that either provided core competencies directly, or had their core competencies clearly labeled as such on-line. In the analysis, the learning outcomes were categorized by theme, and a number of themes emerge under the larger categories of civic knowledge, skills, inclinations/values, and practice (see chart 4).
The learning outcomes for every program reflected knowledge as a core component of the program. The knowledge area was developed differently than national reports and rubrics; specifically, an understanding of the systemic nature of oppression is a significant theme that is not directly mentioned in the literature or in the national reports or rubrics. The national reports do discuss social and environmental justice, but the program student learning outcomes are far more specific in their development of a particularly consciousness regarding social justice. Further, student learning outcome themes of issue awareness in context and knowledge of organizational processes are far more specifically developed than the national conversation reflects. An understanding of democratic processes is consistent with the literature and national reports and rubrics.

**Issue awareness in context**

Programs commonly focus on increasing student knowledge of issues in local, national, and global contexts. Some of the outcomes are more broadly developed and range from intending to “embed students’ experiences of engagement in a broader social context” (Allegheny College Minor in Values, Ethics, and Social Action), “achieve an understanding of community needs” (University of Wisconsin Parkside Certificate in Community Based Learning), and “demonstrate an understanding of the social, political, and economic contexts of communities of place and interest” (Wartburg Major in Community Sociology). Other programs stressed more specific, local understanding, such as the California State University Monterey Bay Community Participation Learning outcome “demonstrate knowledge of the demographics, socio-cultural dynamics and assets of a specific local community” or the Metropolitan State University - Twin Cities Minor in Civic Engagement outcome “know and understand at least one specific issue area or context in which civic engagement takes place and/or increase development of at least one set of civic engagement skills.” While the literature and national rubrics stress the need for students to understand current events, issue awareness in context, as one of the most common identified themes, offers much more specificity in focus.

**Systemic processes of oppression**

Another very common theme for many programs that is not reflected in the literature or national standards is a desire for students to understand the systematic processes of oppression, both historically/culturally and the student’s participation in those processes. For some programs, the competencies simply state an understanding of “inequity” or “oppression”, such as “examine and analyze a community issue in the context of systemic inequities” (California State University Community Participation Learning Outcomes), and “aware[ness] of the impact of systemic inequities on her/his own life and opportunities” (California State University Monterey Bay Minor in Service Learning Leadership), and “critical thinking skills that allow students to explore the causes and effects of human suffering” and “[u]nderstand root causes of social problems” (Cabrini College Minor in Social Justice).

Other competencies are more detailed and perhaps could be read as more political in nature; for example, asking students to “Explain and analyze how historical legacies, individuals, structures, and institutions work interactively to distribute material and symbolic advantages and disadvantages based on race, ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation, and physical ability” (Guilford College Major in Public Service). In addition to understanding the theoretical, cultural, and historical roots...
of oppression, programs also ask students to grapple with their own identities and actually witness the inequality in their community work. Specifically, the California State University Monterey Bay’s Community Participation Learning Outcomes desire that students “Comprehend own social and cultural group identities and the relative privilege or marginalization of each” and the University of Kansas Certificate in Civic Engagement and Community Service requires that students “expose” themselves to “societal inadequacies and injustices.”

Community/organizational processes
A significant number of programs highlighted a need for students to understand how community and organizational processes work. The Allegheny College Minor in Values, Ethics, and Social Action intends “To equip students for complex thinking about social issues by providing them with theoretical and empirical tools for understanding communities and the dynamics of change within them.” Similarly, Alverno College’s Major in Community Leadership encourages students to “Apply theories from various social science and professional disciplines to analyze organizational effectiveness and community issues.” Other programs focus on specifics, such as “power dynamics” (California State University Monterey Bay Minor in Service Learning Leadership), “processes of decision-making and implementation in governmental and non-governmental organizations” (Indiana University Bloomington Certificate in Political and Civic Engagement), or the “interdependence within communities, societies, and the world” (Illinois State University Minor in Public Service). These student-learning outcomes focus on theory and are process oriented, implying that students will use that theory and process knowledge to enact community change.

Democratic processes
Consistent with the review of literature and national rubrics and related to the knowledge of the theory and processes of community and organizations, many programs identify the knowledge of specific democratic processes as a core competency. Some program student learning outcomes list both the general organizational processes and the specific democratic processes as discrete competencies. For example, Illinois State University Minor in Public Service intends that a student “grows an understanding of the democratic process,” and Indiana University Bloomington Certificate in Political and Civic Engagement intends that students “[u]nderstand the American political process and the operation of American civil society” and be able to “[a]nalize and use the products of American political and civic life such as legislation, government reports, judicial decisions, non-profit organization website, newspaper stories, and advocacy group manifestoes.” In this theme, learning outcomes

GUILFORD COLLEGE: COMMUNITY AND JUSTICE STUDIES
Interview with: Sherry Giles, Associate Professor of Justice & Policy Studies; Coordinator of the Community and Justice Studies major

“The Community and Justice Studies major focuses on policies and strategies of public service organizations. Taking an applied interdisciplinary approach, the department works with other departments and many community groups, to emphasize understanding public service organizations, problem-solving, values in public policies, civic activism and strategies for changing organizations. Graduates of the Community and Justice Studies major have pursued graduate study and careers in urban affairs, public administration, law and related vocations. Graduates also have undertaken careers in community organizing and in nonprofit community service organizations focusing on mediation and conflict resolution, spouse and child abuse and similar issues. Many students look forward to civic activism, influencing policy in their communities, and supporting their communities through service.” http://www.guilford.edu/academics/academic-programs/academic-departments/justice-policy-studies/majors/
implied that the knowledge would be used in effective action in communities; for example, a goal of Tufts University Jonathon M. Tisch College of Citizenship and Public Service is that a student “[r]ecognizes or recalls information, concepts, and theories that are essential to build democratic societies.” Finally, some of the competencies in this theme develop a macro approach, such as “[k]now critical social, cultural, political and historical dynamics that underlie the practice of civic engagement from a US and/or global perspective” (Metropolitan State University - Twin Cities Minor in Civic Engagement) and “[u]nderstand different styles of public leadership and the role of political and civic leaders” (Indiana University Bloomington Certificate in Political and Civic Engagement).

