

Research and Reflection on Learning and Teaching in Higher Education

Volume 1

Article 3

2023

Calling All Students? Enrollment in Community-Engaged Learning Courses at a Marianist University

Molly Malany Sayre

University of Dayton, msayre2@udayton.edu

Castel V. Sweet

University of Mississippi, cvsweet@olemiss.edu

Kelly Bohrer

University of Dayton, kbohrer1@udayton.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <https://ecommons.udayton.edu/rrlthe>



Part of the [Civic and Community Engagement Commons](#), [Community-Based Learning Commons](#), [Race and Ethnicity Commons](#), [Scholarship of Teaching and Learning Commons](#), and the [Service Learning Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Sayre, Molly Malany; Sweet, Castel V.; and Bohrer, Kelly (2023) "Calling All Students? Enrollment in Community-Engaged Learning Courses at a Marianist University," *Research and Reflection on Learning and Teaching in Higher Education*: Vol. 1, Article 3.

Available at: <https://ecommons.udayton.edu/rrlthe/vol1/iss1/3>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by eCommons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Research and Reflection on Learning and Teaching in Higher Education by an authorized editor of eCommons. For more information, please contact mschlangen1@udayton.edu, ecommons@udayton.edu.

Calling All Students? Enrollment in Community-Engaged Learning Courses at a Marianist University

Molly Malany Sayre, University of Dayton

Castel V. Sweet, University of Mississippi

Kelly Bohrer, University of Dayton

I call on the University community to ensure that EVERY student receives an integrated curricular, residential, and experiential education designed to build capacity for leadership in civic engagement, community building, and innovation (para. 42) ... We view serving the community and our world as a fundamental part of our Catholic, Marianist mission, our *raison d'être*, and we find that we are called to be — indeed, we must be— “The University for the Common Good.” (para. 86).

These excerpts from current University of Dayton President Eric Spina’s inaugural address in 2017 are more recent iterations of the university’s foundational values. As University of Dayton alumni, students, faculty, and staff will all attest, the word “community” took on a new meaning once they arrived on campus. Driven by the institution’s identity as Catholic and Marianist, its value of community is highlighted and emphasized in nearly every aspect of the institution. All members of the university community are expected to uphold a

“commitment to community” by understanding and embodying three key principles: practicing community living as an essential learning experience, valuing the dignity of every person, and pursuing the common good (University of Dayton, 2010). As a Marianist university committed to education that connects learning to leadership and service (University of Dayton, 2017), community-engaged learning (CEL) courses and opportunities are a quintessential space in which the University of Dayton manifests its academic mission, as is true for many Catholic universities (Casale, 2019). Much of the university’s community engagement is connected to the Fitz Center for Leadership in Community, which “remains grounded in the University of Dayton’s Catholic Marianist values of preference for marginalized people, reciprocal relationships, and shared dialogue for vital community-engaged leadership” (Fitz Center for Leadership in Community, n.d.).

Previous research indicates student involvement with CEL at the University of Dayton is sometimes an expression of Catholic, Marianist values students have been taught by their Catholic families or Catholic schools, thus further tying community engagement to shared values of the university and its students (Fogle et al., 2017). However, the same study found the sample of students who participate in CEL perceive themselves as “outliers” (p. 148), since many of their peers do not participate in community engagement to the same degree as the respondents. This finding led the researchers of the present study to question whether the students in their CEL courses were different from other students in their commitment to civic engagement or other attributes, or whether there was a general orientation to civic engagement among students, given the university’s shared and frequently reiterated values. The present analysis explores whether students who enrolled in three selected CEL courses at the University of Dayton were different from their peers in past experiences of experiential learning, their stated views on community engagement, and their demographic attributes, as compared to students who had not enrolled in the selected CEL courses.

Semester of Service, ETHOS Immersions, and Inside-Out

Expressions of CEL at the university span opportunities in social science, humanities, natural science, and pre-professional departments (Lovett, 2020). They also include the courses involved in the current study: Semester of Service, ETHOS Local Immersion, and Inside-Out Prison Exchange Program courses. Though each course incorporates CEL, they each have unique histories which inform their current forms.

