

**SELF-ASSESSMENT RUBRIC FOR THE
INSTITUTIONALIZATION OF SERVICE-LEARNING
IN HIGHER EDUCATION**

**Andrew Furco
Service-Learning Research & Development Center
University of California, Berkeley**

SELF-ASSESSMENT RUBRIC FOR THE INSTITUTIONALIZATION OF SERVICE-LEARNING IN HIGHER EDUCATION

Andrew Furco
Service-Learning Research & Development Center
University of California, Berkeley

BACKGROUND

The Self-Assessment Rubric for the Institutionalization of Service-Learning in Higher Education was designed to assist members of the higher education community in gauging the progress of their service-learning institutionalization efforts on their campus.

The rubric is structured by five dimensions that are considered by most service-learning experts to be key factors for higher education service-learning institutionalization. Each dimension is comprised of several components that characterize the dimension. For each component, a three-stage continuum of development has been established. Progression from *Stage One: Critical Mass Building* to *Stage Three: Sustained Institutionalization* suggests that the institution is moving closer to fully institutionalizing service-learning on its campus.

The conceptual framework for the rubric is based largely on a benchmark worksheet that was developed by Kevin Kecskes and Julie Muyliaert of the Western Region Campus Compact Consortium's *Continuums of Service* program. The three-stage developmental continuum and most of the self-assessment rubric's institutionalization dimensions were derived from the Kecskes/Mullyaert *Continuums of Service* benchmark worksheet.¹ The other dimensions of the rubric were derived from various literature sources that discuss the critical elements for institutionalizing service-learning in higher education. In particular, the work of the following individuals provided important foundational information for the development of the rubric: Edward Zlotkowski of Bentley College and the American Association for Higher Education; Rob Serow, Diane C. Calleson, and Lani Parker of North Carolina State University; Leigh Morgan of the North Carolina Commission on National and Community Service; Amy Driscoll of California State University, Monterey Bay; Donna Dengel and Roger Yerke of Portland, Oregon; and Gail Robinson of the American Association of Community Colleges.²

¹ The author expresses gratitude to Mr. Kevin Kecskes, Western Region Campus Compact Consortium Program Director and Ms. Julie Muyliaert, State Network Director for their permission to use and adapt the *Continuums of Service* Benchmark Worksheet to develop this self-assessment rubric.

² The author wishes to acknowledge Dr. Tanya Renner of Kapi'olani Community College and Ms. Nicole Konstantinakos Farrar of the California Campus Compact for their assistance in reviewing and refining the components of their self-assessment rubric.

COMPONENTS OF THE RUBRIC

The self-assessment rubric contains five dimensions, each which includes a set of components that characterize the dimension. The five dimensions of the rubric and their respective components are listed below:

DIMENSION	COMPONENTS
I. Philosophy and Mission of Service-Learning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Definition of Service-Learning • Strategic Planning • Alignment with Institutional Mission • Alignment with Educational Reform Efforts
II. Faculty Support for and Involvement in Service-Learning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Faculty Awareness • Faculty Involvement and Support • Faculty Leadership • Faculty Incentives and Rewards
III. Student Support for and Involvement in Service-Learning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Student Awareness • Student Opportunities • Student Leadership • Student Incentives and Rewards
IV. Community Participation and Partnerships	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Community Partner Awareness • Mutual Understanding • Community Agency Leadership and Voice
V. Institutional Support for Service-Learning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Coordinating Entity • Policy-Making Entity • Staffing • Funding • Administrative Support • Evaluation and Assessment

For each component, three stages of development are identified. Stage One is the *Critical Mass Building* stage. It is at this stage the campuses are beginning to recognize service-learning and are building a campus-wide constituency for the effort. Stage Two is the *Quality Building* stage. It is at this stage that campuses are focused on ensuring the development of "quality" service-learning activities; the quality of service-learning activities begins to supercede the quantity of service-learning activities. Stage Three is the *Sustained Institutionalization* stage. It is at this stage that a campus has fully institutionalized service-learning into the fabric of the institution.

