Higher Education

Service Learning

1996

Implementing Service Learning in Higher Education

Robert G. Bringle
Indiana University - Purdue University Indianapolis

Julie A. Hatcher
Indiana University - Purdue University Indianapolis

Recommended Citation

Implementing Service Learning

in Higher Education

Robert G. Bringle

Julie A. Hatcher

Indiana University Purdue University Indianapolis

Robert G. Bringle is Associate Professor of
Psychology and Director, Office of Service Learning, and
Julie A. Hatcher is Associate Instructor of Education
and Assistant Director, Office of Service Learning at
Indiana University Purude University Indianapolis.

Running Head: SERVICE LEARNING

Address Correspondence to:

Robert G. Bringle, Ph.D.
IUPUI Office of Service Learning
355 North Lansing Street
Indianapolis, IN 46202-2896
317-274-6753
Internet: RBRINGLE@INDYVAX.IUPUI.EDU

Abstract

The current interest in service learning provides universities with a unique opportunity to engage their students in community service, expand their educational agenda, and build reciprocal partnerships with the community. This article discusses the implementation of service learning by delineating a set of activities for four constituencies: the institution, faculty, students, and community.

Implementing Service Learning

in Higher Education

In a recent article, "Creating the New American College," Ernest Boyer challenges higher education to reconsider its mission to be that of educating students for a life as responsible citizens, rather than educating students solely for a career. By doing so, the "New American College" will take pride in connecting theory to practice in order to meet challenging social problems, particularly those faced by universities in urban settings. As Ira Harkavey of the University of Pennsylvania Center for Community Partnerships has noted, "universities cannot afford to remain shores of affluence, self-importance and horticultural beauty at the edge of island seas of squalor, violence and despair" [5, p. A48]. Emphasizing service has the potential to enrich learning and renew communities, but will also give "new dignity to the scholarship of service" [5, p. A48].

Universities have valuable resources (e.g., students, faculty, staff, classrooms, libraries, technology, research expertise) that become accessible to the community when partnerships address community needs. They also have a tradition of serving their

communities by strengthening the economic development of the region, addressing educational and health needs of the community, and contributing to the cultural life of the community [11, 21, 25]. Emphasizing the value of community involvement and voluntary community service can also create a culture of service on a campus [e.g., 15, 24].

From a programmatic perspective there are two salient means through which universities support and promote community partnerships: (a) extracurricular, and (b) curricular. On campus, a significant number of college students actively participate in extracurricular community service through student organizations, the activities of student service offices, and campus-based religious organizations [e.g., 1, 22]. Many faculty, staff, and students, particularly those at urban campuses, are involved in their communities (e.g., neighborhood development, community agencies, churches, youth work) independent of the university.

Academic programs can also engage students in the community. Professional schools in particular create a variety of experiential learning opportunities for their students (e.g., clinicals, internships, co-op programs, field experience, practica, student teaching). However, the learning objectives of these activities typically

focus only on extending a student's professional skills and do not emphasize to the student, either explicitly or tacitly, the importance of service in the community and lessons of civic responsibility.

Service learning is a credit bearing educational experience in which students participate in an organized service activity that meets identified community needs and 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 civic responsibility. Unlike extracurricular voluntary service, service learning is a course-based service experience that produces the best outcomes when meaningful service activities are related to course material through reflection activities such as writing and small group discussions. Unlike practica and internships, the experiential activity in a service learning course is not necessarily skill-based within the context of professional education.

Service learning provides an additional means for reaching educational objectives, and academic credit is appropriate for service activities when learning objectives associated with the service are identified and evaluated. Faculty who use service learning

discover that it brings new life to the classroom, enhances performance on traditional measures of learning, increases student interest in the subject, teaches new problem solving skills, and makes teaching more enjoyable [6, 4, 7, 19]. In addition, service learning expands course objectives to include civic education. Benjamin Barber, of the Walt Whitman Center for the Culture and Politics of Democracy, Rutgers University, considers service learning to be an indispensable method for citizenship education through which students learn the arts of democracy [2, 3].