The predecessor to the Semester of Service course was designed to provide students with the opportunity to live in community with one another for the summer while providing direct service to local non-profit organizations. Through the program, students were provided housing and roughly minimum wage for 40 hours of service per week. After two consecutive years of administering the program, the sustainability of the program was questioned due to its financial cost. Around the same time, the Fitz Center for Leadership in Community was looking to revamp an AmeriCorps program, Serve with Energy and Talent (SWEAT). The current Semester of Service program was cultivated as a merger of the Fitz Center's AmeriCorps program and Campus Ministry's Summer of Service program in January, 2002.

At the time of this study, Semester of Service students had the option of working with non-profit partners full-time in the summer or taking a semester-long sabbatical from traditional academic courses to serve full-time at a local non-profit organization. In an attempt to eliminate financial barriers to participation, students were not charged tuition for the semester they served and were provided housing and a \$1,000 living stipend. Students were also enrolled in an accompanying course which utilized a dialogue-based curriculum aimed to expand participants' worldviews and provide students with the knowledge and reflective methodology to become lifelong advocates for social change.

As the Semester of Service program began to gain traction among students mainly representing majors in the College of Arts and Sciences, the program also caught the attention of faculty and staff in

the School of Engineering, particularly those associated with the school's Engineers in Technical Humanitarian Opportunities of Service Learning (ETHOS) Center. Started in 2001 by a group of students working with the Aprovecho Research Center in Oregon, ETHOS offers service learning opportunities for engineering students to use technical skills on cross-cultural immersions, research, or project-based activities. As one of the center's goals is to expose students to ways in which they can use their engineering knowledge and skills to contribute to humanitarian efforts, Semester of Service aligned well with the center's engagement opportunities. Currently known as ETHOS Local Immersion, the engineering-based program mirrors the same structure and format as the Semester of Service program in which students are partnered with a local non-profit to serve full-time for a semester. Engineering students are also provided housing, an \$1,000 living stipend, and they meet weekly as a class.

More recently, the Department of Sociology, Anthropology, and Social Work in the College of Arts and Sciences began offering one Inside-Out Prison Exchange Program ("Inside-Out") course per year in 2016. Inside-Out courses are taught in correctional facilities to classes composed of both traditional college students ("outside students") and people experiencing incarceration ("inside students"), following the pedagogical model of the Inside-Out Center (Pompa, 2013). The course currently offered as the Inside-Out course is Health and Inequality, a social work course on theories of health disparities and health equity. At the University of Dayton, the Inside-Out course is a three-credit course and regular tuition costs apply. The College of Arts and Sciences covers transportation costs for outside students to and from the prison using university funds earmarked to support community engagement. At President Spina's direction, the university has also begun to offer college credit to inside students who complete the course at no cost. Conversations leading to these expressions of support at both the college and university levels have been couched in the congruence between the Inside-Out course and the university's Catholic, Marianist values.

Literature Review

Higher education institutions, in general, are on a quest to provide a civic education that will best prepare students for active community membership upon graduation, with CEL being one of the most common pedagogical methods of doing so (Trudeau & Kruse, 2014; Mitchell, 2018). It provides students with the opportunity to engage with people and problems within a real-world context in a manner that allows students to conceptualize their ability to contribute to the cultivation of a better society (Mitchell, 2018). In addition, CEL as a pedagogical practice “serves as a vehicle for connecting students and institutions to their communities and the larger social good, while at the same time instilling in students the values of community and social responsibility” (Neururer & Rhoads, 1998).

CEL courses utilize a pedagogical model that moves away from traditional content-based curriculum and is more considerate of the students and community (Trudeau & Kruse, 2014). The active learning design of CEL courses supports the cultivation of students’ growth in collaboration skills (Dinour, Szaro, Blumberg, & Bose, 2018); the propensity for students to develop a deeper conceptualization and meaning to their interaction with community (Fogle et al., 2017); and the strengthening of communities and democratic practices through increased civic engagement (Mitchell & Soria, 2018). Despite its well-researched benefits, CEL courses are often seen to be more taxing and carry a heavier workload, for both the faculty and student, in comparison to traditional academic courses (Nicotera et al, 2011; Clark, 2016). For example, students in a community-engaged social work course shared concerns about the additional capacity needed to manage expectations and shared power among student, faculty, and community partners; however, they found immense value in the learning experience and its contribution to the development of marketable skills and their subsequent professional careers (Schwartz, 2010).