It should be noted that some components may take many years to develop. According to Edward Zlotkowski, institutionalizing service-learning (or any other reform effort) in higher education takes time, commitment, and persistence (Zlotkowski, 1999). It is only through the sustained commitment of the campus over time that a sustained institutionalization of service-learning can be realized.

USING THE RUBRIC

As a tool to measure development of service-learning institutionalization, the rubric is designed to establish a set of criteria upon which the progress of service-learning institutionalization can be measured. Thus, the rubric is designed to measure the status of a campus' level of institutionalization at a particular point in time. The results of this status assessment can provide useful information for the development of an action plan to advance service-learning on the campus. It can help identify which institutionalization components or dimensions are progressing well and which need some additional attention. In addition, by using the tool at another point in time to reassess the status of service-learning institutionalization on a campus, the actual growth of each component and dimension over time can be measured.

As a self-assessment tool, the rubric is designed to facilitate discussion among colleagues regarding the state of service-learning institutionalization on a campus. Therefore, there is no one right way to use the rubric. Since a campus' unique culture and character will determine which of the rubric's dimensions are focused on most intensively; the dimensions and components of the rubric should be adapted to meet the needs of the campus. What is most important is the overall status of the campus' institutionalization progress rather than the progress of individual components. In some cases, individual components of the rubric may not be applicable to certain campus situations. In other cases, the rubric may not include some components that may be key to a campus' institutionalization efforts; campuses may wish to add components or dimensions to the rubric.

Some institutions may wish to have key individuals on a campus use the rubric individually to conduct a self-assessment of the campus' service-learning institutionalization efforts. The individual assessments are then compared with one another; discussions regarding the similarities and differences between individual members' impressions may be discussed. Other institutions may wish to discuss the dimension or component in detail and then come to a consensus regarding which development stage best characterizes the campus' development for each component of the rubric. While some institutions will give an overall score for each "dimension," other institutions will look at each component individually. What is most important is that the results of the self-assessment are used to guide the development of a strategic action plan for institutionalizing service-learning on the campus.

Generally, it is not recommended that partial stage scores be given. In other words, a campus group should not state that for a particular component (or dimension), the campus is "between" stage one and stage two. If the campus has not fully reached stage two, then the campus is not at stage two. Each dimension includes a "Notes" column, which allows for the inclusion of any statements, questions, or conclusions that might explain the particular assessment decisions that have been made or might suggest that further information be gathered before a final stage score is assigned.

Finally, this rubric should be viewed as only one assessment tool for determining the status of service-learning institutionalization on a campus. Other indicators should also be observed and documented to ensure that an institution's effort to advance service-learning on campus is conducted systematically and comprehensively.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Calleson, D.C., Serow, R.C., and Parker, L.G. (1998). Institutional perspectives on integrating service and learning. *Journal of Research and Development in Education*, 31(3), 147-154.
- Dengel, D., Driscoll, A., and Yerke, R. (1999). Responding to problems and challenges, changing roles and direction: Service-learning in the context of long term partnerships. In Pascua, A. and Kecskes, K., Eds., *Institutionalizing Service-Learning in Higher Education: Emerging Vision and Strategies*. First Annual *Continuums of Service* Western Regional Conference: Selected Proceedings, 15-17.
- Furco, A., Muller, P., and Ammon, M.S. (1998). *Institutionalizing Service-Learning in Higher Education: Findings from a Study of the Western Region Campus Compact Consortium*. University of California, Berkeley.
- Gray, M.J., Ondaatje, E.H., Fricker, R., Geschwind, S., Goldman, C.A., Kaganoff, T., Robyn, A., Sundt, M., Vogelgesang, L., and Klein, S.P. (1999). *Combining Service and Learning in Higher Education: Evaluation of the Learn and Serve America, Higher Education Program*. Santa Monica: RAND.
- Jacoby, B. (1996). *Service-Learning in Higher Education*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Kecskes, K. and Muyliaert, J. (1997). *Continuums of Service* Benchmark Worksheet. Western Region Campus Compact Consortium Request for Proposals.
- Kendall, J. and Associates. (1990). *Combining Service and Learning: A Resource Book for Community and Public Service*. Raleigh: National Society for Experiential Education.
- Levine, A. (1980). *Why Innovation Fails*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Pascua, A. and Kecskes, K., Eds. (1999). *Institutionalizing Service-Learning in Higher Education: Emerging Vision and Strategies*. First Annual *Continuums of Service* Western Regional Conference: Selected Proceedings.
- Serow, R.C., Calleson, D.C., Parker, L., and Morgan, L. (1996). Institutional support for service-learning. *Journal of Research and Development in Education*, 29(4), 220-225.
- Zlotkowski, E. (1999). Beyond individual success: Issues in service-learning implementation. In Pascua, A. and Kecskes, K., Eds., *Institutionalizing Service-Learning in Higher Education: Emerging Vision and Strategies*. First Annual *Continuums of Service* Western Regional Conference: Selected Proceedings, 3-7.
- Zlotkowski, E. (Jan/Feb. 1996). A new voice at the table? Linking service-learning and the academy. *Change*, 21-27.