The recent interest in service learning has been strengthened by the work of national organizations interested in combining service and education (e.g., Campus Compact, American Association of Higher Education, Council for Adult Experiential Learning, National Society for Experiential Education, National Youth Leadership Council, Partnership for Service Learning), and the National Community Service Trust Act of 1993. Universities are particularly well-suited to become national leaders in the development of service learning. Indiana University Purdue University Indianapolis is an urban university that has invested resources and personnel to establish an Office of Service Learning. In doing so, we (a) participated in

Campus Compact's Summer Institute for the Project on
Integrating Service with Academic Study and the Stanford
Summer Institute on Service Learning, (b) attended
national and regional conferences on service learning
and experiential education, (c) reviewed the extant
service learning literature, (d) collected information
from many programs which were in various stages of
institutionalizing service learning, (e) reviewed
materials from 8 university-based centers focusing on
service, and (f) participated on the University of
Colorado at Boulder listserv on service learning
(Internet: SL@CSF.COLORADO.EDU). On the basis of this
work, we developed the following model for implementing
and institutionalizing service learning within higher
education.

Comprehensive Action Plan for Service Learning (CAPSL)

Developing service learning at the institutional
level has been characterized as a cycle that includes
awareness, planning, prototype, support, expansion, and
evaluation [18, pp. 37-38]. This model of institutional
change was based on the 44 institutions that
participated in the 3-year Campus Compact Project on
Integrating Service with Academic Study. Based on our
examination of service learning programs nationwide and

our discussions with many more experienced persons, we have expanded this model and have applied it to additional constituencies. The resulting model, the Comprehensive Action Plan for Service Learning (CAPSL), identifies four constituencies on which a program for service learning (e.g., an Office of Service Learning) needs to focus its principle activities: institution, faculty, students, and community. Although this is not an exhaustive list of constituencies to be considered in service learning programming, these four constituencies must be included for the initial efforts to be successful.

Insert Table 1 about here

CAPSL also identifies a sequence of activities/tasks/outcomes to be pursued for each of the four constituencies (see Table 1). Following initial planning, activities need to increase awareness within each constituency concerning the general nature of service learning. This educational process is helped by having at least one concrete example or prototype course available. An Office of Service Learning can then expand the development of service learning by gathering resources and designing training activities for each

constituency. The office also needs to document the implementation of service learning (monitoring) and the outcomes of service learning (evaluation). The results of all these efforts should be recognized publicly in the media and through scholarship and research published in professional journals. Finally, evidence of growth and maturity will be reflected in the degree to which service learning becomes institutionalized.

The sequence of activities identified by CAPSL does not represent a prescriptive model; rather, this sequence represents a heuristic that can focus attention on important steps of planned change and program development. Although the activities are presented as a linear sequence, in practice the pattern will seldom be linear. Instead, there may be numerous cycles back and forth across activities. However, as Wood [31] observes, even though change is not linear or uniform, "what is important is to maintain the direction, to keep to the course" (p. 53). CAPSL provides that direction by identifying a sequence of actions for strategic planning by prioritizing activities and providing a basis for monitoring progress. There is a rationale to the ordering of tasks in CAPSL which presumes that an activity may be premature if other previous tasks have been neglected.

For example, faculty development efforts mentioned under expansion (e.g., service learning course development grants) will be of limited effectiveness if faculty do not understand service learning. Nor should the sequence of tasks be considered lock step such that an earlier step needs to be accomplished in its entirety before the next step is attempted. Thus, all or most faculty do not need to understand service learning in order to proceed with expansion, only enough to justify those efforts. It is not assumed that progress across the constituencies, either across the entire university or within an academic unit, goes at the same pace. Programmatic development will typically occur unevenly in a mix of small increments and a few big jumps.