Many view the role of higher education in terms of its capacity to produce employable graduates (Yorke, 2006; Tyson, 2013), resulting

in an interpretation that most students select majors and subsequent academic courses based on their ability to support the development of transferable skills needed to become gainfully employed upon graduation. However, in consideration of higher education's foundation in land grant and civic missions (Mitchell, 2018), scholars are urging higher education institutions to recommit to incorporating engaged pedagogies that provide the opportunity for both students and faculty to grapple with lived experiences and theory in a manner that produces new knowledge and the ability to address pressing social problems (The Crucible Moment, 2012; Trudeau & Kruse, 2014; Mitchell, 2018). Subsequently, universities are embracing a commitment to learning goals that will produce both employable and civic-minded graduates.

Methods

This paper uses data from an ongoing research study examining students' CEL outcomes and their effects, if any, on future career choice and community involvement. The study was approved by the university's Institutional Review Board. From spring 2018 through fall 2019, we collected data from 75 students enrolled in ETHOS, Semester of Service, and Inside-Out courses. These programs included undergraduate juniors and seniors from a variety of colleges, majors, and pre-professional programs. In addition, in the fall 2019 semester we collected responses from 65 control students at similar academic levels. Students invited to participate in the control group included those in senior capstone courses in two of the three majors most represented in the Semester of Service courses (psychology and human rights studies) and students in the on-campus sections of the social work course that was also taught as the Inside-Out course. A control group comparable to participants in ETHOS programs was not available at the time of the analysis.

The questionnaire included quantitative and qualitative items. Quantitative data in this analysis includes demographic data--students' age (in years) and year in school (1 = first year, 2 = second year, etc.). Students were asked to select their racial identity from the following

options: White, Black or African-American, Native American, Alaskan Native, Asian, Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander, Biracial, Multiracial, or Other. Due to very small counts of students with racial identities other than White, non-White racial identities were grouped together for statistical tests. Students were asked to report how many hours per week their parents spend, on average, performing community service outside their jobs. Students also provided information on their parents' relative social status by marking their position on a nine-rung ladder on which the top of the ladder represents "people who have the most money, most education, and most respected jobs" (Common Cold Project, 2016). This data was coded according to the nearest rung on the ladder.

Students provided further quantitative data on their previous participation in experiential learning. Students were asked when and for what duration they participated in study abroad, internships, service, leadership, and mentored or independent research activities (Coker, Heiser, Taylor, & Book, 2017). Duration of each experience was converted into hours and summed by type. Total hours across all types of experiential learning were calculated and grouped in 500-hour increments (0, 1-499, 500-999, ... 3,500 and over) to meet normality assumptions for statistical tests.

The questionnaire also collected qualitative data. This included an open-ended question asking participants their view of community engagement. Responses to the question were transcribed and transferred into NVivo, a computer-based software program, for a two-step qualitative analysis process. The first step included performing open coding (Babbie, 2010) to loosely label principal ideas of students' responses to the question such as the impact of community engagement, students' personal experience with community engagement, methods of community engagement, or the significance of community engagement in education. Codes such as "engage community in solutions," "essential part of human life," "help other," "reciprocity," and "understanding others" were used to organize responses. Utilizing NVivo, preliminary codes were reviewed and

visually connected into more dominant themes and categories based on students' articulation of community engagement. Codes such as "impact on community", "thriving community", and "sustainable community" were combined into a broader theme of "beneficial to community", and codes such as "engage difference" and "engage community in solution" were combined into a broader theme of "diversity and inclusion."

The second step in the qualitative analysis included a focused coding process of reviewing the data line-by-line, coding responses with the broader themes that emerged as a result of combining preliminary codes from the first step of analysis (Esterberg, 2002). Throughout the analysis process, there was an intentional attempt to label responses using NVivo codes by using the language and wording articulated by students as a means to authentically capture participants' views as they articulated them (Charmaz, 2014).

Findings

Quantitative Results

Independent samples t-tests and chi-square tests were used to investigate possible differences between students who have enrolled in CEL courses and students in control groups. When statistically significant, these tests indicate differences or relationships between or among groups. The two groups were not significantly different in average age, number of hours parents spend doing community service outside of their employment, or parents' relative social status. (See Table 1.) The average year in school for students in control groups was significantly higher than for students in CEL courses ($t = 2.75, p \leq .05$). A chi-square test of independence indicated a relationship between racial identity and participation in CEL courses ($\chi^2 [1, n = 140] = 5.53, p \leq .05$). As shown in Table 2, students with racial identities other than White were more likely to participate in non-CEL than CEL courses.