SELF ASSESSMENT RUBRIC FOR THE INTITUTIONALIZATION OF SERVICE-LEARNING IN HIGHER EDUCATION

DIMENSION I: PHILOSOPHY AND MISSION OF SERVICE-LEARNING

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

DIRECTIONS: For each of the four categories (rows), place a circle around the cell that best represents the CURRENT status of the development of a definition, philosophy, and mission of service-learning.

	STAGE ONE <i>Critical Mass Building</i>	STAGE TWO <i>Quality Building</i>	STAGE THREE <i>Sustained Institutionalization</i>	NOTES
DEFINITION OF SERVICE-LEARNING	There is no campus-wide definition for service-learning. The term "service-learning" is used inconsistently to describe a variety of experiential and service activities.	There is an operationalized definition for service-learning on the campus, but there is some variance and inconsistently in the use of the term.	The institution has a formal, universally accepted definition for high quality service-learning that is used consistently to operationalize many or most aspects of service-learning on campus.	
STATEGIC PLANNING	The campus does not have an official strategic plan for advancing service-learning on campus.	Although certain short-range and long-range goals for service-learning have been defined for the campus, these goals have not been formalized into an official strategic plan that will guide the implementation of these goals.	The campus has developed an official strategic plan for advancing service-learning on campus, which includes viable short-range and long-range institutionalization goals.	
ALIGNMENT WITH INSITUTIONAL MISSION	While service-learning complements many aspects of the institution's mission, it remains on the periphery of the campus. Service-learning is rarely included in larger efforts that focus on the core mission of the institution.	Service-learning is often mentioned as a primary or important part of the institution's mission, but service-learning is not included in the campus' official mission or strategic plan.	Service-learning is part of the primary concern of the institution. Service-learning is included in the campus' official mission and/or strategic planning.	
ALIGNMENT WITH EDUCATIONAL REFORM EFFORTS	Service-learning stands alone and is not tied to other important, high profile efforts on campus (e.g., campus/community partnership efforts, establishment of learning communities, improvement of undergraduate teaching, writing excellence emphasis, etc.)	Service-learning is tied loosely or informally to other important, high profile efforts on campus (e.g., campus/community partnership efforts, establishment of learning communities, improvement of undergraduate teaching, writing excellence emphasis, etc.)	Service-learning is tied formally and purposefully to other important, high profile efforts on campus (e.g., campus/community partnership efforts, establishment of learning communities, improvement of undergraduate teaching, writing excellence emphasis, etc.)	

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

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

One of the essential factors for institutionalizing service-learning in higher education is the degree to which faculty members are involved in implementation and advancement of service-learning on a campus. According to Edward Zlotkowski, Jane Kendall and others, the faculty is "the key to the long-term capacity of...institutions to commit to public service and to meaningful learning in the community." (Kendall et al., 1990, Combining Service and Learning, Volume 1, p.12).