Community-based learning/Service-learning knowledge

Finally, in the knowledge category, a few programs identify in their learning outcomes a need for students to understand the principles of service learning and/or community-based learning. A few examples include, the University of California Los Angeles Minor in Civic Engagement’s “Knowledge of the diverse traditions of service and the history of service movements” and “Familiarity with empirical research addressing cognitive and affective outcomes of service learning and community involvement.” Understandably, the California State University Monterey Bay Minor in Service Learning Leadership has a more developed learning outcome for service learning: “Service Learning Design and Pedagogy – Students know the theoretical roots and various approaches to service learning and experiential education pedagogy; have a working understanding of empirical research in service learning, focusing on cognitive and affective outcomes for student learning and development as well as community development; facilitate service learning and practical experiences, and identify and assess critical components of effective service learning; and assess community service learning as a strategy for (a) creating more just communities, and (b) preparing students for lifelong community participation.”

While only a few programs directly state this theme, the general principles of community-based or service-learning are reflected by other programs in skills outcomes, such as reciprocity.

Civic Skills

Civic skills are a significantly larger category in the analysis of civic learning outcomes. The skills range from those that are more specifically focused on civic engagement to those that are commonly thought of as part of a traditional liberal arts education. However, even for those more general skills of liberal education, the program learning outcomes discuss those skills in the context of civic education.
Primarily, the program outcomes reflect the skills of leadership, community building, communication, and analysis. The programs develop leadership more than the national conversation reflects. While not directly stated in the literature and national reports, students learning outcomes of conflict management/civility and intercultural competence emerge as distinct strong skill-based themes, while research and translating theory into practice are minor themes.

- **Intercultural competence**

The most common theme for the program student-learning outcomes is in developing students’ capacity for intercultural competence, which is reflected in how diversity and intercultural competence are emphasized as both knowledge and skills in the national reports and rubrics.

Some of the programs used the language of “diversity,” “multicultural,” or “cultural pluralism,” but, in intent, the goal is that students be able to communicate and work with people and communities that reflect a range of cultural diversity. For many schools, the outcomes are more general and focus on an appreciation for diversity—“Recognizing and appreciating human diversity and commonality” [Auburn University Minor in Community and Civic Engagement], “develops an appreciation of diversity” [Illinois State University Minor in Public Service], and “appreciate the roles that diversity and multiculturalism play in human relations, their own identity, and the fundamental way they view the world” [University of Maine at Machias Major in the Behavioral Sciences and Community Studies]. Other programs emphasize reflection and respect, such as University of California Los Angeles Minor in Civic En-

---

**SALT LAKE COMMUNITY COLLEGE: CIVICALLY ENGAGED SCHOLAR PROGRAM**

Interview with Lisa Walz, Service learning Coordinator

“The Civically Engaged Scholar program provides a structure for students to develop knowledge and skills to become active members of their communities. The program enhances both academic learning and volunteer experiences. Personal and academic knowledge deepen as students critically reflect on their civic participation in our community. Civically Engaged Scholars stand out as leaders who strive to impact our communities for the better.” [http://www.slcc.edu/thaynecenter/civicallyengagedscholars.asp](http://www.slcc.edu/thaynecenter/civicallyengagedscholars.asp)

The mission of the Civically Engaged Scholar [CES] program at Salt Lake Community College is to provide students with a formal education on social justice issues, through both designated service-learning courses and a co-curricular discussion series. CES is an honors program administered by the Thayne Center for Service & Learning, which was established in 1994. There are three tracks open to all students: Academic Service-Learning, Community Building, and Engaged Leadership. Additionally, all students enrolled in an “Engaged Department” graduate automatically with this honor. As of 2012, SLCC’s Occupational Therapy Assistant Program is the only full Engaged Department at the college, though others are currently pursuing the designation. Each track includes required and elective coursework within designated service-learning classes, service with a nonprofit community partner, and presentations and written reflections on the student’s service experiences. During the 2011-12 academic year, the program coordinator instituted a required monthly meeting for all students in the program, which both helps deepen their understanding and practice of civic engagement, and builds community among the students. Three specific learning outcomes guide the work of the program. These learning outcomes are directly tied to the mission of the program, the mission of the Thayne Center, and in turn, the civic mission of SLCC. The learning outcomes are: 1) Students will be able to identify, understand, and appreciate human differences. 2) Students will be able to list and explain their personal values as they relate to their individual identity, self-esteem, and attitude. 3) Students will be able to define, describe, and analyze five social justice issues effecting college, local, regional, national, and global communities. A mixed-method assessment of these outcomes is conducted annually through an online survey and individual mentoring sessions with program members.
gagement’s outcomes “Ability to reflect critically about diversity, commonality, and democracy” and “Respect for cultural pluralism and multiple viewpoints.” Other programs were specific about the ability to communicate with intercultural competency, for example “Have knowledge, awareness, and skills in relation to cultural competency as it relates to racial ethnic minorities, research, community leadership, and public service” (University of California Irvine Major in Public and Community Service) and “Intercultural knowledge and competence – a set of cognitive, affective, and behavioral skills and characteristics that support effective and appropriate interaction in a variety of cultural contexts” (University of Wisconsin Milwaukee Community Service Learning).

Communication

Related to intercultural competence is another very common theme—the more general ability to communicate effectively in a variety of contexts (interpersonal, presentational, written). The literature and the national reports and rubrics emphasize the importance of communication, both written and oral, as do the program outcomes.

Communication outcomes tend to be longer and contain more elements than other competencies. The Providence College Major in Public and Community Service Studies identifies six outcomes in significant detail; one of those is the “Eloquent listening” competency.” They define it as follows:

We borrow the term “listen eloquently” from Langston Hughes. This first competency refers not just to what some call “active listening,” but to a capacity Nell Morton describes as “hearing people into speech.” The ability to listen eloquently allows someone to discern the interests of others in conversation, as well as find common ground in working for community change [see Margaret Wheatley’s ideas about “simple conversations to change the world”].