Table 1. Results of independent samples t-tests on demographic variables of students in CEL (n = 75) and control (n = 65) groups

	Mean (SD)	t
Age		1.84
CEL ^a	20.71	
Control	20.94	
Year in school		2.75*
CEL	3.78	
Control	3.52	
Parent 1 community service		1.23
CEL ^c	2.34	
Control ^a	3.34	
Parent 2 community service		.30
CEL ^e	2.49	
Control ^b	2.73	
Parent 1 relative social status		.19
CEL ^a	5.34	
Control ^b	5.39	
Parent 2 relative social status		-.13
CEL ^d	5.90	
Control ^c	5.87	

* p ≤ .05

^a Missing = 2; ^b Missing = 3; ^c Missing = 4; ^d Missing = 5; ^e Missing = 6

Table 2. Cross tabulation of racial identity of students in CEL (n = 75) and control (n = 65) groups

Group	Students Identifying as White		Students Identifying as People of Color		Total	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
CEL	70	93.3	5	6.7	75	100
Control	52	80	13	20	65	100

CEL and control groups were similar in the number of hours they had spent in various types of experiential learning prior to the CEL course or enrollment in the study. There were no significant differences in hours of previous experience in study abroad, service,

leadership positions, mentored or independent research, or in total hours. (See Table 3.) The only area of significant difference between CEL and control groups was in internship hours. Students participating in CEL courses reported an average of 508.64 hours in internships as compared to an average of 275.5 hours among control group participants.

Table 3. Results of independent samples t-tests on hours of previous experience of CEL (n = 75) and control (n = 65) groups

	Mean (SD)	t
Study abroad		.23
CEL	240.00	
Control	255.23	
Internships		-3.01*
CEL	508.64	
Control	275.50	
Service		1.70
CEL	183.82	
Control	275.71	
Leadership		-.73
CEL	353.75	
Control	288.37	
Research		1.09
CEL	43.18	
Control	67.86	
Total Hours, grouped		-.93
CEL	3.19	
Control	2.89	

*p ≤ .05

Qualitative Results

Answers to the open-ended question on views of community engagement ranged in length from one word to a couple sentences and fell into ten thematic categories: important; beneficial to community; beneficial to individuals; beneficial to all; holistic and meaningful

education; helping others; civic duty; diversity and inclusion; challenging; and uphold human rights.

Responses from students in CEL courses and responses from students in the control groups were represented in all themes; however, some themes were more likely to characterize one group of students' responses over the other. (See Table 4.)

Table 4. Results of qualitative analysis of open-ended responses from students in CEL (n = 75) and control (n = 65) groups

	CEL		Control	
	n	%	n	%
Beneficial to All	13	17%	3	5%
Beneficial to Community	15	20%	14	22%
Beneficial to Individual	12	16%	10	15%
Challenging	3	4%	1	2%
Civic Duty	5	7%	1	2%
Diversity & Inclusion	3	4%	3	5%
Helping Others	5	7%	6	9%
Holistic and Meaningful Education	3	4%	8	12%
Important	13	17%	18	28%
Uphold Human Rights	2	3%	0	0%
No Response	1	1%	1	2%
TOTAL	75	100%	65	100%

When comparing responses of students who have enrolled in CEL courses to students in control groups, students in CEL courses were more likely to express how community engagement is *beneficial to all* and to articulate community engagement in terms of reciprocal ability to be meaningful both to the community and the individual. As a student in the Inside-Out course explained, “I think community engagement is extremely important because it gets you out of your ‘bubble’ and allows for more varying viewpoints and experiences from other people. Engaging with others in your community is vital to grow yourself and grow your community.”

In contrast to students in the control groups, students in CEL courses more frequently depicted community engagement as our *civic duty*. They shared thoughts of how “it is our civic duty to be engaged in your community” and that “it is essential to living somewhere and being fully a part of it.” Similarly, students in CEL courses also provided perspectives of community engagement as a way to *uphold human rights*. “Community engagement is essential to the upholding of human rights. When we spend time with others in our community, we create relationships and help others.” Students in CEL courses not only spoke of the positive benefits of community engagement, but also highlighted how *challenging* community engagement can be. “It is essential, but should not be forced. When community engagement is forced, it isn't effective on either side and creates tension and attitudes of contention between parties,” a student in the Inside-Out course expressed.