DIRECTIONS: For each of the four categories (rows), place a circle around the cell that best represents the *CURRENT* status of faculty involvement in and support for service-learning on your campus.

	STAGE ONE <i>Critical Mass Building</i>	STAGE TWO <i>Quality Building</i>	STAGE THREE <i>Sustained Institutionalization</i>	NOTES
FACULTY AWARENESS	Very few members know what service-learning is or understand how service-learning is different from community service, internships, or other experiential learning activities.	An adequate number of faculty members know what service-learning is and understand how service-learning is different from community service, internships, or other experiential learning activities.	A substantial number of faculty members know what service-learning is and can articulate how service-learning is different from community service, internships, or other experiential learning activities.	
FACULTY INVOLVEMENT & SUPPORT	Very few faculty members are instructors, supporters, or advocates of service-learning. Few support the strong infusion of service-learning into the academy or into their own professional work.	While an adequate number of faculty members are supportive of service-learning, few of them are advocates for infusing service-learning in the overall mission and/or their own professional work. Only a few key faculty members actively participate as service-learning instructors.	A substantial number of influential faculty members participate as instructors, supporters, and advocates of service-learning and support the infusion of service-learning both into the institution's overall mission AND the faculty members' individual professional work.	
FACULTY LEADERSHIP	None of the most influential faculty members on campus serve as leaders for advancing service-learning on the campus.	There are only one or two influential faculty members who provide leadership to the campus' service-learning effort.	A highly respected, influential group of faculty members serves as the campus' service-learning leaders and/or advocates.	
FACULTY INCENTIVES & REWARDS	In general, faculty members are not encouraged to engage in service-learning; few if any incentives are provided (e.g., mini-grants, sabbaticals, funds for conferences, etc.) to pursue service-learning activities; faculty members' work in service-learning is not usually recognized during their review, tenure, and promotion process.	Although faculty members are encouraged and are provided various incentives (mini-grants, sabbaticals, funds for service-learning conferences, etc.) to pursue service-learning activities, their work in service-learning is not always recognized during their review, tenure, and promotion process.	Faculty who are involved in service-learning receive recognition for it during the campus' review, tenure, and promotion process; faculty are encouraged and are provided various incentives (mini-grants, sabbaticals, funds for service-learning conferences, etc.) to pursue service-learning activities.	

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

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

DIRECTIONS: For each of the four categories (rows), place a circle around the cell that best represents the *CURRENT* status of student support for and involvement in service-learning on your campus.

	STAGE ONE <i>Critical Mass Building</i>	STAGE TWO <i>Quality Building</i>	STAGE THREE <i>Sustained Institutionalization</i>	NOTES
STUDENT AWARENESS	There is no campus-wide mechanism for informing students about service-learning courses, resources, and opportunities that are available to them.	While there are some mechanisms for informing students about service-learning courses, resources, and opportunities that are available to them, the mechanisms are sporadic and concentrated in only a few departments or programs (e.g., course flyers).	There are campus-wide, coordinated mechanisms (e.g., service-learning listings in the schedule of classes, course catalogs, etc.) that make students aware of the various service-learning courses, resources, and opportunities that are available to them.	
STUDENT OPPORTUNITIES	Few service-learning opportunities exist for students; only a handful of service-learning courses are available.	Service-learning options (in which service is integrated in core academic courses) are limited to only a certain groups of students in the academy (e.g., students in certain majors, honors students, seniors, etc.).	Service-learning options (in which service is integrated in core academic courses) are available to students in many areas throughout the academy, regardless of the students' major, year in school, or academic and social interests.	
STUDENT LEADERSHIP	Few, if any, opportunities on campus exist for students to take on leadership roles in advancing service-learning in their departments or throughout the campus.	There are a limited number of opportunities available for students to take on leadership roles in advancing service-learning in their departments or throughout the campus.	Students are welcomed and encouraged to serve as advocates and ambassadors for institutionalizing service-learning in their departments or throughout the campus.	
STUDENT INCENTIVES AND REWARDS	The campus has neither formal mechanisms (e.g., catalogued list of service-learning courses, service-learning notation on students' transcripts, etc.) or informal mechanisms (news stories in paper, unofficial student certificates of achievement) that encourage students to participate in service-learning or reward students for their participation in service-learning.	While the campus offers some informal incentives and rewards (news stories in paper, unofficial student certificates of achievement) that encourage students to participate in service-learning and/or reward students for their participation in service-learning, the campus offers few or no formal incentives and rewards (catalogued list of service-learning courses, service-learning notation on students' transcripts, etc.)	The campus has one or more formal mechanisms in place (e.g., catalogued list of service-learning courses, service-learning notation on students' transcripts, etc.) that encourage students to participate in service-learning and reward students for their participation in service-learning.	

