The purpose of this qualitative multiple case study was to explore how institutionalized student affairs service-learning offices define service-learning, the process upper-level administrators, student affairs educators, and faculty members go through to institutionalize service-learning in student affairs divisions, and the faculty development practices employed by student affairs educators in student affairs divisions. The seven administrators and six faculty members who participated in this study were employees at North Carolina Campus Compact (NCCC) and South Carolina Campus Compact (SCCC) member institutions. More specifically, this study included 13 total participants from three NCCC institutions and three SCCC institutions.

The data for this study were gathered through document analysis and semi-structured interviews. Data analysis was conducted with a social constructivist philosophical worldview. I analyzed each case study’s data individually, conducted a cross-case analysis, and then identified patterns that emerged from the documents and the interviews. The Furco Self-Assessment Rubric for the Institutionalization of Service-Learning in Higher Education and the Campus Compact Service-Learning Pyramid were employed to identify each participating institution’s commitment to institutionalized service-learning.
The six institutions described in this study represented various levels of service-learning institutionalization. However, the service-learning definitions, service-learning institutionalization processes, and faculty development practices identified at these institutions were consistent with the service-learning standards found in the service-learning literature. Each institution allocated the human, financial, and organizational resources needed to institutionalize service-learning. The student affairs educators and the faculty members universally approved of service-learning’s organizational placement at their respective institutions. The findings provide evidence service-learning can be institutionalized in student affairs and that student affairs educators are qualified to equally share leadership of an institution’s service-learning efforts with their academic affairs counterparts.
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CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

Student affairs educators and faculty members regularly collaborate to develop educational environments where every office, program, and initiative presents students with opportunities to learn (Kuh, 1996; NASPA & ACPA, 2004; ACPA et al., 2006). Service-learning has been identified as an ideal practice and pedagogy to use during these collaborations (ACPA, 1996a; NASPA & ACPA, 2004; ACPA et al., 2006). Service-learning has inseparable historical ties to civic engagement, experiential education, and community-based learning (Butin, 2011; Clayton et al., 2010; Rocheleau, 2004). It is generally a highly adaptable and institutional mission-driven pedagogy that can be employed in a variety of institutional contexts (Beatty, 2010; Holland, 1997; O'Meara & Niehaus, 2009). For example, differing institutional mission statements and contexts may influence student affairs educators at religiously affiliated colleges to define and practice service-learning differently than practitioners at public minority-serving institutions.

Service-learning’s documented positive influence on student learning and its connection to institutional mission statements make it ideal for student affairs educators seeking to increase student learning in and out of traditional classroom settings. The Southern Regional Education Board (1969) provided one of the earliest service-learning definitions by explaining service-learning is “the accomplishment of tasks that meet genuine human needs in combination with conscious educational growth” (p. 2). More recently, Prentice (2002) wrote service-learning “combines community service with academic instruction, focusing on critical, reflective thinking
and personal and civic responsibility” (p. 1). Although there are many service-learning definitions, service-learning is commonly defined by practitioners in institutionalized service-learning offices as “a course-based, credit-bearing educational experience in which students participate in an organized service activity that meets identified community needs, 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” (Bringle & Hatcher, 1995, p. 112). Practitioners in the institutionalized civic engagement offices at University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, Minnesota State University Moorhead, Northern Michigan University, and several other colleges use the Bringle and Hatcher (1995) service-learning definition as the official service-learning definition for their offices (Carolina Center for Public Service, n. d.; Minnesota State University Moorhead, n. d.; Northern Michigan University, n. d.). However, the way service-learning practitioners define service-learning usually depends on their institution’s mission, values, civic engagement history, organizational structure, and the community where the institution is located.

Regardless of the definition, service-learning is cited as beneficial to students, faculty members, and the community (Bringle, Phillips, & Hudson, 2004; Caruso, Bowen, & Adams-Dunford, 2006; Knight-McKenna, Darby, Spingler, & Shafer, 2010). Service-learning helps students gain an appreciation for and an understanding of community norms and civic responsibilities, increases student understanding of course material, cultivates students’ personal development, increases student understanding of systematic social problems, and helps students develop cultural competence and the ability to interact with various ethnic and cultural groups (Abes, Jackson, & Jones, 2002; Battistoni, 2002; Chupp & Joseph, 2010). Service-learning has also been found to benefit faculty members by increasing their students’ understanding of course
material, creating university-community partnerships, and raising student appreciation for the community (Banerjee & Hausafus, 2007). Service-learning pedagogy is even more beneficial to faculty members working at institutions where engaged scholarship and community-based research are valued in the tenure and promotion process (Nicotera et al., 2011).