Alternatively, students in the control group succinctly expressed how *important* they felt community engagement to be. These students also wrote about the relevance of individuals connecting with the community and those around them while also acknowledging their limited involvement personally. “[Community engagement is] extremely important and a very notable thing to do, but I have personally not been active in my opinion,” shared a social work control group student.

In addition, students enrolled in the control group were more likely to view community engagement in terms of how it is *beneficial to community*. Students in the control group described the impact on positive attitudes within the community which then could lead to more cohesion among residents. As a social work control group student wrote, “[community engagement] promotes good attitudes towards community and improves quality of life. It helps connect people through a common goal.” Students in the control group were also more likely to articulate views of community engagement that focused on its *benefit to individuals* by sharing views of how “it is very important and leads to gaining a unique set of skills,” or how community

engagement “can build character and change world views,” as two students mentioned. Furthermore, control group students took it a step further by detailing viewpoints of not only how community engagement was beneficial to individuals, but how they viewed community engagement as a way of also *helping others*. A student in the control group stated, “I feel that community engagement is a great thing for people to do. It helps you feel better about yourself while also helping others.”

Surprisingly, students in the control group were more likely to view community engagement in connection with a *holistic and meaningful education* compared to students in CEL courses. Such students shared how they felt community engagement should be required for all majors and should be emphasized in college. “I think it’s an important part of learning. It backs up content I have learned and keeps me motivated,” stated a student in the social work control group.

Students in both CEL courses and students in the control group proportionately considered CEL as a means to further *diversity and inclusion* by providing a space for often segregated groups to come together. As a student in the Inside-Out course mentioned, “I believe [community engagement] is essential in a thriving community. Without it, communities can be segregated, unaware of what’s going on around them, and become less cohesive.” Similarly, a social work student in the control group stated, “I believe community engagement is a positive thing that is able to bring people coming from many different backgrounds together.”

Discussion

T-tests and chi-square tests demonstrated very few differences between participants enrolled in the CEL courses included in the study and the control group of students not enrolled in those courses. On average, students were comparable in age, hours parents spend in community service outside their jobs, and parents’ relative social status. The finding of no difference in parents’ hours of community service between students in CEL and control groups is novel, in that

the ecological framework (Gitterman & Germain, 2008) would suggest that parents' community service, as part of a student's environment, would influence students' civic engagement, including through CEL. The result is in contrast to previous research, which has found associations between parental behavior and adolescent civic engagement (Kelly, 2006; Rossi, Lenzi, Sharkey, Vieno, & Santinello, 2016; Warren & Wicks, 2011). The apparent lack of association between parental community service hours and students' participation in CEL warrants further exploration.

Students in CEL and control groups did not differ in their hours of previous experience in most types of experiential learning. On average, students reported comparable hours in study abroad, service, leadership, and research experiences, as well as hours in all areas combined. Instead of attracting students with more community service experience or students who have participated in more extensive experiential learning overall, the CEL courses included in the study are attracting students with similar types and quantities of previous experience as students who are not enrolling in these CEL courses. The exception to this similarity is in the area of internships. CEL students reported more hours spent in internships than students in the control group. One explanation is that engineering students are more likely to co-op than liberal arts students, and engineering students comprised a greater proportion of the CEL group than the control group. Post hoc analyses showed that the mean hours in internships among students majoring in engineering ($n = 39$) was 790.77, as compared to an average of 249.66 hours among students with majors other than engineering ($n = 101$). As all of the engineering students are in the CEL group, this explains the significant difference from the control group in internship hours.

CEL and control group students described largely similar views on community engagement. CEL students were more likely to identify benefits to all and a larger proportion of control students described CEL as important. More students in the control group commented on the place of CEL within holistic education. Otherwise, comparable

proportions of CEL and control students reported each of the other themes found in the analysis. Taken together, these results indicate little difference between CEL and control students' views of community engagement. This is consistent with the quantitative analyses, which showed generally similar characteristics and past experiences of CEL students and control group students.

These similarities may indicate a generalized acceptance of the importance of community engagement as an aspect of the Catholic, Marianist value of community. As described above, the concept of community is pervasive at the university, so it is understandable that both CEL students and their peers recognize the value of community engagement. Yet, it is interesting that past research of UD students found that CEL students felt differently from the majority of their fellow students because of their community involvement (Fogle, et al., 2017). Anecdotally, CEL students continue to draw distinctions between their community engagement outside the campus "bubble" and other students who stay within the bounds of campus. It is notable, then, that students have similar thoughts about community engagement as well as past experiences but their responding actions to those thoughts differ.