DIMENSION IV: COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION AND PARTNERSHIPS

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

DIRECTIONS: For each of the three categories (rows), place a circle around the cell that best represents the *CURRENT* status of community participation and partnership on your campus.

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

DIMENSION V: INSTITUTIONAL SUPPORT FOR SERVICE-LEARNING

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

***DIRECTIONS:** For each of the six categories (rows), place a circle around the cell that best represents the CURRENT status of your campus' institutional support for service-learning.*

	STAGE ONE <i>Critical Mass Building</i>	STAGE TWO <i>Quality Building</i>	STAGE THREE <i>Sustained Institutionalization</i>	NOTES
COORDINATING ENTITY	There is no campus-wide coordinating entity (e.g., committee, center, or clearinghouse) that is devoted to assisting the various campus constituencies in the implementation, advancement, and institutionalization of service-learning.	There is a coordinating entity (e.g., committee, center, or clearinghouse) on campus, but the entity either does not coordinate service-learning activities exclusively or provides services to only a certain constituency (e.g., students, faculty) or limited part of the campus (e.g., certain majors).	The institution maintains coordinating entity (e.g., committee, center, or clearinghouse) that is devoted primarily to assisting the various campus constituencies in the implementation, advancement, and institutionalization of service-learning.	
POLICY-MAKING ENTITY	The institution's policy-making board(s)/committee(s) do not recognize service-learning as an essential educational goal for the campus	The institution's policy-making board(s)/committee(s) recognize service-learning as an essential educational goal for the campus, but no formal policies have been developed.	The institution's policy-making board(s)/committee(s) recognize service-learning as an essential educational goal for the campus and formal policies have been developed or implemented.	
STAFFING	There are no staff/faculty members on campus whose primary paid responsibility is to advance and institutionalize service-learning on the campus.	There is an appropriate number of staff members on campus who understand service-learning fully and/or who hold appropriate titles that can influence the advancement and institutionalization of service-learning throughout the campus; however their appointments are temporary or paid from external grant funds.	The campus houses and funds an appropriate number of permanent staff members who understand service-learning and who hold appropriate titles that can influence the advancement and institutionalization of service-learning on campus.	
FUNDING	The campus' service-learning activities are supported primarily by soft money (short-term grants) from sources outside the institution.	The campus' service-learning activities are supported by both soft money (short-term grants) from sources outside the institution as well as hard money from the institution.	The campus' service-learning activities are supported primarily by hard funding from the campus.	
ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT	The campus' administrative leaders have little or no understanding of service-learning, often confusing it with other campus outreach efforts, such as community service or internship programs.	The campus' administrative leaders have a clear understanding of service-learning, but they do little to make service-learning a visible and important part of the campus' work.	The campus' administrative leaders understand and support service-learning, and actively cooperate to make service-learning a visible and important part of the campus' work.	
EVALUATION & ASSESSMENT	There is no organized, campus-wide effort underway to account for the number and quality of service-learning activities taking place.	An initiative to account for the number and quality of service-learning activities taking place throughout the campus has been proposed.	An ongoing, systematic effort is in place to account for the number and quality of service-learning activities that are taking place throughout the campus.	