Specific skills/experiences: storytelling, the ability to find common interests in one-to-one conversations, use of “field notes” as practice in observation and as the basis for reflection [ethnography], conflict resolution, stakeholder analysis, community mapping.

Providence College’s major in Public And Community Service also identifies “Writing and Public Speaking” as a core competency. Their definition of this is:

Communications skills are essential to any undergraduate major, and to citizenship in a democracy more generally. But Public and Community Service Studies majors need to be able to communicate their thoughts and actions, both vertically to community and world leaders, and horizontally, with fellow students and community members.

Specific skills/experience: Skills here include the ability to write well, which includes editing and proofing skills and the ability to write to specific audiences. “Public” speaking not only involves the capacity to present to different groups, but also the ability to converse one-on-one, and to present visual materials in public.

Tufts University Jonathon M. Tisch College of Citizenship and Public Service also devotes two outcomes to communication with “Communication--Effectively communicates to build democratic societies” and “Develop communication skills to Responding--Builds and maintains interpersonal relationships in order to build democratic societies.”

Some programs see communication as a way to engage and share disciplinary and professional knowledge, such as “communication and organizing skills that enable them to act upon that knowledge as members of the campus community and eventually as professionals in their chosen fields” [Cabrini College Minor in Social Justice], “communicate disciplinary ideas for academic and general audiences in oral, written, and visual presentation formats” [University of Maine at Machias Major in the Behavioral Sciences and Community Studies], and “Demonstrate effective oral and written communication skills consistent with the professional expectations of the discipline” [Wartburg Major in Community Sociology].

Other programs reflect communication as broad skill set to be utilized in different ways in a variety of contexts. Some examples are “Communication--Courses in this track build effective communication skills, develop problems-solving skills and attain excellence in
interpersonal communication, writing and public speaking” (University of Massachusetts Dartmouth Minor in Leadership and Civic Engagement), and “Effectively writes, reads, views, visualizes, speaks, and listens” (Montclair State University Leadership Development through Civic Engagement Minor Program).

Other programs used a rhetorical definition of communication, such as the Indiana University Bloomington Certificate in Political and Civic Engagement outcome “Communicate in an effective and persuasive manner in a variety of public venues” and the University of Illinois Certificate in Civic Leadership outcome in Rhetoric “Students learn to analyze and create persuasive, issue-oriented arguments, with particular emphasis on the dimensions of language, genre, situation, and consequences, and experiment with presenting arguments in both verbal and visual media. CCLCP’s capstone course in public discourse broadens and deepens students’ understanding of the rhetorical tools used by civic leaders and change agents.”

Writing is often mentioned with other communication skills in the outcomes, but very few programs have outcomes that are solely focused on writing. Two of those programs are the Waynesburg University Minor in Service Leadership outcome “think and write critically about the complex network out of which substantial American and international social problems arise (such as poverty, homelessness and/or inadequate housing, hunger and illiteracy)” and the University of Illinois Certificate in Civic Leadership outcome:

Writing--Students hone their skills by working on writing projects with community-based partner organizations. Examples include brochures, fact sheets, news releases and media kits, annual reports, issue overviews, and workshop materials. Students also learn to present their community-based research in thesis-driven, formally documented academic papers. Other written work may include field notes, a community or organization profile, a blog, and ‘cover letters’ explaining and justifying an approach to a writing projects”

In the case of the former outcome, it connects to the understanding of social inequities; the interconnection to other competencies of knowledge or skills is common in the communication theme. The sheer number of learning outcomes that reflect the need for students to develop strong oral and written communication skills reflects the emphasis placed on oral and written communication skills in the literature and national rubrics.

INDIANA UNIVERSITY-BLOOMINGTON: POLITICAL AND CIVIC ENGAGEMENT (PACE)
Interview with Michael Grossberg, Sally M. Reahard Professor, Department of History; Professor, School of Law; Co-Director, Indiana University Center on Law, Society, and Culture; Director, Political and Civic Engagement Program

“The PACE program prepares undergraduate students for a lifetime of participation in American political and civic life. Its interdisciplinary courses and activities develop their communication, organization, decision-making, critical thinking, and leadership skills; and PACE motivates them to be knowledgeable, effective, and committed citizens. Through PACE students take part in a wide range of political and civic organizations: advocacy groups, non-profit agencies, political campaigns, branches of local, state, and national government, community organizations, and the media. PACE students are ready to work in political and civic organizations right after graduation and to pursue post-graduate education in law, public policy, education, business, the media, social work, and many other fields. PACE also enhances the education of students headed toward careers in other areas such as health care or the arts who want to be engaged citizens.” http://pace.indiana.edu/
The PACE program is an interdisciplinary undergraduate certificate program that began in 2009 in response to the call from students to have a more organized program in civic and political engagement. It is designed to integrate theory and practice through experiential learning. In addition to core and elective course work, the program includes an annual deliberative issue forum, internships and a capstone. The 2011-2012 academic year was the first year of a full curriculum, meaning that it was the first year to have seniors in the program and thus students in the capstone. From the outset of the program they developed 11 program goals and eight learning objectives.

The learning objectives each include a three level rubric for assessment and are: Acquisition of Knowledge, Analysis of Knowledge, Leadership Development, Collaborative & Creative Conflict, Effective Communication, Political and Civic Identity, Problem Solving, and Social Awareness & Ethical Responsibility. The development of these learning objectives and program goals was guided by the experience and knowledge of the advisory board about what it takes to be effective in public/political life. The learning outcomes are assessed through course assignments which are collected as a whole through an electronic portfolio. Additionally, they conduct focus groups with each capstone class about what the students have learned through the certificate. They have plans for long-term tracking of the students after they graduate, with a goal of creating a community of which the students want to remain a part.