The financial and human capital service-learning initiatives bring into communities benefit the communities tremendously (Chupp & Joseph 2010; Clayton, Bringle, Senor, Huq, & Morrison, 2010; Jeandron, & Robinson, 2010). Service-learning projects are likely to benefit the community when community members, institutional representatives, and students have a passion for the work being done, a clear understanding of the project’s goals and outcomes, a mutual respect and utilization of everyone’s expertise, and a system in place to hold everyone accountable for their work (Leiderman, Furco, Zapf, & Goss, 2002; Nicotera, Cutforth, Fretz, & Summers, 2011; Strand, Marullo, Cutforth, Stoecker, & Donohue, 2003; Torres, Sinton, White, & Berg, 2000).

The use of service-learning is an example of the student affairs profession’s historical commitment to improving the student experience at colleges and universities. Student affairs educators help students balance their needs with those of others to create communities of mutual respect on college campuses (Torres, Jones, & Renn, 2009). The pedagogies and philosophies spearheading student affairs practice have evolved to meet students’ needs in higher education’s ever-changing social, economic, and political climate (ACPA & NASPA, 2010). Student affairs practice can be organized into two models: traditional and innovative (Manning, Kinzie, & Schuh, 2014). Traditional models mirror the initial priorities of the student affairs profession, focus on experiences outside the traditional classroom setting, and place minimal emphasis on student learning and engagement goals. Innovative models focus on student learning and/or
collaboration and coordination with academic priorities. Service-learning can be categorized as an innovative practice because it provides student affairs educators the opportunity to promote student learning by working collaboratively with faculty members. It should be noted student affairs educators are not likely adhere to the principles of just one model. Student affairs educators may incorporate aspects of both the aforementioned models into practice (Manning, Kinzie, & Schuh, 2014).

Student affairs practice can also be categorized in three paradigms: student services, student development, and student learning (ACPA & NASPA, 2010; Barham & Scott, 2006; Hamrick, Evans, & Schuh, 2002). The student services paradigm began in the early twentieth century. Practitioners working during the student services paradigm focused on delivering services that enhanced college students’ educational experience. More specifically, these practitioners supported students and the preeminence of their institution’s academic mission by providing services to students outside the classroom (NASPA, 1987). Housing, dining services, registrars, and admissions represent some of the functional areas present during the student services paradigm (Evans et al., 2010; Hamrick, Evans, & Schuh, 2002; Manning, Kinzie, & Schuh, 2014).

The student services paradigm defined the student affairs profession until the mid-1970s when the student development paradigm created new ways of thinking about the nature of student affairs practice (Barham & Scott, 2006; Brown, 1972). Student development is defined as the ways a student grows, progresses, or increases his or her developmental capabilities as a result of enrollment in college (Rodgers, 1990). The research and theory associated with college student development is termed student development theory, which provides the basis for student development practice (McEwen, 2003; Harper & Quaye, 2009; Howard-Hamilton, 2007;
Hubbard, 2012; Strange & King, 1990). As college student populations became more diverse in the 1970s, 1980s, and 1990s, student development theory evolved to focus on identity development related to racial and ethnic groups, sexual orientation, and women (Torres, Jones, & Renn, 2009). In addition, student affairs educators during the student development paradigm professed student experiences both inside and out of the classroom were educational and must be used to help students achieve their full developmental potential (Brown, 1972; Evans et al., 2010; NASPA, 1987; NASPA & ACPA, 2004).