Institutions

CAPSL describes a model for the development of service learning in universities at the institutional level (see Table 2 for examples). A small group of key individuals (administrators, faculty, students, staff, community leaders) with the appropriate interest, motivation, and skills is needed to execute the critical first steps. As Wood [31] points out, "Educational programs . . . need champions. Those champions must be found in the faculty if an innovation is to be profound

and long-lasting. Administrators should not be shy about seeking out faculty champions" (p. 53). The planning stage needs to include a self-assessment on the following items: (a) where the institution is and where it is going; (b) the institutional, student, and faculty culture, climate, and values [29]; and (c) the resources and obstacles for developing service learning in the institution. Individuals in this group will benefit from visits to similar institutions with more mature programs, become advocates on campus for service and service learning, attend service learning conferences, and secure institutional commitments (e.g., budget, office space, personnel commitments). A strategic action plan for implementing service learning can then be developed [e.g., 17, 28]. As Schmidtlein [26] points out, the key to successful change is, "adapting planning practices to the institution's unique characteristics" (p. 85). One of the best ways for a university to do this is with the help of Campus Compact's regional institutes that target institutional development.

Insert Table 2 about here

At some point in these early steps it is necessary to identify a person to assume leadership and

administrative responsibility for subsequent program operations and establish an Office of Service Learning. The Office of Service Learning will need to communicate to staff, students, faculty, and community agencies its mission and planned activities. As Rubin [24] notes, this is a more formidable task at a commuter university than at a small liberal arts college because of "the lack of personal relationships and informal networks" (p. 48).

Farmer [12] cautions that some educational change is ephemeral because, "too often, change agents focus too much on implementing change and too little on sustaining it" (p.16). Thus, the efforts and investments devoted to initiating service learning must be complemented with the resources to sustain and expand the program. Institutions should examine their faculty reward structures and determine how they facilitate and inhibit faculty involvement in service learning. With development and maturity, service learning will become a significant component of the curriculum, and faculty and staff will participate in service learning organizations, share their success with other institutions, and contribute to professional conferences.

The university, as an institution, can be both the means of and the object of data collection that monitors program development, evaluates institutional outcomes, and publishes the results of this research in professional journals. The Office of Service Learning should facilitate this research, which is critical to strengthening the knowledge base to promote and expand service learning as an academic field [14].

Academically, the prevalence of service learning courses is initial evidence that service learning is important to the institution. An additional sign of growth and maturity occurs when service learning transcends a collection of courses. For example, coordinated course sequences in service learning, service learning being integral to general education, and an entire curriculum organized around service learning [e.g., 20] reflect increasing levels of programmatic development and maturity. Administratively, evidence that service learning is institutionalized would include having service and service learning as explicit parts of the institution's mission, long-range plans, institutional assessment, and hard-line budget allocations.

Faculty

Faculty involvement is critical because service

learning in its most common form is a course-driven feature of the curriculum. Therefore, the work of an Office of Service Learning must focus on interesting faculty in service learning and providing them with support to make the curricular changes necessary to add a service learning component to a course. Some faculty may already be using service learning or experiential learning activities that are similar to service learning. In addition, there are faculty who are supportive and curious. Identifying and involving interested and experienced faculty in planning (e.g., forming a Faculty Advisory Committee) is important to later activities (see Table 3 for examples). This needs to include formal and informal forums, for as Wood [31] points out, "the absence of such conversation virtually guarantees maintenance of the status quo" (p. 53).

Creating a common understanding of what constitutes service learning at a particular institution will pay dividends later. This can be accomplished through brochures, news releases, faculty workshops, brown bag talks, and presentations at departmental meetings. These activities can be helped by having a prototype course that provides a local example which includes a

syllabus to read, an instructor who can share wisdom and advice, examples for how course components such as reflection and evaluation can be structured, and a group of students who are advocates for service learning. In addition, syllabi that provide examples of service learning courses across the curriculum can be collected from other institutions.

Insert Table 3 about here

A primary task of an Office of Service Learning will be to facilitate course development. As a change agent, the Office of Service Learning can expect to play many of the multiple roles identified by Farmer [12]: (a) catalyst, (b) solution giver, (c) process helper, (d) resource linker, and (e) confidence builder. A particularly important role is providing the opportunity for experienced faculty to meet one-on-one with interested faculty. The office will also gather resources (e.g., syllabi, literature), provide support (e.g., mini-grants, faculty stipends), and plan faculty development activities (e.g., workshops) that lead to the expansion of service learning courses. The office should regularly publicize the successes on campus and in the community.