Leadership

Civic leadership is a very common theme, both explicitly and implicitly, in the program outcomes. Programs identify a need for students to develop “A vision that can empower and inspire others” (University of California Los Angeles Minor in Civic Engagement) or “Inspires or facilitates others to build democratic societies” (Tufts University Jonathon M. Tisch College of Citizenship and Public Service). Other programs focus on specific leadership skills, including, not surprisingly, the University of Massachusetts Dartmouth Minor in Leadership and Civic Engagement’s outcome in “Policy and Decision Making—Courses in this track develop an understanding of how leadership skills are applied and decisions are made in a variety of contexts” and the University of Wisconsin Milwaukee Community Service Learning outcome in “Leadership Identity Development—To gain an understanding of one’s own beliefs, values, and responsibilities that will play a role in the leadership positions and styles that one undertakes. To learn about existing leadership models and use them to identify a personal leadership style.”

Leadership skills and principles are apparent or implied in a number of other categories, such as other civic skills and the larger categories of inclinations and practice. Leadership is also reflected as a more minor theme of the literature review and the analysis of national reports; however, programs place a great emphasis on leadership throughout the learning outcomes.

Community building

Reflected in the national conversations and related to leadership, programs ask students to be able to apply their skills to build communities. Some programs focus on the specific term “community building,” as in the Guilford College Major in Public Service outcome in “Community Building: Develop and apply the skills used to build a sense of community that enables diverse groups to accomplish social change in contemporary societies where individualism and competition are emphasized” and the Montclair State University Leadership Development through Civic Engagement Minor’s outcome in “Community Building—Demonstrates capacity to bring diverse individuals together to work towards and implement common goals through dialogue.” Other schools have outcomes that specifically attempt to develop knowledge into skills that influence how students work in the community. The California State University Monterey Bay Community Participation Learning Outcomes ask students to “[d]emonstrate reciprocity and responsiveness in service work with community” and the Indiana University Bloomington Certificate in Political and Civic Engagement outcomes require students to “work with those who hold opposing views and devise effective solutions to public problems through democratic decision-making.” Both of the previous outcomes call upon students to use other civic skills and are manifestations of students utilizing their knowledge practically in their communities.

Conflict management/civility

Closely related to building bridges is the theme of conflict management/civility, which is a significant theme of the program outcomes. As in the Indiana University Bloomington Certificate in Political and Civic Engagement outcome from the above section, other programs also specify conflict management and civility as important skills for students in their work with communities. Some common ways that this theme is manifest in the outcomes are “Behaving, and working through controversy, with civility” (Auburn University Minor in Community and Civic Engagement), “Builds bridges across differences” (California State University Monterey Bay Minor in Service Learning Leadership), and “Finds common ground and respects disagreements with
civility and diplomacy” (Montclair State University Leadership Development through Civic Engagement Minor). This area of conflict management and civility is closely related to the skill that was most commonly found in the core competencies—Intercultural Competence.

Research/modes of inquiry
While the national reports discussed knowledge of sources, programs emphasize research as an important skill competency for students. The language surrounding research is simple and usually manifested as a short phrase. Examples are “Research: students learn how to find information in a community” (Allegheny College Minor in Values, Ethics, and Social Action), “be able to locate and evaluate sources of information” (University of Maine at Machias Major in the Behavioral Sciences and Community Studies), and “Conduct financial analysis and social scientific research” (Alverno College Major in Community Leadership). As is evident in these examples and other competencies, the research theme often focuses on disciplinary or specific modes of inquiry that were valued by the program.

Analysis
Related to research and communication, programs emphasize the need for students to be able to analyze research and their own experience in ways that would be useful for their work in communities. The need for critical analysis is reflected in the literature and the national reports and rubrics.

Some examples of learning outcomes from the program include, “Analysis: students learn to analyze such research as appropriately” (Allegheny College Minor in Values, Ethics, and Social Action), “Assesses value and of civic engagement initiatives” (Tufts University Jonathon M. Tisch College of Citizenship and Public Service), and “the opportunity to develop their analytical skills as they formulate opinions and use reasoned judgment and communication skills to articulate their analyses” (University of San Francisco Minor in Public Service and Community Engagement). Other programs focus on outcomes of the analysis process, such as “Thinks creatively to generate effective strategies to build democratic societies” (Tufts University Jonathon M. Tisch College of Citizenship and Public Service), “Creative thinking – the capacity to combine or synthesize existing ideas, images, or expertise in original ways and the experience of thinking, reacting, and working in an imaginative way characterized by a high degree of innovation, divergent thinking, and risk-taking” (University of Wisconsin Milwaukee Community Service Learning), “Problem solving – a process to design, evaluate, and implement a strategy to answer an open-ended question or achieve a desired goal” (University of Wisconsin Milwaukee Community Service Learning), and “Analyzes and synthesizes information objectively, takes a critical stance – uses signs and logic to be able to see false dichotomy, conflicts and analogues” (Montclair State University Leadership Development through Civic Engagement Minor Program).

Critical thinking
Related to analysis, a smaller number of programs specifically emphasize critical thinking skills; those that do usually combined those skills with others (communication or analysis) or focused more broadly on critical thinking as a liberal learning objective. Some specific program outcomes are: “Critical Thinking—Distinguishes between fact and opinion; asks questions; makes detailed observations; uncovers assumptions and defines terms; and makes assertions based on sound logic and solid evidence” (Montclair State University Leadership Development through Civic Engagement Minor), “displays critical thinking within the arena of democratic conversations and social issues” (Illinois State University Minor in Public Service), “Applied critical thinking: students learn to think in complex ways about social problems such as poverty” (Allegheny College Minor in Values, Ethics, and Social Action), and “Practices critical thinking as a guide to belief and action in a democratic society” (Tufts University Jonathon M. Tisch College of Citizenship and Public Service).

In the skills category, the learning outcomes imply if not directly state the need for students to be able to use their learning to take action in a community, which is summed up by the next skill-based theme identified in the learning outcomes—Theory into Practice.
Theory into practice

A smaller number of programs directly state student-learning outcomes that require students to put theory into practice. This competency is not specifically mentioned in the literature or the organizational reports, but the ability to put theory or knowledge into practice is implied in the national conversations and throughout the program learning outcomes.