The emergence of the student learning paradigm in the mid-1990s coincided with the student affairs profession’s concerted advocacy for service-learning as an innovative and experiential way to engage students. Historically, the student affairs profession relied on faculty members to cultivate and enhance student learning (Barham & Scott, 2006; NASPA, 1987; NASPA & ACPA, 2004). The student learning paradigm was introduced when contemporary student affairs educators began taking a proactive role in furthering student learning (ACPA, 1996b; ACPA & NASPA, 1998). Student affairs educators in the student learning paradigm proactively and strategically plan to invest resources in services and programs that meet educational outcomes and promote student learning (ACPA, 1996b; ACPA et al., 2004; ACPA & NASPA, 1998). Moreover, student affairs educators in the student learning paradigm seek more collaborations with fellow student affairs educators and with faculty members (ACPA, 1996a; NASPA & ACPA, 2004; NASPA & ACPA, 2010). The advent of the student learning paradigm encouraged many student affairs educators to take a more proactive and meaningful role in promoting student learning. Service-learning provides the aforementioned educators with multiple opportunities to address their student learning goals.
The student affairs practice models and paradigms represent the philosophical and theoretical approaches currently informing student affairs practice. Since the philosophies and theories informing student affairs practice are not monolithic, there are contemporary student affairs educators who employ aspects of several models and paradigms into practice (Manning, Kinzie, & Schuh, 2014). Institutional type, institutional mission statements, campus leadership, and professional discretion also influence the ways student affairs educators approach their work (Manning, Kinzie, & Schuh, 2014).

**Background of the Problem**

Traditionally, service-learning has been institutionalized in academic affairs. Berman and McLaughlin (1974) defined institutionalization as “the point when an innovative practice, having been implemented, loses its 'special project' status and becomes part of a routinized behavior of the institutional system” (p. 16). Holland (2000) described service-learning institutionalization as “those issues related to the exploration, implementation, expansion, and sustainability of service learning as a programmatic endeavor” (p. 53). Institutionalization is seen as the pinnacle indicator of institutional importance for relatively new institutional programs and practices like service-learning (Holland, 2009; Young et al., 2007). An institutional commitment to service-learning typically results in the creation of a centralized service-learning unit, which provides leadership and campus-wide logistical assistance for service-learning efforts (Harwood et. al., 2005; Holland, 1997; Vogel, Seifer, Gelmon, 2010). Service-learning becomes institutionalized when an institution makes civic engagement and community engagement top priorities and invests continuous resources into civic engagement initiatives through institutional mission statements, presidential leadership, budget allocations, the tenure and promotion process, and campus-wide service-learning work (Bringle & Hatcher, 2000; Gelmon et al., 2004).
Campus Compact is a national organization of college presidents committed to promoting civic and community engagement through higher education (Campus Compact, 2013; Saltmarsh, Zlotkowski, & Hollander, 2002). The organization was founded, in part, to reconnect institutions of higher education to their original mission of preparing students to participate actively and effectively in a democratic society (Stanton, Giles, & Cruz, 1999). Student affairs educators and faculty members collaborating in institutionalized service-learning offices are likely to refer to Campus Compact resources when planning, conducting, and assessing service-learning (Campus Compact, 2013; Chadwick & Pawlowski, 2007; Hinck & Brandell, 2000; Stanton, Giles, Cruz, 1999; Torres, Sinton, White, & Berg, 2000). Campus Compact member institutions are ideal for researching service-learning institutionalization because all Campus Compact colleges have committed to institutionalizing service-learning, civic engagement, and/or community engagement. Although student affairs divisions are not explicitly mentioned in the Campus Compact mission or vision statement, many of the organization’s member institutions organizationally house service-learning in student affairs. Therefore, student affairs educators at Campus Compact institutions can observe the organization’s mission and vision while simultaneously supporting the mission of their respective institutions.

Service-learning offices housed organizationally in academic affairs are more likely to garner institutional and faculty buy-in because academic affairs divisions are seen as the institutional home of academic rigor and are therefore more respected by faculty members (Bringle & Hatcher, 2000; Forbes, Washburn, Crispo, & Vandeveer, 2008; Hinck & Brandell, 2000; Vogelgesang, 2004). At many colleges, service-learning is seen as an academic practice and pedagogy reserved for faculty members and outside the purview and expertise of student affairs educators. Student affairs educators are perceived as being better equipped to spearhead
non-course-based civic and community engagement efforts like volunteerism and community service. The commonly held stance in the service-learning literature that an academic affairs division is a more appropriate organizational home for service-learning than a student affairs division perpetuates the false narrative that student affairs educators cannot contribute to student learning (Bringle & Hatcher, 2000; Forbes, Washburn, Crispo, & Vandeveer, 2008; Hinck & Brandell, 2000; Vogelgesang, 2004). This narrative may exist, in part, because student affairs educators have not historically focused on student learning or published service-learning research in abundance. The student affairs profession’s voice in the service-learning literature is largely silent. There is very little research on how student affairs educators define service-learning or how student affairs divisions are chosen to be the organizational home of service-learning,