Our belief is that faculty respond best to these initiatives when the office reports directly to an academic officer (e.g., academic dean, academic vice president) because such an arrangement provides academic leadership and academic integrity to service learning. However, regardless of the administrative arrangement, collaboration with an active student volunteer program in an Office of Student Affairs can facilitate the development of service learning. The successes of the Haas Center at Stanford, the Center for Social Concern at Notre Dame, and the Swearer Center at Brown University reflect the benefits of having both efforts (i.e., service learning, student volunteer services) housed together in a central location.

Faculty are willing to attempt a change, including service learning, when the promise of the innovation leaves them feeling more efficacious and more competent as teachers [9] and when the investments to achieve these outcomes are modest. Therefore, prerequisites for effective faculty development include a clear understanding of service learning, expected benefits from service learning for the faculty and student, and the requisite investments of time. The prospects of expected benefits and costs must be realistic, otherwise

disenchantment and resentment will develop. The Office
of Service Learning can provide well-timed extrinsic
incentives (e.g., course development stipends) and
support (e.g., mini-grants, experienced faculty who
serve as mentors) to overcome obstacles. Faculty are
also sensitive to long-term outcomes that accrue from
curricular development including success of students,
recognition during personnel review, and publication of
articles in scholarly journals about their work on
service learning.

An Office of Service Learning will also be in a
position to collect information that monitors faculty
activities and the resulting growth in service learning
courses on campus. As a service learning program
matures, it will develop the means through which it can
collect evaluation data that detail student and faculty
outcomes which result from service learning courses. The
work by Barber [2] and Giles and Eyler [13] to develop
scales specifically designed for service learning
courses is an extremely important step in the evolution
of research on service learning. Determining why
particular outcomes occur requires, in addition to
adequate outcome measures, sophisticated experimental
designs and data analysis procedures.

Administratively, institutionalization of faculty

commitment to service learning is demonstrated when service learning is recognized and used in personnel decisions (hiring, promotion and tenure, merit reviews). Academically, service learning that is an integral part of the curriculum and is not dependent upon a small group of faculty reflects institutionalization.

Students

Students are in a paradoxical position with regard to service activities. On the one hand, some students are involved in voluntary service through campus organizations. Campus Compact provides ample evidence of the vigor that student-initiated and student-led service programs can display. Furthermore, urban universities have a sizable portion of nontraditional students who are actively involved in their communities independent of the campus. On the other hand, students are dependent upon others for service learning opportunities. Service learning typically occurs only if a faculty member develops a service learning course, the course is approved, the course is offered, and the course is appropriate for a student (e.g., meets degree requirements, prerequisites). Faculty are also dependent upon students in that a service learning course will only be successful and repeated if students

enroll in the course and if it results in a successful educational experience.

Astin's [1] research shows a sharp decline in student volunteer activities between high school and college. Furthermore, in comparison to residential campuses, nonresidential urban universities are learning environments that are disproportionately classroom oriented, with fewer campus activities occurring outside the classroom. As Schuh, Andreas, and Strange [27] note about urban universities that are commuter campuses, "People can come and go so freely that it is difficult for the institution to develop traditions, bonds with students, and a sense of belonging" (p. 67). Our research [30] found that, for our commuting students, academic credit related to service activities increased the attractiveness of students getting involved in service. Thus, service learning, with the incentive of academic credit for service associated with the classroom, provides an important means for increasing student participation in community service and enhancing the community service experiences for those already involved. Furthermore, service learning can provide an important function for students at urban universities by integrating their multiple life roles on campus and in the community [16] with support services and academic

credit.

As Schuh, Andreas, and Strange [27] point out, universities that "promote students' involvement in out-of-class experiences that are educationally purposeful" (p. 66) create a powerful learning environment and a greater sense of belonging. This is particularly important to a commuter campus that can too easily regard students impersonally. Successful service programs, including both voluntary service and service learning, can build a greater sense of community on campus. This is consistent with Astin's [1] finding that rates of peer interactions and faculty/student interactions were both strongly related to participation in volunteer work.

It is important in planning a service learning program to know the nature of the student climate and culture, including student attitudes toward voluntary service activities (individual or through student groups) and student attitudes toward service learning course development (e.g., Is service learning more attractive in freshman courses, in the major, only in certain disciplines, only for additional credit?). In addition, it is valuable to have students involved in planning activities (e.g., as members of service

learning advisory committees, grant proposals) in order to develop campus-wide support (see Table 4).