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

SELF-ASSESSMENT RUBRIC FOR THE INSTITUTIONALIZATION OF SERVICE-LEARNING IN HIGHER EDUCATION

Self-Assessment Rubric Summary Sheet

Institution: _____

Date: _____

DIMENSION I Philosophy and Mission of Service-Learning	STAGE ONE <i>Critical Mass Building</i>	STAGE TWO <i>Quality Building</i>	STAGE THREE <i>Sustained Institutionalization</i>
• Definition of Service-Learning			
• Strategic Planning			
• Alignment with Institutional Mission			
• Alignment with Education Reform Efforts			

DIMENSION II Faculty Support and Involvement in Service-Learning	STAGE ONE <i>Critical Mass Building</i>	STAGE TWO <i>Quality Building</i>	STAGE THREE <i>Sustained Institutionalization</i>
• Faculty Awareness			
• Faculty Involvement and Support			
• Faculty Leadership			
• Faculty Incentives and Rewards			

DIMENSION III Student Support and Involvement in Service-Learning	STAGE ONE <i>Critical Mass Building</i>	STAGE TWO <i>Quality Building</i>	STAGE THREE <i>Sustained Institutionalization</i>
• Student Awareness			
• Student Opportunities			
• Student Leadership			
• Student Incentives and Rewards			

DIMENSION IV Community Participation and Partnerships	STAGE ONE <i>Critical Mass Building</i>	STAGE TWO <i>Quality Building</i>	STAGE THREE <i>Sustained Institutionalization</i>
• Community Partner Awareness			
• Mutual Understanding			
• Community Agency Leadership and Voice			

DIMENSION V Institutional Support for Service-Learning	STAGE ONE <i>Critical Mass Building</i>	STAGE TWO <i>Quality Building</i>	STAGE THREE <i>Sustained Institutionalization</i>
• Coordinating Entity			
• Policy-Making Entity			
• Staffing			
• Funding			
• Administrative Support			
• Evaluation and Assessment			

Adapted from the *Self-Assessment Rubric for the Institutionalization of Service-Learning in Higher Education* by Dr. Andrew Furco, Director, Service-Learning Research & Development Center, University of California, Berkeley

SELF-ASSESSMENT GUIDE FOR INSTITUTIONALIZING SERVICE-LEARNING IN HIGHER EDUCATION

This guide is designed to assist a team of campus administrators, faculty, staff, and/or students in assessing the level of service-learning institutionalization at their campus. It presents a set of questions for discussion that are intended to help the team members determine more clearly the level of service-learning institutionalization on their campus. The questions presented in this guide are focused on the five dimensions that frame the *Self-Assessment Rubric for the Institutionalization of Service-Learning in Higher Education*. The guide is intended to be used in conjunction with the self-assessment rubric.

The questions included in each section are intended to assist you in your discussions in order that your team members may come to a consensus regarding the level of institutionalization at which each of the dimension resides currently. Given that each campus is unique in regards to its culture, context, and goals, the team should add to, modify, or delete those questions that are not relevant to its campus situation.

Step One

Establish a team of individuals who are familiar with your campus and with service-learning who will commit to conducting a full assessment of the service-learning institutionalization on your campus. The team should be made up of at least three individuals and may include key administrators, faculty, staff, students, and/or community members.

Step Two

Familiarize yourself with the dimensions of service-learning institutionalization, as presented and described in the *Self-Assessment Rubric for the Institutionalization of Service-Learning in Higher Education*.

Step Three

Engage your team members in a discussion of each dimension of service-learning institutionalization, focusing on the questions presented in the *Self-Assessment Guide for Institutionalizing Service-Learning in Higher Education*. Keeping in mind the three levels of service-learning institutionalization, the goal of the discussion is for the team to arrive at some level of agreement regarding the institutionalization level for each component of service-learning. While each component of the guide should receive some attention, the extent to which the team discusses a particular component will depend on the importance of that component for advancing service-learning on the campus.