Statement of the Problem

Given the significant role service-learning has played in the student affairs profession’s effort to enhance student learning, it is important for student affairs educators to consider institutionalizing service-learning in student affairs divisions. Institutionalized service-learning offices provide evidence that colleges believe service-learning practices are an expression of their core missions and purposes (Bringle & Hatcher, 2000; Hartley, Harkavy, & Benson, 2005). Institutionalization is cited in the service-learning literature as the key to sustaining and enhancing service-learning efforts at institutions of higher education (Bringle & Hatches, 2000; Casey & Springer, 2006; Furco, Muller, & Ammon, 1998). There is nothing fundamentally problematic about institutionalizing service-learning in academic affairs. However, promoting service-learning institutionalization in academic affairs exclusively as the organizational home of serving-learning is an issue because doing so fails to acknowledge the colleges and universities
that institutionalize service-learning exclusively in student affairs or jointly in student affairs and academic affairs. Service-learning and student affairs practice share a commitment to advancing institutional missions and enhancing student learning (Caruso, Bowen, & Adams-Dunford, 2006; NASPA, 1987; NASPA & ACPA, 2010). Institutionalizing service-learning in student affairs can help student affairs educators utilize institutional resources to cultivate on-and off-campus learning environments where students acquire knowledge from practitioners, faculty members, and community members (Beere, Votruba, & Wells, 2011; Holland & Langesh, 2010; Stater & Fotheringham, 2009).

Several institutions of higher educations have successfully institutionalized service-learning in student affairs, but there is little literature documenting this (The Lowell Bennion Community Service Center, n. d.; Welch & Saltmarsh, 2013). There is some literature on how student affairs educators in offices where service-learning is institutionalized meet educational outcomes and promote student learning (Basinger & Bartholomew, 2006; Bringle & Hatcher, 1996; Buchanan, 1998). However, an extensive review of the service-learning literature did not yield any research on how student affairs educators in offices where service-learning is institutionalized define service-learning or what faculty development practices are employed by student affairs educators to support faculty use of service-learning pedagogies.

Research on service-learning institutionalization in student affairs may benefit the student affairs profession by contributing to the literature on how student affairs educators define service-learning, institutionalize service-learning, and promote student learning. Additionally, research on service-learning institutionalization may also provide evidence student affairs educators are well-qualified to lead service-learning efforts.
This study was designed to address three research questions:

- How do student affairs educators at Campus Compact institutions where service-learning is institutionalized in student affairs define service-learning?
- What process do upper-level administrators, student affairs educators, and faculty members go through to institutionalize service-learning in student affairs at Campus Compact institutions?
- What faculty development practices are employed by student affairs educators at Campus Compact institutions where service-learning is institutionalized in student affairs to support faculty members teaching service-learning courses?

**Subjectivity Statement**

I am a student affairs educator who is passionate about service-learning and the student affairs profession’s relevance in higher education. I was introduced to service-learning as a doctoral student and I have invested a considerable amount of my time learning about service-learning as a pedagogy and practice. I am also a service-learning practitioner who works at an institution where service-learning is institutionalized in a student affairs division. The student affairs professions’ perspectives on service-learning are mostly absent in the service-learning literature. I find it troubling that the prevailing narrative in the service-learning literature is that service-learning should be institutionalized exclusively in academic affairs. I conducted this study to explore the ways student affairs educators define service-learning, the processes upper-level administrators, student affairs educators, and faculty members go through to institutionalize service-learning in student affairs, and the faculty development practices employed by student affairs educators to support faculty members teaching service-learning courses. I believe the
student affairs profession’s voice in the service-learning literature has been missing for too long. It is my hope this study will encourage other student affairs educators to publish service-learning research and provide faculty members and service-learning practitioners who do not work in student affairs with evidence that student affairs divisions should be an option when determining where service-learning should be placed organizationally. I believe academic affairs divisions may be the most appropriate organizational placement for service-learning at some colleges and universities. However, the belief that academic affairs is always the best option as the organizational home for service-learning is questionable.

Definitions

The following definitions will help provide some clarity on issues discussed in this study.