Insert Table 4 about here

Although service learning is becoming more prevalent in K-12 curricula, many students, and particularly nontraditional students, do not know about service learning. On small campuses, formal and informal communication can quickly and effectively solve this problem. However, at large universities, informing students about the nature of service learning courses is much more difficult. Providing information about course offerings to counselors, descriptions in course schedules, articles in school newspapers, and using students from past service learning classes as advocates can help in spreading the word. As students become more experienced with service learning, some can assume leadership roles in courses as student assistants and site coordinators and participate in the design and execution of action research that focuses on needs assessment, program evaluation, and advocacy. Recognition of students' involvement in voluntary service and service learning is important. This recognition should start with designing effective

service learning courses so that students have successful experiences that result in enhanced learning. In addition, recognition can include internal and external publicity, scholarships that reward past service or include a service requirement, nominations for service awards regionally and nationally, and co-curricular transcripts that summarize service and service learning experiences which typically do not show on traditional transcripts.

The Office of Service Learning should collect information that reflects growth in enrollment in service learning among students and its impact on students. In addition, research may also be directed at student outcomes (affective, cognitive, behavioral, social) that document the value of service learning.

One effective means for expansion of service learning is the "4th credit option" implemented at Georgetown University and the Lowell Bennion Center at the University of Utah. This allows students to propose a contract with any instructor to do service learning for additional academic credit on an individual basis. This option empowers students to initiate service learning experiences and encourages faculty to experiment with service learning on a small scale.

Delve, Mintz, and Stewart [10] provide an example of a student development model that identifies the following 5 phases of involvement in service learning: (a) exploration (naive excitement), (b) clarification (values clarification), (c) realization (insight into the meaning of service), (d) activation (participation and advocacy), and (e) internalization (the service experience influences career and life choices). A mature service learning curriculum will promote this type of student development through coordinated course sequences and assessment [20].

Institutionalization of service learning for students is reflected in extensive use of the 4th credit option, wide-spread faculty interest in service learning and student enrollment in service learning classes, curricula integrated around service learning, student assessment related to service learning activities, service learning that is part of the institution's general education curriculum [20], student recruitment to the campus because of service learning curricula, increased retention of students due to service learning, and a student culture that accepts and promotes service and service learning.

Community

Although interactions between the university and

their communities are integral to any university [8, 23], building these interactions into partnerships is a matter of time and commitment of resources [11]. According to Ruch and Trani [25], three characteristics identify effective university-community relationships: (a) the interaction is mutually beneficial to the university and the community, (b) the interaction is guided by institutional choice and strategy, and (c) the interaction is one of value and import to both partners. Universities must provide strong leadership, articulate clear goaIs, and maintain supportive institutional policies to develop these partnerships [25].

Community representatives need to be involved in planning service learning programs (see Table 5). However, representation is difficult because it prompts such questions as, "Who should be represented? Which communities? Agencies? Funding sources? Clients? Neighborhoods? Government?" The appropriate constituencies may not be identifiable prior to program and course development. Under these circumstances, those planning service learning programs must make their best approximation at representation and acknowledge that adjustments may be necessary as the program evolves. Staff from agencies with extensive volunteer

support programs and with experience in service learning (e.g., prototype course) may be good choices. Agency staff are assumed to be adequate representatives of the communities and clients served by that agency. However, if only agency personnel are represented, an additional concern is that there may not be adequate representation from clients and community members.

Insert Table 5 about here

Even community agencies that have extensive experience with volunteers may not know about the nature of service learning and how the differences between service learning and voluntary service are important to their responsibilities. Thus, formal and informal education about service learning is important for site supervisors, directors of volunteer services, and agency directors.