Step Four

Once the team members have sufficiently discussed all of the *components within a dimension* and have arrived at an agreed upon responses to the various questions, the team members should then move to the institutionalization RUBRIC and identify the institutionalization level for each component within that dimension. Focusing on one dimension at a time may help maintain structure and organization to the various discussions that are held.

Step Five

Once all of the important questions for all five components of the guide have been discussed and all the institutionalization level for corresponding items on the rubric have been assessed, the team should look at the rubric holistically and determine at which level of service-learning institutionalization (*Critical Mass Building, Quality Building, Sustained Institutionalization*) the campus resides.

Step Six

Develop a set of action steps that will help advance the campus along the continuum of service-learning institutionalization.

DIMENSION I: Philosophy and Mission of Service-Learning	
<u>Component 1:</u> Definition of Service-Learning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What is the definition of "service-learning" for our campus? • What are other terms, if any, that are being used synonymously with service-learning? • What are at least five criteria that define a service-learning experience? • Who on our campus can articulate the definition of service-learning?
<u>Component 2:</u> Strategic Planning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What are the primary components of the strategic plan for advancing service-learning on our campus? • What are the short- and long-range goals for service-learning on our campus? • Who on our campus can state the short- and long-range goals for service-learning at our institution?
<u>Component 3:</u> Alignment with Institutional Mission	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Where is service-learning stated in the campus's mission or vision statement? • How overtly is service-learning recognized in the campus's mission and/or campus-wide master plan.
<u>Component 4:</u> Alignment with Educational Reform Efforts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • With which campus-wide efforts is service-learning connected? • To what degree are the efforts with which service-learning is tied high profile, campus-wide efforts?
DIMENSION II: Faculty Support for and Involvement in Service-Learning	
<u>Component 1:</u> Faculty Awareness	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Randomly select five or more faculty members on the campus. How well can they articulate accurately the definition of service-learning?

<p><u>Component 2:</u> Faculty Involvement and Support</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How widespread is the practice of service-learning among the faculty on our campus? Provide specific examples. • Which faculty members use service-learning in their professional work? • Which faculty members serve as advocates for advancing service-learning on our campus?
<p><u>Component 3:</u> Faculty Leadership</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Which faculty members provide leadership for service-learning on the campus? • Identify five or more of the most influential faculty members on campus (e.g., faculty members who are well-respected by peers and often play influential roles affecting campus policies). How many of them provide leadership for service-learning on the campus?
<p><u>Component 4:</u> Faculty Incentives and Rewards</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In what ways are faculty encouraged and/or rewarded by the campus for engaging in service-learning? • How closely (or seriously) are community-based learning and service-learning activities considered in the review, promotion, and tenure of faculty? Provide specific examples. • To what extent is faculty engagement in service-learning an "official" campus policy for promotion, review, and tenure.
<p>DIMENSION III: Student Support for and Involvement in Service-Learning</p>	
<p><u>Component 1:</u> Student Awareness</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What are the campus-wide mechanisms for making students aware of service-learning activities and opportunities? How far-reaching are these mechanisms (e.g., how many students are able to learn about and participate in service-learning)?
<p><u>Component 2:</u> Student Opportunities</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What opportunities do students have to participate in service-learning? • To what degree are service-learning opportunities for students widespread throughout the campus?

<p><u>Component 3:</u> Student Leadership</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What opportunities do students have to serve as leaders and advocates of service-learning? • How do students' become leaders and advocates of service-learning? • What opportunities are there on campus that prepare and train students to become leaders and advocates of service-learning?
<p><u>Component 4:</u> Student Incentives and Rewards</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What rewards and incentives are there for students to participate in service-learning? How formalized are these rewards and incentives? To what degree are they offered campus-wide?
<p>DIMENSION IV: Community Participation and Partnerships</p>	
<p><u>Component 1:</u> Community Partner Awareness</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To what extent are community agencies that partner with the campus aware of the campus's goals and definition of service-learning? Provide specific examples. • To what extent are community agencies that partner with the campus aware of the range of service-learning opportunities that are offered by the campus? Provide specific examples.
<p><u>Component 2:</u> Mutual Understanding</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In the development of service-learning activities on campus, how much attention does the campus pay to the community's needs, schedules and preferred timelines? Provide specific examples. • In the development of service-learning activities, how much attention do community agencies pay to the campus' needs, schedules and preferred timelines? Provide specific examples.