**Academic Affairs:** The division at an institution of higher education responsible for providing leadership, coordination, and support for an institution’s academic programs. This division usually has the responsibility for academic planning, academic budget administration, academic personnel decisions, university-wide curricular requirements, and academic accreditation (Benedict College, n. d.; University of Wyoming, n. d.).

**Campus Compact:** “Campus Compact advances the public purposes of colleges and universities by deepening their ability to improve community life and to educate students for civic and social responsibility. Campus Compact envisions colleges and universities as vital agents and architects of a diverse democracy, committed to educating students for responsible citizenship in ways that both deepen their education and improve the quality of community life” (Campus Compact, 2013, p. 12).
**Civic Engagement:** “The process of working to make a difference in the civic life of our communities and developing the combination of knowledge, skills, values and motivation to make that difference. It means promoting the quality of life in a community, through both political and nonpolitical processes” (Ehrlich, 2000, p. vi.).

**Community:** An all-encompassing term used to describe representatives from non-profit organizations, schools, social service agencies, neighborhood organizations, businesses, and health care providers (Strand, Marullo, Cutforth, Stoecker, & Donohue, 2003).

**Community Engagement:** The collaboration between colleges and their larger communities (local, regional/state, national, global) for the mutually beneficial exchange of knowledge and resources in a context of partnership and reciprocity (New England Resource Center for Higher Education, n. d.).

**Community Service:** A mandated or voluntary contribution of time and labor to address human and community needs (Ikeda, Sandy, & Donahue, 2010).

**Experiential Education:** A pedagogical philosophy and methodology concerned with learning activities outside of the traditional classroom environment, the objectives of which are planned and articulated prior to undertaking the experience (McElhaney, 1998).

**Institutionalization:** “The point when an innovative practice, having been implemented, loses its 'special project' status and becomes part of a routinized behavior of the institutional system” (Berman & McLaughlin, 1974, p. 16).

**Service-Learning:** “A teaching and learning method that upholds a commitment to appreciating the assets of and serving the needs of a community partner while enhancing student learning and academic rigor through the practice of intentional reflective thinking and responsible civic action” (Duncan & Kopperud, 2008, p. 4).
**Student Affairs:** The divisional organizational structure in an institution of higher education that houses programs and initiatives designed to promote and enhance student development and student learning outside and inside an institution’s formal curriculum (ACPA & NASPA, 2010).

**Volunteerism:** The practice of freely giving time to provide some kind of service or assistance without expecting anything in return (Duncan & Kopperud, 2008).

**Conclusion**

The predominant theme in the service-learning literature is that service-learning should be institutionalized in academic affairs. The researchers preserving this narrative view service-learning as a rigorous and dynamic academic endeavor best reserved for faculty members. Although a number of colleges have institutionalized service-learning in academic affairs, there are also some colleges that have institutionalized service-learning in student affairs. The rationale for and value of institutionalizing service-learning in student affairs is virtually nonexistent in the service-learning literature. The absence of research on service-learning institutionalization in student affairs perpetuates the narrative student affairs educators are unfit to play meaningful roles in the student learning process and creates the false impression service-learning should always be institutionalized in academic affairs. This study sought to address the lack of research on service-learning institutionalization in student affairs by exploring the process of institutionalizing service-learning in student affairs at Campus Compact institutions. Campus Compact institutions are ideal for researching service-learning institutionalization because all Campus Compact colleges commit financial and human resources to institutionalize service-learning, civic engagement, and/or community engagement.
CHAPTER 2
LITERATURE REVIEW

This study was designed to explore the ways student affairs educators define service-learning, the processes upper-level administrators, student affairs educators, and faculty members go through to institutionalize service-learning in student affairs, and the faculty development practices employed by student affairs educators to support faculty members teaching service-learning courses. The literature review focuses on the intricacies of service-learning and service-learning institutionalization. It is divided into the following sections: (a) service-learning definitions, (b) service-learning practices, (c) service-learning institutionalization, (d) Campus Compact history, (e) assessment of institutionalization, (f) synthesis of assessment approaches, and (g) conclusion. The service-learning definitions section includes several service-learning definitions, underscores the importance of defining service-learning, and introduces service-learning’s core principles. Next, the service-learning practices section addresses the two predominant approaches to service-learning: civic engagement and social justice. The service-learning institutionalization section provides an overview of service-learning institutionalization in student affairs and the rationale for institutionalizing service-learning in academic affairs. The service-learning institutionalization section is followed by the Campus Compact history section and the assessment of institutionalization section. The Campus Compact history section includes Campus Compact’s national history, North Carolina Campus Compact’s (NCCC) history, and South Carolina Campus Compact’s (SCCC) history. The assessment of institutionalization section provides descriptions of the tools used to assess
service-learning and community engagement institutionalization. This chapter concludes with a synthesis of the aforementioned assessment tools and a chapter summary.