The most striking difference between CEL and control groups was in students' racial identity. While nearly equal proportions of CEL and control group students connected community engagement with diversity and inclusion, students with racial identities other than White were less likely to participate in the CEL courses in the study than in control groups. Mitchell, Donahue, and Young-Law (2012) observe that "service learning is being implemented by mostly white faculty with mostly white students at predominantly white institutions to serve mostly poor individuals and mostly people of color" (p. 612). The authors discuss CEL as a "pedagogy of whiteness." Dahan, Cruz, Perry, Hammell, and Danley (2019) found that some students attending a university in their home city, which was racially segregated, and participating in CEL expressed a double consciousness of both city residents who shared characteristics with the clients served

by CEL activities, as well as that of students, who participated in campus-based discussions of the city that included problematic generalizations of their own racial and ethnic groups. Both of these sources suggest that our findings may track with underrepresentation of students of color in CEL courses at other universities and for reasons related to the pedagogy itself.

Considering how engaged learning experiences are generally offered and developed with White middle- and upper-class students in mind, Taranath (2019) recommends that we must reconsider the target audience for these opportunities and how the programs' goals may be inclusive or exclusive of those with other social identities. In particular, many opportunities center on a programmatic goal of increasing students' comfort engaging across differences and their ability to become contributing members of a diverse society (Trudeau & Kruse, 2014; Mitchell, 2018). Acknowledging that an experience in which a student of one intersectional identity is able to engage across difference is not necessarily the same as an experience that allows another student to engage across difference should provide an opportunity to reconceptualize CEL options that are more inclusive of and inviting to students of color and students with other marginalized identities. Furthermore, understanding that social identities are not a monolithic experience for all who share a particular identity, CEL opportunities should be as diverse as the student body they are being offered to.

Hartman et al. (2020) made a series of recommendations to address diversity, equity, and inclusion (DEI) in study abroad and global education programs which can be generally applied to CEL as well. These include discarding the stated or assumed idea of the "typical student" (p. 52) and tying CEL reforms to campus DEI efforts. CEL opportunities should also recognize that students with marginalized identities (racial or otherwise) have acquired a range of skills to resist oppression, and CEL programs can incorporate this lived experience as an asset in community engagement. Doing so may re-center CEL as a pedagogy of anti-racism and justice rather than one of Whiteness

(Mitchell et al., 2012). This would also allow students to conceptualize ways in which their skills and experiences contribute to their ability to address pressing social problems (The Crucible Moment, 2012; Trudeau & Kruse, 2014; Mitchell, 2018).

Current literature also suggests that CEL, as a pedagogy for highly engaged learning, can promote the academic success of students from racial minority groups (Strum, Eatman, Saltmarch, & Bush, 2011). Thus, increasing representation of students of color in CEL courses can be one aspect of broader efforts to support the academic success of these students. In addition, racial diversity among students participating in study abroad opportunities has been increasing since at least 2005 (Institute of International Education, 2019). Further research should explore effective strategies to ensure access for students of all racial identities to all forms of CEL, including identifying and reducing barriers to CEL and addressing university practices that disincentivize CEL.

Limitations

There were several limitations to this study. First, the findings reflect a comparison of three selected CEL courses and matching control groups for the Semester of Service and Inside-Out courses. The study was limited by lack of a control group of engineering students. Second, since the research team selected the three CEL programs to study and random sampling was not utilized, the results of the study cannot be generalized to other CEL programs at the university or at other universities. Third, by asking students about specific types of CEL (e.g., service, leadership) and not prior CEL generally, the questionnaire may not have captured the full breadth of students' previous exposure and involvement in CEL. This is expected to have affected both CEL and control groups since the same questionnaire was used, so it is unlikely that quantitative comparisons of prior experiences would have been drastically different if more general CEL questions were used instead.