Communities need to participate in guiding the identification of service activities at a macro level (e.g., United Way community needs assessment) and a micro level (e.g., a particular course). An Office of Service Learning provides an important function of cataloging and linking constituencies and resources as service learning courses are developed. In turn, the

office should follow through on linkages to monitor and evaluate community placements. As previously mentioned, the aspiration is that the university and segments of the community develop partnerships. Evidence that a stable, meaningful, and mature partnership is evolving would include continuity in the relationships across time, consensus that mutual needs are being met, collaboration in advocacy and grant proposals, formal and informal participation by the agency staff in the university context (e.g., team teaching), and formal and informal participation by the faculty, alumni, and students in the agency (e.g., advocacy, Board of Directors, consultant).

<u>Conclusions</u>

Virtually all universities are interested in committing their resources to develop effective citizenship among their students, to address complex needs in their communities through the application of knowledge, and to form creative partnerships between the university and the community. Service learning provides one means through which students, faculty, and administrators can strive toward these aspirations.

The Comprehensive Action Plan for Service Learning (CAPSL) provides a heuristic for guiding the development

of service learning programs in higher education. It
does so by concentrating efforts on four constituencies
that must be considered in implementing a service
learning program and by providing a means for developing
strategic plans that address each constituency.

Although this agenda may appear daunting, assembling a
team from the constituencies and prioritizing objectives
can make the work more manageable. In addition, CAPSL
provides a means for assessing, for each constituency,
the developmental status of a service learning program.

As a general guide, CAPSL only specifies the goal at
each step (e.g., increase awareness among students).
This is both an advantage and a disadvantage of the
model. On the positive side, it is general enough that
the execution of each cell can be tailored to local
conditions. Unfortunately, for the same reason, it is
not possible to detail how each step can be successfully
accomplished at a particular university, although some
suggestions and examples are provided. It is possible
to take the sequence of activities from the general CAPSL
model (i.e., planning through institutionalization) and
apply it to any cell in the matrix (e.g., research by
faculty). Regardless of how CAPSL is implemented, it
does provide guidance for planned development and
evaluation of service learning programs.

References

1. Astin, A.W. <u>Student Involvement in Community Service: Institutional Commitment and the Campus Compact</u>. Paper presented at the meeting of the California Campus Compact, Los Angeles, December, 1990.

2. Barber, B.R. "A Mandate for Liberty: Requiring Education-based Community Service." <u>The Responsive Community</u>, Spring, 1991.

3. Barber, B.R., and R.M. Battistoni, eds. <u>Educating for Democracy</u>. Dubuque, IA: Kendall/Hunt, 1994.

4. Boss, J.A. "The Effect of Community Service Work on the Moral Development of College Ethics Students." <u>Journal of Moral Education</u>, forthcoming.

5. Boyer, E. "Creating the New American College." <u>The Chronicle of Higher Education</u>, March 9 (1994), A48.

6. Bringle, R.G., and J.F. Kremer. "An Evaluation of an Intergenerational Service-learning Project for Undergraduates." <u>Educational Gerontologist, 19</u> (1993), 407-416.

7. Cohen, J., and D. Kinsey. "'Doing Good' and Scholarship: A Service-learning Study." <u>Journalism Educator</u>, Winter (1994), 4-14.

8. Colon, M., M. Kennedy, and M. Stone. "A

Metropolitan University and Community Development."

Metropolitan Universities, 1(1990-91), 61-74.

9. Deci, E.L., and R.M. Ryan. "Intrinsic Motivation to

Teach: Possibilities and Obstacles in Our Colleges

and Universities." In Motivating Professors to

Teach Effectively, edited by J.L. Bess, pp. 27-35.

San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1982.

10. Delve, C.I., S.D. Mintz, and G.M. Steward. (1990).

"Promoting Values Development through Community

Service: A Design." In Community Service as

Values Education, edited by C.I. Delve, S.D. Mintz,

and G.M. Steward, pp. 7-29. San Francisco:

Jossey-Bass, 1990.

11. Dore, J. "A City and its Universities: A Mayor's

Perspective." Metropolitan Universities, 1(1990),

29-35.

12. Farmer, D.W. (1990). "Strategies for Change." In

Managing Change in Higher Education, edited by D.W.

Steeples, pp. 7-17. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass,

1990.

13. Giles, D., Jr. "National Service-Learning

Research Project." National Society for

Experiential Education Quarterly, Spring (1994),

11.