**Service-Learning Definitions**

Service-learning is a multidimensional pedagogy and practice with a number of names and definitions (Butin, 2011; Duncan & Kopperud, 2008; Ikeda, Sandy, & Donahue, 2010; Pasquesi, 2013; Vogelgesang, 2004). It has been called academic service-learning and community service-learning in the service-learning literature and at some institutions of higher education to better reflect what pedagogical focus has primacy (Butin, 2010; Furco & Miller, 2009; Knight-McKenna, Darby, Spingler, & Shafer, 2011; Phillips, Bolduc, & Gallo, 2013). Many colleges and universities hyphenate the term “service-learning” to join service-learning’s two central concepts: community action, the "service," and efforts to learn from community action, the "learning" (Beatty, 2010; Jacoby, 1996; Stanton, Giles, & Cruz, 1999).

Contemporary service-learning definitions highlight the importance of appropriately balancing a community’s needs through service with an institution’s desire to enhance student learning through educational experiences outside the classroom (Beatty, 2010; Fitzgerald et al., 2012; Rice, 2010). For example, Duncan and Kopperud (2008) defined service-learning as “a teaching and learning method that upholds a commitment to appreciating the assets of and serving the needs of a community partner while enhancing student learning and academic rigor through the practice of intentional reflective thinking and responsible civic action” (p. 4). Similarly, Benson and Harkavy (2003) defined service-learning as “an active, creative pedagogical technique that integrates community service with academic study in order to enhance a student's capacity to think critically, solve problems practically, and function as a lifelong, moral, democratic citizen in a democratic society” (p. 1224).
Bringle and Hatcher’s (1995) definition of service-learning is the most frequently cited definition of service-learning (Beere, Votruba, & Wells, 2011; Bringle & Steinberg, 2010; Hatcher & Erasmus, 2008; Ikeda, Sandy, Donahue, 2010; Pinzon & Arceo, 2006; Warchal & Ruiz, 2004). Bringle and Hatcher (1995) defined service-learning as “a course-based, credit-bearing, educational experience in which students (a) participate in an organized service activity that meets identified community needs and (b) reflect on the service activity in such a way as to gain further understanding of course content, a broader appreciation of the discipline, and an enhanced sense of civic responsibility” (p. 112). This definition highlights the academic nature of service-learning, the importance of reciprocity in the development of service-learning courses, the significance of reflection activities connecting service activities to reach targeted educational outcomes, and the centrality of civic learning objectives. Several service-learning offices institutionalized in student affairs use the Bringle and Hatcher (1995) service-learning definition as the official definition of their service-learning work (Carolina Center for Public Service, n. d.; Minnesota State University Moorhead, n. d.; Northern Michigan University, n. d.). The student-led APPLES (Assisting People in Planning Learning Experiences in Service) program in the Carolina Center for Public Service at the University of North Carolina at Chapel-Hill offers students a variety of ways to involve themselves in service-learning, including service-learning courses, service-learning initiatives, and service-learning internships (Carolina Center for Public Service, n. d.). The University of Minnesota Moorhead Academic Service-Learning Center’s mission is to work collaboratively with faculty, students, and community organizations to initiate and provide quality academic service learning opportunities (Minnesota State University Moorhead, n. d.). The Academic Service-Learning Advisory Board at Northern Michigan University is a student affairs-academic affairs collaboration designed to advance the
University’s 85 service-learning courses in 35 majors (Northern Michigan University, n. d.). Although the aforementioned institutions approach service-learning in different ways, the Bringle and Hatcher (1995) service-learning definition is at the foundation of their work.