<p><u>Component 3:</u> Community Partner Voice and Leadership</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What opportunities are afforded to community agencies to express their needs, recruit student volunteers, and/or have access to faculty members? • What role do community agencies play in campus-wide leadership of service-learning? • To what extent are community agencies invited to serve on campus service-learning committees or participate in campus service-learning events.
<p>DIMENSION V: Institutional Support for Service-Learning</p>	
<p><u>Component 1:</u> Coordinating Entity</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What (Who) is the coordinating agent for service-learning on the campus? • What percentage of all service-learning activities on the campus are coordinated, monitored, and/or filtered through this coordinating agent?
<p><u>Component 2:</u> Policy-making Entity</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Which are the campus' central (most powerful) policy-making boards/committees? Make a list of them. • What do the campus' central policy-making boards/committees say about service-learning? How overtly and/or specially do they discuss service-learning? • What formal policies have the campus's central policy-making entities established for service-learning? Provide specific examples.
<p><u>Component 3:</u> Staffing</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What staff is supported by the campus to facilitate service-learning? • To what degree is this staff's work focused exclusively on service-learning? • In terms of the status of their position, how much power/authority does the service-learning staff hold to influence the advancement and institutionalization of service-learning on the campus?

<p><u>Component 4:</u> Funding</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How is service-learning financially supported on the campus? What are the sources of funding (hard money, soft money, etc.)? • How much money is budgeted for service-learning on the campus? Is this amount sufficient? Why or why not?
<p><u>Component 5:</u> Administrative Support</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • When have the chief administrators of the campus discussed service-learning (based on our definition) publicly in campus or external forums? • How well are the chief administrators of the campus understand the concept of service-learning? Provide examples. • What are at least three ways the chief administrators have supported that advancement and/or institutionalization of service-learning on the campus?
<p><u>Component 6:</u> Evaluation and Assessment</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What mechanisms are in place to account for the number and quality of service-learning activities taking place on campus? • How adequate, complete, and/or comprehensive are these mechanisms? • How is the quality of the campus's service-learning activities monitored?

TIPS FOR USING THE SELF-ASSESSMENT GUIDE

The following tips were derived from recommendations provided by team members who pilot tested the self-assessment guide:

- Although possible, the questions of the guide are not intended to be discussed in their entirety in one sitting. Several meetings may be needed to ensure that each component receives adequate attention.
- Many of the institutionalization components are dependent upon each other (e.g., faculty support for service-learning is contingent upon administrative support). Typically, a discussion about one component may often involve discussions about other components. It is easy to get sidetracked and move the discussion off of the initial topic. Keep in mind the primary component that is being discussed while making note of issues that may arise regarding other components. These notes will come in handy when those components focused on in later discussions.
- Avoid the temptation of rushing to "complete" the guide or "complete" the rubric. Details and answers to some of the questions for particular components may not be readily available at the discussion table and therefore, may require some investigation, data collection, and analysis. The goal is not to "complete" the guide or rubric, but rather to arrive at a best estimate of where along the continuum of service-learning institutionalization your campus resides.
- Every question of the guide does not need to be discussed. Only focus on the questions that are most important to your campus. Ignore those questions in the guide which may not be relevant to your particular campus. Conversely, add any questions that are important to discuss, which are not included in the guide.
- The questions of the guide need not be discussed sequentially. Campus teams are encouraged to begin discussions on the topics that are of most importance and interest to the campus.
- Providing "evidence" that support team members' responses may prove useful, especially when there is a lack of agreement among the team members regarding answers to particular items.
- Careful consideration should be given to who is represented on the self-assessment team to ensure that all of the items in the guide can be addressed adequately. It is recommended that the composition of the team remain constant throughout the duration of the self-assessment process.