14. Giles, D., E.P. Honnet, and S. Migliore, eds.

Research Agenda for Combining Service and Learning in the 1990s. Raleigh, NC: National Society for Internships and Experiential Education, 1991.

15. Golden, D.C, B.O. Pregliasco, and M.J. Clemons. "Community Service: New Challenges for a Metropolitan University." Metropolitan Universities, 4(1993), 61-70.

16. Jacoby, B. "Adapting the Institution to Meet the Needs of Commuter Students." Metropolitan Universities, 1(1990), 61-71.

17. Keller, G. Academic Strategy: The Management Revolution in Higher Education. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1983.

18. Kupiec, T.Y., ed. Rethinking Tradition: Integrating Service with Academic Study on College Campuses. Denver, CO: Education Commission of the States, 1993.

19. Markus, G.B., J.P.F. Howard, and D.C. King. "Integrating Community Service and Classroom Instruction Enhances Learning: Results from an Experiment." Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 15 (1993), 410-419.

20. Mentkowski, M., and G. Rogers. "Connecting Education, Work, and Citizenship." Metropolitan

Universities, 4(1993), 34-46.

21. Muse, W.V. "A Catalyst for Economic Development." Metropolitan Universities, 1(1990), 79-88.

22. O'Brien, E.M. "Outside the Classroom: Students as Employees, Volunteers, and Interns." Research Brief, 4(1993), 1-12.

23. Perlman, D.H. "Diverse Communities: Diverse Involvements." Metropolitan Universities, 1(1990), 89-100.

24. Rubin, S.G. "Community Service and Metropolitan Universities." Metropolitan Universities, 2(1991), 47-57.

25. Ruch, C.P., and E.P. Trani. "Scope and Limitations of Community Interactions." Metropolitan Universities, 1(1990-91), 27-39.

26. Schmidtlein, F.A. "Responding to Diverse Institutional Issues: Adapting Strategic Planning Concepts." In Adapting Strategic Planning to Campus Realities, edited by F.A. Schmidtlein, and B.H. Milton (pp. 83-93). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1990.

27. Schuh, J.H., R.E. Andreas, and C.C. Strange. "Students at Metropolitan Universities." Metropolitan Universities, 2(1991), 64-74.

28. Steeples, D.W. Successful Strategic Planning: Case

Studies. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1988.

29. Tierney, W.G., ed. Assessing Academic Climates and Cultures. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1990.

30. Velo, P.M., and Bringle, R.G. Matching Empathy with Concrete and Abstract Reasons to Promote Volunteerism. Paper presented at the 13th Mid-American Undergraduate Psychology Research Conference, Evansville, IN, April, 1994.

31. Wood, R.J. "Changing the Educational Program." In Managing Change in Higher Education, edited by D.W. Steeples (pp. 51-58). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1990.

Table 1

Comprehensive Action Plan for Service Learning (CAPSL)

	Institution	Faculty	Students	Community
Planning				
Awareness				
Prototype				
Resources				
Expansion				
Recognition				
Monitoring				
Evaluation				
Research				
Institutionali-zation				

Table 2
Examples of Institutional Activities

	Institution
Planning	• Form a working group of key persons • Survey institutional resources and climate • Attend Campus Compact Regional Institute • Develop a Campus Action Plan for service learning
Awareness	• Ensure that key administrators know about service learning and program development • Publicize university's activities to others regionally • Join national organizations (e.g., Campus Compact, NSEE) • Attend service learning conferences
Prototype	• Identify existing program in similar institutions and visit
Resources	• Obtain commitments (budget, office space, personnel) • Apply for grants (e.g, Learn and Serve America: Higher Education) • Develop a means for coordinating service activities and programs on campus
Expansion	• Conduct workshops on service learning for administrators and staff (e.g., counselors, student enrollment services) • Attend service learning conferences • Bring in consultants from more mature service learning programs • Collaborate regionally with other universities in programming and grant applications
Recognition	• Participate in conferences by offering workshops • Publish research • Publicize service learning initiatives in local media
Monitoring	• Collect data within institution (e.g., # of courses, # faculty teaching service learning courses, # of students enrolled)
Evaluation	• Compile annual report of Office of Service Learning • Incorporate in institutional accreditation
Research	• Research service learning within institution and across institutions
Institutionalization	• Service learning (or service) is part of university mission statement • Service learning is identifying feature of general education • University sponsors regional or national conference on service learning • Service learning courses listed in bulletins, schedule of classes, course descriptions • Hardline budget commitments to sustain service learning programs