An institutionally agreed upon service-learning definition separating service-learning from other forms of community and civic engagement is critical to service-learning institutionalization (Hinck & Brandell, 2000). Service-learning, community service, volunteerism, and other forms of civic engagement have similarities, but there are distinct differences between the aforementioned practices. Community service is a mandated or voluntary contribution of time and labor to address human and community needs (Ikeda, Sandy, & Donahue, 2010). It focuses on meeting the community’s needs with little or no emphasis on student learning (Anderson, Swick, & Yff, 2001). Volunteerism is the practice of freely giving time to provide some kind of service or assistance without expecting anything in return (Duncan & Kopperud, 2008). Conversely, service-learning involves linking service activities with rigorous academic material and reflection exercises to address community needs while simultaneously fostering student learning (Cairn & Kielsmeier, 1991; Ward, 2005).

Furthermore, community service and volunteerism are often intermittent experiences while service-learning experiences are continuous and typically last at least one semester (Hartley, Harkavy, & Benson, 2005).

**Service-Learning Core Principles**

The Duncan and Kopperud (2008) definition of service-learning is similar to many present-day definitions of service-learning in that it explicitly highlights the pedagogy’s core principles: student learning, reflection, and reciprocity (Clayton et al., 2010; Cushman, 2002; Gelmon et al., 2001). Many contemporary student affairs educators cite increasing student
As an academically grounded form of community engagement, service-learning promotes student learning by giving students the chance to earn academic credit for the demonstration of learning through reflection on the service (Clayton & O’Steen, 2010; Vogelgesang, 2004). The focus in service-learning is always on learning and not on the number of hours students serve (Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education, 2012). Given the preeminence of academic mission statements at colleges and universities, service-learning has been tied to student learning outcomes in order to sustain and legitimize service-learning in higher education (Butin, 2010; Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education, 2012).

Enrollment in service-learning courses has risen throughout the years due, in part, to unprecedented numbers of students entering college with community engagement experience (Checkoway, 2013). Service-learning courses provide these students with academically grounded opportunities to continue working collaboratively in the community after high school. In addition to developing a penchant to help, many students in service-learning courses acquire the critical thinking skills needed to learn about the ethical issues and political challenges associated with conducting service (Exley, 2004; Lowery et al., 2006; Rocheleau, 2004). Students engaged in service-learning develop a better understanding of course material, a greater desire to participate fully in class discussions, better faculty-student relationships due to the greater emphasis on student-centered teaching, a finer sense of self-awareness, and a heightened appreciation of diversity (Banerjee & Hausafus, 2007; Burke, 2007). There is also evidence the hands-on experience students receive in service-learning courses helps faculty members address
deficits or blind spots in students’ learning (Bloomgarden & O’Meara, 2007; Hatcher, Bringle, & Muthiah, 2004; O’Meara & Niehaus, 2009).

Reflection is a critical component of every service-learning course and is defined several ways in the service-learning literature (Ash, Clayton, & Atkinson, 2005; Clayton, 2009; Eyler, 2001; Hatcher & Bringle, 1997; Rice, 2010). The inclusion of reflection in service-learning helps distinguish service-learning from volunteerism and makes it more than community service (Caruso, Bowen, & Adams-Dunford, 2006; Kronick, Dahlin-Brown, & Luter, 2011). Reflection is commonly defined as “the intentional consideration of an experience in light of particular learning objectives” (Hatcher & Bringle, 1997, p. 153). It is designed to compel students to explore the perspectives, stories, questions, and feelings that accompany the service-learning experiences (Duncan & Kopperud, 2008; Kaye, 2014). Reflection also encourages students to explore the insights, stereotypes, and reactions that arise from those experiences (Hatcher, Bringle, & Muthiah, 2004; Pinzon & Arceo, 2006). Reflection assignments and activities are the most effective when they encourage openness to new ideas and include experimentation, continual assessment, and faculty members learning with and alongside students (Ash & Clayton, 2009; Eyler & Giles, 1999). Reflection connects real-life experiences with classroom instruction, challenges students’ assumptions about the community, and encourages students to consider their service experience in its larger social and political context (Campus Compact, 2000; Caruso, Bowen, & Adams-Dunford, 2006; Chupp & Joseph, 2010). Students can reflect on their service-learning activities through journals, reflection papers, portfolios, artwork, oral presentations, and several other creative avenues (Beere, Votruba, & Wells, 2011; Kronick, Dahlin-Brown, & Luter, 2011). Without well-designed opportunities for reflection, service-learning advocates contend the primary purpose of service, enhanced student learning, may not
occur (Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education, 2012; Chupp & Joseph, 2010).