Some of the program outcomes are more general in understanding the relationship of theory and practice, such as “Integrative learning – transferring and relating one learning experience to another experience” [University of Wisconsin Milwaukee Community Service Learning], “Analyze and use the scholarship on American political and civic life and understand the relationship between theory and practice” [Indiana University Bloomington Certificate in Political and Civic Engagement], “Connect course concepts to your experiences for deeper learning” [University of Wisconsin Parkside Certificate in Community Based Learning], and “Be able to integrate theory and experience” [Metropolitan State University - Twin Cities Minor in Civic Engagement]. Other programs ask students to put specific knowledge or skills into practice. Some examples are “Know the variety of forms of civic engagement and have the ability to assess the efficacy of different approaches and strategies” [Metropolitan State University - Twin Cities Minor in Civic Engagement], “Ability to apply discipline-specific knowledge to contemporary or anticipated community needs”, [University of California Los Angeles Minor in Civic Engagement], and “Gain specific applied research [both quantitative and qualitative training] and analytical skills [scientific and statistical fundamentals] to address social issues as critical thinkers and problem solvers” [University of California Irvine Major in Public and Community Service]. The latter examples of theory into practice imply that students will have practiced bringing theory to bear on community issues during their time in the program.

Social responsibility/citizenship

Many student-learning outcomes center on students understanding and acting upon the obligations of citizenship in a socially responsible manner. In the national reports and rubrics, the theme “contribute to the common good” can be seen as a related value, but programs do not use this language and develop it differently in the student learning outcomes.

Some programs again engage citizenship more broadly with outcomes such as “Developing empathy, ethics, values, and sense of social responsibility” [Auburn University Minor in Community and Civic Engagement], “Instill in students the value, appreciation and ethical responsibility of community investment, action research, and civic engagement” [University of California Irvine Major in Public and Community Service], and “Understanding of how civic engagement and participation in public life contribute to overall quality of life in the community” [University of California Los Angeles Minor in Civic Engagement]. Many programs develop this outcome as personal, such as the Illinois State University Minor in Civic Engagement outcomc “A civically educated individual gains a sense of self-awareness as a citizen” and the University of Alaska Anchorage Certificate in Civic Engagement outcome “Articulate public uses of their education and civic engagement.”

Action in community

An inclination to act in the community is not reflected in the literature or national reports, but it certainly is implied in the practice area of the national reports, where service learning and volunteering are emphasized. In the program outcomes, the inclination is clearly for students to have a life-long investment in their communities. This is related to, but different from, the broader ideas of citizenship and volunteering described in the national reports.
Many programs specifically emphasize student inclinations to take action in the community as a learning outcome, including the University of California Los Angeles Minor in Civic Engagement outcomes “A desire to promote their visions of social justice locally and globally” and “A willingness to participate actively in public life, address public problems, and serve their communities.” Many programs ask students to take specific sorts of action in the community. Examples are: “Promoting social justice locally and globally” and “Taking an active role in the political process,” and “Participating actively in public life, public problem solving, and community service” (Auburn University Minor in Community and Civic Engagement). Others call on students to use other skills (research, communication, or analysis) to effectively take action in the community; an example is “Seek out various perspectives, engage in dialogue, analyze the effectiveness of policies, and take informed and principled stands on vital public issues” (Indiana University Bloomington Certificate in Political and Civic Engagement) and “Students will become familiar with the pressing social issues of the day as they develop the necessary skills and knowledge for working in reciprocal partnerships, participating in diverse democratic societies, and providing thoughtful servant leadership” (University of San Francisco Minor in Public Service and Community Engagement).

Self-reflection

While the American Democracy Project report is the only national report to mention self-reflection as an inclination, many academic programs focus on students’ self-reflection upon their own experiences and those of others as they move toward acting in the community. Some examples include: “aware of her/his own identities, stereotypes and assumptions” (California State University Monterey Bay Minor in Service Learning Leadership), “Critically assess self and how others see him/her” (Montclair State University Leadership Development through Civic Engagement Minor Program), and “able to personally integrate reflection on service, social issues, and course content” (Illinois State University Minor in Public Service). Finally, the University of Maine at Machias Major in the Behavioral Sciences and Community Studies outcomes encourage students “to self-critique for purposes of ongoing learning, personal and professional development, and ethical decision making.”

Ethics

The literature and a few national reports and rubrics discuss ethics, but, in the program learning outcomes, ethics as a theme is surprisingly less noticeable. Many programs implicate ethical standards in other categories (knowledge or skills), but few programs actually underscore ethics in their student learning outcomes. Those that do have outcomes such as: “Values and ethics: students learn to reason ethically about social issues and to connect them to philosophical or religious models of value” (Allegheny College Minor in Values, Ethics, and Social Action), “Explore moral-ethical dimensions of community issues and apply criteria for evaluating approaches to dealing with them” (Alverno College Major in Community Leadership), “Courses in this track develop integrity and understanding of the values of fairness, responsibility for self and for others, and personal accountability” (University of Massachusetts Dartmouth Minor in Leadership and Civic Engagement), and “Demonstrate effective interpersonal skills, professional responsibilities, and ethical sensibilities in research and applied work” (Wartburg Major in Community Sociology).

Personal development

Finally, in the inclinations or values themes, a few programs emphasize personal gains for students in a number of areas. The examples are wide ranging; a few are “Develop your own social philosophy” (Alverno College Major in Community Leadership), “Recognizes own personal perspective. Understands and appreciates others’ perspectives and interests” (Montclair State University Leadership Development through Civic Engagement Minor Program), “A commitment to a set of personal values” (University of California Los Angeles Minor in Civic Engagement), and “Cultivate your own interests while working with community partners” (University of Wisconsin Parkside Certificate in Community Based Learning).