Conclusion

This analysis of students who enrolled in the CEL courses included in the sample compared to a control group shows few differences in hours of experiential learning, relative social status, or parental hours of community service. Students' views on community engagement also did not vary widely. The one area of significant difference is in racial identity, with fewer students with non-White racial identities participating in CEL courses than in control groups. In order to achieve full participation as advanced by Strum, Eatman, Saltmarch, & Bush (2011), each person, of any identity and background, must be provided the opportunity to contribute and engage in society. Furthermore, as a Catholic and Marianist institution, the University of Dayton believes diversity, equity, and inclusion are fundamental to achieving the university mission, attaining institutional excellence (Office of Diversity and Inclusion, n.d.), and consequently, fulfilling a commitment to community. Therefore, to ensure each student has the opportunity to pursue a commitment to community academically, CEL programs must be developed and reviewed to ensure the opportunities offered are accessible, equitable, and inclusive for all identities and backgrounds.

About the Authors

Molly Malany Sayre is an associate professor of social work at the University of Dayton. Her research explores community-engaged learning, health, and social inequality, with interests in civic engagement, maternal health, and stress.

Castel Sweet is an assistant professor of practice and director of the Center for Community Engagement in the Division of Diversity and Community Engagement at the University of Mississippi. Her practice and scholarship seek to advance community-university collaborations that are equitable and mutually beneficial. She is particularly interested in the influence of place and space on engagement practices.

Kelly Bohrer is the executive director of the Ethos Center and the director of community engagement in the School of Engineering at the

University of Dayton. She is a boundary spanner, a practitioner scholar, an adjunct faculty member, and a social justice and sustainability education consultant with over 20 years of experience in higher education, civic, and nonprofit work. Her research interests include community-engaged engineering; engineering and human rights; community engaged learning and scholarship; and high-impact experiential learning for social change.

References

- Babbie, E. (2010). *The Practice of Social Research*. Wadsworth Press.
- Casale, F. M. (2019). The constituent place of service in Catholic higher education. In W. V. Flores & K. S. Rogers (Eds.), *Democracy, Civic Engagement, and Citizenship in Higher Education* (pp. 119-122). Lexington Books.
- Charmaz, K. (2014). *Constructing grounded theory*. Sage.
- Clark, L. (2017). Implementing an institution-wide community-engaged learning program: The leadership and management challenge. In J. Sachs & L. Clark (Eds), *Learning through community engagement*. Springer.
- Coker, J. S., Heiser, E., Taylor, L., & Book, C. (2017). Impacts of experiential learning depth and breadth on student outcomes. *Journal of Experiential Education*, 40(1), 5-23.
- Common Cold Project. (2016). Childhood subjective social status. Retrieved from <https://www.cmu.edu/common-cold-project/measures-by-study/psychological-and-social-constructs/childhood-measures/childhood-subjective-social-status.html>
- Dahan, T. A., Cruz, K., Perry, A., Hammell, B., & Danley, S. (2019). "I live both lives": Exploring double consciousness in resident-students at an engaged institution. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 25(2), 1-18.
- Dinour, L. M., Szaro, J., Blumberg, R., & Bose, M. (2018). A convergent mixed-methods exploration of the effects of

- community-engaged coursework on graduate student learning. *Journal of Nutrition Education and Behavior*, 50(6), 596-609.
- Esterberg, K. G. (2002). *Qualitative methods in social research*. McGraw-Hill.
- Fitz Center for Leadership in Community. (n.d.). *About us*. Retrieved April 2020 from <https://udayton.edu/artssciences/ctr/fitz/about.php>
- Fogle, E. M., Franco, S. D., Jesse, E. M., Kondritz, B., Maxam, L., McMillen, C., ... Trunk, D. J. (2017). Served through service: Undergraduate students' experiences in community engaged learning at a Catholic and Marianist university. *Journal of Catholic Education*, 20, 126-153.
- Gitterman, A., & Germain, C. B. (2008). Ecological framework. In *Encyclopedia of Social Work* (Vol. 2, pp. 99-102). New York, NY: Oxford.
- Hartman, E., Reynolds, N. P., Ferrarini, C., Messmore, N., Evans, S., Al-Ebrahim, B., & Brown, J. M. (2020). Coloniality-decoloniality and critical global citizenship: Identity, belonging, and education abroad. *Frontiers: The interdisciplinary journal of study abroad*, 32(1), 33-59.
- Institute of International Education. (2019). Profile of U.S. Study Abroad Students, 2005/06-2017/18. *Open Doors Report on International Educational Exchange*. Retrieved from <https://www.iie.org/en/Research-and-Insights/Open-Doors/Data/US-Study-Abroad/Student-Profile>
- Kelly, D. C. (2006). Parents' influence on youths' civic behaviors: The civic context of the caregiving environment. *Families in Society: Journal of Contemporary Social Services*, 87(3), 447-455.
- Lovett, K. (Ed.). (2020). *Diverse Pedagogical Approaches to Experiential Learning: Multidisciplinary Case Studies, Reflections, and Strategies*. Palgrave.
- Mitchell, T. D., Donahue, D. M., & Young-Law, C. (2012). Service learning as a pedagogy of whiteness. *Equity and Excellence in Education*, 45(4), 612-629.