Table 3
Examples of Faculty Activities

	Faculty
Planning	•Survey of faculty interest and courses currently offered •Identify faculty for service learning advisory committee
Awareness	•Create internal publicity (e.g., brochures, newsletters) •Announce availability of course development funds
Prototype	•Establish criteria for service learning courses •Identify or develop prototype course •Publicize prototype to increase awareness
Resources	•Identify interested faculty, and faculty mentors •Maintain syllabus file by discipline •Compile library collection on service learning •Secure funds for expansion
Expansion	•Offer faculty development workshops on service learning and specialty topics •Arrange one-on-one consultations •Provide course development stipends and mini-grants to support service learning initiatives •Focus efforts on underrepresented schools •Develop faculty mentoring program
Recognition	•Publicize faculty development efforts •Include service learning activities on personnel Annual Report forms
Monitoring	•Collect data from service learning courses (e.g., # of service hours, # of faculty involved, impact on students, # of courses meeting service learning criteria)
Evaluation	•Provide assessment methods and designs to faculty •Evaluate course performance outcomes
Research	•Facilitate faculty service learning research •Research faculty involvement in service learning
Institutionalization	•Service learning is part of personnel decisions (e.g., hiring, annual review, promotion and tenure) •Service learning is a permanent component of course and the curriculum

Table 4
Examples of Student Activities

	Students
Planning	• Survey of existing voluntary service activities (individual and student groups) • Survey of attitudes toward service and service learning • Identify students for service learning Advisory Committee
Awareness	• Inform counselors of existing service learning courses • Provide information on service learning courses in class schedule
Prototype	• Include past students in service learning courses in the recruitment of new students • Create course assistant positions for past students in service learning courses
Resources	• Publish a list of service learning courses and instructors • Secure money for service learning course assistants
Expansion	• Offer courses that develop student leadership and personal growth through service • Create 4th credit option for students to design "independent" service learning components
Recognition	• Offer student scholarships that require service • Promote student scholarships that recognize service • Create co-curricular student activities transcript • Write letters of recommendation • Nominate students for local, regional, and national recognitions and awards
Monitoring	• Submit weekly reports, and agency interviews during service learning course • Participate in university surveys on familiarity and interest in service learning
Evaluation	• Evaluate the service learning course • Identify and evaluate service and educational objectives within a service learning course • Participate in university surveys on value of service learning
Research	• Research student service learning experiences • Conduct action research projects
Institutionalization	• Widespread use of 4th credit option • Consistently high enrollment in service learning courses • Service learning is part of university and student culture

Table 5
Examples of Community Activities

	Community
Planning	• Identify community representatives for service learning Advisory Committee • Survey existing university/community partnerships
Awareness	• Publicize to community at large about service learning • Educate community on differences between voluntary service activities and service learning activities • Initiate one-on-one meetings with agency personnel • Visit community agencies
Prototype	• Invite experienced agency staff from prototype courses to participate in later stages
Resources	• Compile community needs assessments (e.g., United Way community needs assessment) • Compile list of agencies interested in service learning
Expansion	• Sponsor community workshops and discussions on service learning (e.g., responsibilities in training and supervising students, educational partners in teaching and evaluating students) • Expand service learning opportunities to new areas at existing agencies • Establish new agency partnerships • Collaborate with community agencies in writing grants • Assist agencies in expanding agency plan and mission
Recognition	• Plan recognition event for exemplary agencies and agency personnel • Publicize universities and community partnerships in local media
Monitoring	• Participate in training, supervising, and evaluating students • Maintain records of student and faculty involvement at the agency
Evaluation	• Assess impact of service learning activities on meeting agency and client needs
Research	• Collaborate with faculty and students on action research projects • Provide necessary data of service learning participants
Institutionalization	• Agencies allocate additional resources to support and train student volunteers • Agency personnel team teach with faculty • Faculty are formally involved with agency (e.g, Board of Directors)