Civic Practice

The literature and national reports highlight practice as service-learning or volunteering; in the student learning outcomes, less than one-fourth of the programs have specific practice-oriented outcomes. Apparent in the preceding analysis, all of the programs
imply that students will utilize their knowledge, skills, and inclinations to act in the world, but fewer programs explicitly emphasize the need for students to act in the community as a learning outcome. The difference is understandable, in that for student learning outcomes, the practice in the community is used by academic programs to develop other student outcomes rather than as a learning outcome in and of itself.

Some student learning outcome examples of the specific emphasis on practice are: “have experience working in groups in classes and collaboratively in the community” [University of Maine at Machias Major in the Behavioral Sciences and Community Studies] and “utilize service experiences as laboratories for the learning of courses in their academic major programs” [Waynesburg University Minor in Service Leadership]. The University of Kansas Certificate in Civic Engagement and Community Service devotes three learning outcomes to civic practice with “gone beyond the classroom to help your community and to further your own education,” “applied your course content in the context of the real world,” and “assisted community agencies in better serving their clients.”

Finally, a number of outcomes are not readily categorized into civic learning competencies. Those focus on subject matter competencies or very specific disciplinary knowledge (sociology or social science research skills) or on more general concepts of broad thinking and commitments to lifelong learning or results in the community.

Summary

The learning outcomes of the civic engagement programs generally mirror those identified in the literature and the national rubrics. Differences in how those outcomes are discussed and how central those outcomes are in the programs are apparent in the analysis.

Knowledge of democratic processes is reflected in the national conversation and the outcomes, but many schools also discuss the necessity for students to understand organizational processes to help them understand how change is made in communities. Academic program emphasis on knowledge not specifically mentioned or highlighted in the literature or national rubrics is most surprising. Primary among these is knowledge of the systematic processes of oppression. A number of colleges shared the specific focus on this outcome, and the language and tone of the program learning outcomes signal a particular social justice agenda for student work in communities. Also, the program student learning outcomes are definitive about students gaining awareness of specific issues and understanding those issues within a specific context. While the national conversations imply contextual understanding of specific community issues, the program student learning outcomes emphasize it. Further, the program student learning outcomes develop knowledge of sources and diverse cultures as skills rather than knowledge outcomes, as in the national conversations.

In the skills area, written and oral communication, leadership, building bridges, and analysis are consistent with the literature and national reports and rubrics. In the national reports, the ability to put theory into practice is not directly stated but clearly implied, and the ability to research is coded as knowledge. The civic inclinations of social responsibility, obligations of citizenship, and taking action in the community are central in the student learning outcomes, however, in the literature and national reports, “contribute to the common good” emerges as a more vague theme that encapsulates them. Ethics is critical, but, in the program student learning outcomes, ethics did not emerge as a central theme. Ethics is implied in many learning outcomes, but very few programs specifically mention the development or use of ethical standards. A final inclination revealed in the analysis is self-reflection, a disposition to reflect on oneself, one’s position in the world, and one’s actions.

Finally, the national reports focus on engaging students in the community via service or community-based learning to develop and enhance student knowledge and skills. While less then one-fourth of the programs specifically discuss the actual engagement of students in service or community-based learning in their outcomes, the programs as a whole certainly imply that as a pedagogical technique. In some ways, the absence makes sense. Engagement in the community is not an explicit student outcome but is clearly used by programs in the development of student civic knowledge and skills.
# REVIEW OF KEY EVIDENCE STRANDS