- Mitchell, T. D. (2018). Forward. In D. M. Donahue & S. Plaxton-Moore, *The student companion to community-engaged learning: What you need to know for transformative learning and real social change*. Stylus Publishing.
- Mitchell, T. D., Donahue, D. M., & Young-Law, C. (2012). Service learning as a pedagogy of whiteness. *Equity and Excellence in Education*, 45(4), 612-629.
- Mitchell, T. D., & Soria, K. M. (2018). Introduction: Educating for citizenship and social justice—practices for community engagement at research universities. In T. D. Mitchell & K. M. Soria (Eds.), *Educating for citizenship and social justice*. Palgrave MacMillan.
- Neururer, J., & Rhoads, R. A. (1998). Community service: Panacea, paradox, or potentiation. *Journal of College Student Development*, 39(4), 321-330.
- Nicotera, N.; Cutforth, N.; Fretz, E.; and Thomas, S. S. (2011) Dedication to Community Engagement: A Higher Education Conundrum? *Journal of Community Engagement and Scholarship*. 4(1), 37-49.
- National Task Force on Civic Learning and Democratic Engagement. (2012). *A Crucible Moment: College Learning and Democracy's Future*. American Association of Colleges and Universities. Retrieved from https://www.aacu.org/sites/default/files/files/crucible/Crucible_508F.pdf
- Office of Diversity and Inclusion (n.d.) *Vision and Guiding Principles*. Retrieved April 2020 from <https://udayton.edu/diversity/about/vision-mission-principles.php>
- Pompa, L. (2013). Drawing forth, finding voice, making change: Inside-Out learning as transformative pedagogy. In S. W. Davis & B. S. Roswell (Eds.), *Turning teaching inside-out: A pedagogy of transformation for community-based education* (pp. 13-25). New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.

- Rossi, G., Lenzi, M., Sharkey, J. D., Vieno, A., & Santinello, M. (2016). Factors associated with civic engagement in adolescence: The effects of neighborhood, school, family, and peer contexts. *Journal of Community Psychology, 44*(8), 1040-1058.
- Schwartz, K. (2010) Community engaged research: Student and community perspectives. *Partnerships: A Journal of Service Learning & Civic Engagement. 1*(2), 1-16.
- Spina, E. (2017, April 4). Inaugural Address [Speech text]. University of Dayton.
- Strum, S., Eatman, T., Saltmarsh, J., & Bush, A. (2011). Full participation: Building the architecture for diversity and community engagement in higher education. *Imagining America. 17*.
- Taranath, A. (2019) *Beyond Guilt Trips*. Between the Lines.
- Trudeau, D. & Kruse, T. P. (2014) Creating Significant Learning Experiences through Civic Engagement: Practical Strategies for Community-Engaged Pedagogy. *Journal of Public Scholarship in Higher Education, 4*, 12-30.
- Tymon, A. (2013). The Student Perspective on Employability. *Studies in Higher Education, 38*(6), 841-856.
- University of Dayton. (2010). Commitment to community: Principles of community living.
https://ecommons.udayton.edu/studev_docs/1/
- Warren, R., & Wicks, R. H. (2011). Political socialization: Modeling teen political and civic engagement. *Journalism and Mass Communication Quarterly, 88*(1), 156-175.
- Westover, J. H. (2017). Utilizing community-engaged experiential learning and service-learning pedagogy to foster increased engaged educational experiences at Utah Valley University: A research proposal. *Journal of the Utah Academy of Sciences, Arts, and Letters, 94*, 229-246.
- Yourke, M. (2006). Employability in Higher Education: What Is It and What Is It Not. *The Journal of Higher Education Academy, Series 1*. Retrieved from

<http://www.heacademy.ac.uk/resources/detail/ourwork/employability/employability336>