## SECTION C: Academic Programs

### Appendix A: Programs with Identified Learning Outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Type of Program</th>
<th>Web Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allegheny College</td>
<td>Meadville, PA</td>
<td>Values, Ethics, and Social Action</td>
<td>Minor</td>
<td><a href="http://sites.allegheny.edu/vesa/">http://sites.allegheny.edu/vesa/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alverno College</td>
<td>Milwaukee, WI</td>
<td>Community Leadership</td>
<td>Major</td>
<td><a href="http://depts.alverno.edu/cld/">http://depts.alverno.edu/cld/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auburn University</td>
<td>Auburn, AL</td>
<td>Community and Civic Engagement</td>
<td>Minor</td>
<td><a href="http://www.cla.auburn.edu/cla/ccc/resources-for-students/minor/">http://www.cla.auburn.edu/cla/ccc/resources-for-students/minor/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cabrini College</td>
<td>Radnor, PA</td>
<td>Social Justice</td>
<td>Minor</td>
<td><a href="http://www.cabrini.edu/Academics/Academic-Departments/Social-Justice-Minor.aspx">http://www.cabrini.edu/Academics/Academic-Departments/Social-Justice-Minor.aspx</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California State University, Monterey Bay</td>
<td>Seaside, CA</td>
<td>Service Learning Leadership</td>
<td>Minor</td>
<td><a href="http://service.csumb.edu/">http://service.csumb.edu/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado School of Mines</td>
<td>Golden, CA</td>
<td>Humanitarian Engineering</td>
<td>Minor</td>
<td><a href="http://humanitarian.mines.edu/">http://humanitarian.mines.edu/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guilford College</td>
<td>Greensboro, NC</td>
<td>Community and Justice Studies</td>
<td>Major</td>
<td><a href="http://www.guilford.edu/academics/academic-programs/academic-departments/justice-policy-studies/">http://www.guilford.edu/academics/academic-programs/academic-departments/justice-policy-studies/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois State University</td>
<td>Normal, IL</td>
<td>Civic Engagement and Responsibility</td>
<td>Minor</td>
<td><a href="http://americandemocracy.illinoisstate.edu/">http://americandemocracy.illinoisstate.edu/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana University</td>
<td>Bloomington, IN</td>
<td>Political and Civic Engagement</td>
<td>Certificate</td>
<td><a href="http://pace.indiana.edu/">http://pace.indiana.edu/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health</td>
<td>Baltimore, MD</td>
<td>Community-Based Public Health</td>
<td>Certificate</td>
<td><a href="http://www.jhsph.edu/academics/programs/certificates/program/44">http://www.jhsph.edu/academics/programs/certificates/program/44</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan State University, Twin Cities</td>
<td>Saint Paul, MD</td>
<td>Civic engagement</td>
<td>Minor</td>
<td><a href="http://www.metrostate.edu/msweb/explore/catalog/undergrad/index.cfm?l=U&amp;section=3&amp;page_name=civic_engagement.html">http://www.metrostate.edu/msweb/explore/catalog/undergrad/index.cfm?l=U&amp;section=3&amp;page_name=civic_engagement.html</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montclair State University</td>
<td>Montclair, NJ</td>
<td>Civic Engagement</td>
<td>Minor</td>
<td><a href="http://www.montclair.edu/catalog/view_requirements.php?CurriculumID=627">http://www.montclair.edu/catalog/view_requirements.php?CurriculumID=627</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providence College</td>
<td>Providence, RI</td>
<td>Public and Community Service Studies</td>
<td>Major</td>
<td><a href="http://www.providence.edu/academics/Pages/public-community-service-studies.aspx">http://www.providence.edu/academics/Pages/public-community-service-studies.aspx</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salt Lake Community College</td>
<td>Salt Lake City, UT</td>
<td>Civically Engaged Scholar Program</td>
<td>Scholar program</td>
<td><a href="http://www.slcc.edu/thaynecenter/civicallyengagedscholars.asp">http://www.slcc.edu/thaynecenter/civicallyengagedscholars.asp</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Program</td>
<td>Type of Program</td>
<td>Web Address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tufts University</td>
<td>Medford, MA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Alaska Anchorage</td>
<td>Anchorage, AK</td>
<td>Civic Engagement</td>
<td>Certificate</td>
<td><a href="http://www.uaa.alaska.edu/engage/civic/index.cfm">http://www.uaa.alaska.edu/engage/civic/index.cfm</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of California, Irvine</td>
<td>Irvine, CA</td>
<td>Public and Community Service</td>
<td>Major</td>
<td><a href="http://www.socsci.uci.edu/ssarc/pcs/index.html">http://www.socsci.uci.edu/ssarc/pcs/index.html</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of California Los Angeles</td>
<td>Los Angeles, CA</td>
<td>Civic Engagement</td>
<td>Minor</td>
<td><a href="http://www.communitylearning.ucla.edu/civic-engagement-minor.html">http://www.communitylearning.ucla.edu/civic-engagement-minor.html</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Georgia</td>
<td>Athens-Clarke County, GA</td>
<td>Civic Engagement</td>
<td>Certificate</td>
<td><a href="http://www.caes.uga.edu/academics/leadership/">http://www.caes.uga.edu/academics/leadership/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Illinois</td>
<td>Urbana, IL</td>
<td>Civic Leadership</td>
<td>Certificate</td>
<td><a href="http://www.uic.edu/depts/oaa/CCLCP/index.html">http://www.uic.edu/depts/oaa/CCLCP/index.html</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Kansas</td>
<td>Lawrence, KS</td>
<td>Service Learning</td>
<td>Certificate</td>
<td><a href="http://www.servicelearning.ku.edu/certification.shtml">http://www.servicelearning.ku.edu/certification.shtml</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Maine at Machias</td>
<td>Machias, ME</td>
<td>Behavioral Sciences and Community Studies</td>
<td>Major</td>
<td><a href="http://www.umm.maine.edu/behavsci.html">http://www.umm.maine.edu/behavsci.html</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Massachusetts Amherst</td>
<td>Amherst, MA</td>
<td>Citizen Scholars Program</td>
<td>2 year academic service learning program</td>
<td><a href="http://www.honors.umass.edu/about-citizen-scholars">http://www.honors.umass.edu/about-citizen-scholars</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Massachusetts Dartmouth</td>
<td>Dartmouth, MA</td>
<td>Leadership and Civic Engagement</td>
<td>Minor</td>
<td><a href="http://www.umassd.edu/seppce/centers/cce/leadershipcivicengagementminor/">http://www.umassd.edu/seppce/centers/cce/leadershipcivicengagementminor/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of San Francisco</td>
<td>San Francisco, CA</td>
<td>Public Service and Community Engagement</td>
<td>Minor</td>
<td><a href="http://www.usfca.edu/mccarthycenter/programs/PSCP.html">http://www.usfca.edu/mccarthycenter/programs/PSCP.html</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Wisconsin Milwaukee</td>
<td>Milwaukee, WI</td>
<td>Community Leadership Living Learning Community</td>
<td>Service Learning program</td>
<td><a href="http://www6.uwm.edu/soe/academics/ed_policy/comm_leadership/">http://www6.uwm.edu/soe/academics/ed_policy/comm_leadership/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Wisconsin Parkside</td>
<td>Kenosha, WI</td>
<td>Community Based Learning</td>
<td>Certificate</td>
<td><a href="http://www.uwp.edu/departments/community.partnerships/cbl/certificate.cfm">http://www.uwp.edu/departments/community.partnerships/cbl/certificate.cfm</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wartburg College</td>
<td>Waverly, IA</td>
<td>Community Sociology</td>
<td>Major</td>
<td><a href="http://www.wartburg.edu/socsci/soc.html">http://www.wartburg.edu/socsci/soc.html</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waynesburg University</td>
<td>Waynesburg, PA</td>
<td>Service Leadership</td>
<td>Minor</td>
<td><a href="http://www.waynesburg.edu/web/serveleadershipstudies">http://www.waynesburg.edu/web/serveleadershipstudies</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CONNECTIONS BETWEEN FINDINGS

As has been shown throughout this paper, there are many themes that emerge consistently from the literature review, the review of national records, and the specific academic programs. There are also several differences among the three.

Knowledge
All three reviews identify civic knowledge as a critical core competency area. The literature review identifies knowledge of government processes, citizens’ rights and responsibilities, political and legal systems, diversity and pluralism, and current affairs as some of the major content knowledge areas. These same areas are identified and expanded upon through the examination of national rubrics. AAC&U’s Civic Engagement Values Rubric also identifies making connections between one’s own scholarly discipline and civic engagement as a core competency. LEAP identifies knowledge of the physical and natural world as core competencies for civic engagement. Unlike the literature review and the national rubric review, the analysis of campus themes identifies knowledge of the systemic nature of oppression as a key knowledge area. The campuses also tend to highlight social justice knowledge as a critical competency. Finally, the campus analysis identifies core competencies relevant to knowledge of community/societal issues in local, national, and global contexts.

Skills
All three reviews identify core competencies that can be categorized as civic engagement skills. The literature review identifies critical reasoning about morality and causes, democratic decision-making, social organizing, consensus building, policy formation and analysis, communication and research skills; leadership and management skills; and assessing feasibility of change. The national report review identifies several of these same themes. It also identifies communication in multiple languages and teamwork. The campus analysis finds a greater emphasis on intercultural competence, leadership, and conflict management, and less emphasis on research and translating theory into practice.

Practice
The literature review identifies experiences as the third and final core competency category. This area includes community services, social organizing, project planning, community planning, and other real-world experiences. Similarly, the national report review identifies civic engagement practice, including students’ integration of knowledge, skills, and values to inform actions with others, moral behavior, navigation of political systems, civility, communication strategies, leadership, commitment to collaboration, and application of learning to new and complex contexts. The program review does not identify a practice category. This may be because some of these same concepts are included in the other major core competency areas. It may be because of the different authors’ interpretations of the data, as each section of this report was developed and written by different researchers. It could also be that campuses do not view the practice of civic engagement as a core competency area – practice would be for the purpose of gaining knowledge and skills and not a competency in and of itself.

Inclinations
A fourth and final general category of core competencies identified in this review is civic inclinations. This category does not emerge in the literature review. However, it is identified in both the review of national reports and academic programs and the review of local campuses. In the analysis of national rubrics, civic inclinations identified include, for example, respect for human dignity, empathy, open-mindedness, tolerance, ethical integrity, sense of responsibility. Similar to the review of national rubrics, the review of campuses also finds core competencies centered on facilitating students’ sense of responsibility to society or sense of citizenship. The campus review also identifies inclination to act in one’s community, to become a part of the civic life of one’s community and/or the broader community, as a civic inclinations core competency. Ethics comes up in both the national rubrics review and the campus review. Other core competencies raised by the campus review include self-reflection and personal development. Finally, civic practice, which is a separate category in the literature review and the national report review, is subsumed under civic inclinations in the campus review.
We view this document as the initiation of a national dialogue on core competencies in civic engagement which will help to define and legitimate this emerging scholarly field. We also believe it will help to delineate the learning outcomes appropriate for civic engagement majors, minors, and certificate programs, and that it will raise questions that demand further exploration. As each section of this report was developed and written by different committee members, through conference calls and virtual communication, several of whom have never met face-to-face, we as the writers of this text are still processing the work that we have done and considering its implications and appropriate next steps. We are extremely excited about the opportunity to have these conversations face-to-face at the Center for an Engaged Democracy 3rd Annual Research Institute, to share our findings with conference participants, and to benefit from your feedback.

We are pleased that we are not only able to present this synthesis of our findings, but that we are also able to provide you with links to many of the sources used for this analysis online. We encourage you to review these sources for additional ideas and inspiration as you are developing or refining the core competencies for your program. We also believe that much of the value in this initial research review lies in the ability to identify both commonalities and differences among the core competencies noted in the scholarly literature, espoused by national professional associations, and utilized by community engagement majors, minors, certificate programs, and extracurricular programs across the country.
## Chart 5: Core Competencies, Synthesis Across Key Evidence Strands

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CIVIC KNOWLEDGE</th>
<th>CIVIC SKILLS</th>
<th>CIVIC PRACTICE</th>
<th>CIVIC INCLINATIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Literature Review</strong></td>
<td>Government processes</td>
<td>Critical reasoning about morality and causes</td>
<td>Community services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Citizens’ rights and responsibilities</td>
<td>Democratic decision-making</td>
<td>Social organizing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Political and legal systems</td>
<td>Social organizing</td>
<td>Project planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Diversity and pluralism</td>
<td>Consensus building</td>
<td>Community planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Current affairs</td>
<td>Policy formation and analysis</td>
<td>Other real-world experiences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Democratic texts, movements, and principles</td>
<td>Communication and research skills</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Diverse cultures and histories of US and global societies</td>
<td>Leadership and management skills</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Knowledge of political systems</td>
<td>Assessing feasibility of change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Connections between one’s own scholarly discipline and civic engagement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Knowledge of the physical and natural world</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>National Reports</strong></td>
<td>Critical reasoning about morality and causes</td>
<td>Critical inquiry and reasoning</td>
<td>Integration of knowledge, skills, and values to inform actions with others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Democratic decision-making</td>
<td>Gathering and evaluating evidence</td>
<td>Moral behavior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social organizing</td>
<td>Being informed by multiple perspectives</td>
<td>Navigation of political systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Consensus building</td>
<td>Communication skills</td>
<td>Civility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Policy formation and analysis</td>
<td>Bridge building across differences</td>
<td>Communication strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Communication and research skills</td>
<td>Communication in multiple languages and teamwork</td>
<td>Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leadership and management skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assessing feasibility of change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Academic Programs</strong></td>
<td>Intercultural competence</td>
<td>Integration of knowledge, skills, and values to inform actions with others</td>
<td>Sense of responsibility to society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Communication skills</td>
<td>Moral behavior</td>
<td>Sense of citizenship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leadership skills</td>
<td>Navigation of political systems</td>
<td>Inclination to act in one’s community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conflict management/ civility</td>
<td>Civility</td>
<td>Become a part of the civic life of one’s community and/or the broader community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Research</td>
<td>Communication strategies</td>
<td>Ethics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Analysis</td>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>Self-reflection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Critical Thinking</td>
<td>Commitment to collaboration</td>
<td>Personal development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Theory to Practice</td>
<td>Application of learning to new and complex contexts</td>
<td>Civic Practice</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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