Institutions of higher education are becoming more conscious of their responsibilities as citizens in the context of their communities and are intentionally increasing programs in local communities that go beyond traditional classroom-based education (Bringle & Steinberg, 2010; Brukardt, Holland, Percy, & Zimpher, 2004; Campus Compact, 2013). Instituting community partnerships for academic and service purposes requires a commitment to building and sustaining off-campus relationships (Bloomgarden & O'Meara, 2007; Exley, 2004). Service-learning partnerships encourage students to engage in discipline-specific analyses and service activities that address authentic social issues in the local community and utilize the community as a learning site where students develop and implement action plans to complex social issues within the context of course curricula (Furco, 2010). Service-learning collaborations also contribute to community development and improve town-gown relationships. Colleges and universities committed to building community capacity view communities as the source of multiple assets and avoid deficit model thinking (Brukardt, Holland, Percy, & Zimpher, 2004). Service-learning practitioners can develop authentic community relationships by soliciting community voice when creating service projects and developing true partnerships with the community to ensure the services provided meet a real need (Buchanan, 1998; Clayton & O’Steen, 2010; Duncan & Kopperud, 2008).

Historically, partnerships between institutions of higher education and public and private entities have been characterized by a considerable amount of tension over who determines the particular issues to address and how those issues are ultimately addressed (Chambers, 2005; Illich, 1968). Colleges and universities have been perceived by their surrounding communities
as removed and isolated from society (Hatcher & Erasmus, 2008; Rice 2010). At many institutions, the relationship between colleges and communities has transitioned to an engaged model where colleges and community partners co-create solutions to community issues through ongoing negotiations, compromises, and a commitment to reciprocity (Fitzgerald, Bruns, Sonka, Furco, & Swanson, 2012; Kezar, 2005a; Young, Shinnar, Ackerman, Carruthers, & Young, 2007). Reciprocity refers to the mutually beneficial relationship among those serving and those served (Ikeda, Sandy, & Donahue, 2010; Kronick, Dahlin-Brown, & Luter, 2011; Lilly, 2001; Sponsler & Hartley, 2013). The inclusion of reciprocity in service-learning collaborations can lessen the likelihood that conflict, exploitation, and coercion will occur (Lowery et al., 2006). Sustained service-learning partnerships thrive when service-learning practitioners and students view the community as a place for teaching, research, service, and reciprocal relationships among students and community members (Cushman, 2002; Rocheleau, 2004). Reciprocal partnerships help create an environment where the community and institutional benefits extend beyond a given service site or engagement activity (Leiderman, Furco, Zapf, & Goss, 2002).

**Service-Learning Practices**

Contemporary service-learning practices are typically value-laden and approached in a variety of ways (Beatty, 2010; Hatcher & Erasmus, 2008; Pinzon & Arceo, 2006). Findings suggest service-learning courses enable faculty members to express a commitment to addressing a specific local, regional, national, or international social cause (O'Meara & Niehaus, 2009). Service-learning practitioners and instructors have historically focused on increasing student learning through community engagement and placed a secondary focus on benefiting the community (Beere, Votruba, & Wells, 2011). In present-day service-learning practice and research, there has been a call for service-learning courses to stress social justice issues and civic
learning (Chambers, 2005; Fitzgerald, Bruns, Sonka, Furco, & Swanson, 2012; Holland, 2005; Hoppe, 2004; Iverson, 2013). The aforementioned service-learning practices are consistent with the student affairs profession’s goal fostering engaged citizenship, social justice, and participatory involvement (ACPA et. al., 2006; NASPA & ACPA, 2004).

The social justice approach to service-learning is designed to help students address conflict and power differences in society, expose and challenge the existing social order, actively devise ways to make the world more equitable, and view the world through a political lens by considering exploitation, voice, and resistance (Beatty, 2010; Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education, 2012; Chupp & Joseph, 2010). Advocates of the social justice approach believe students are intrinsically connected to broader communities and that all citizens have a responsibility to work toward social justice in those communities (Duncan & Kopperud, 2008). Students participating in service-learning experiences are likely to see problems as systemic and to believe promoting social justice should be a priority for society (Eyler, Giles, & Braxton, 1997). There is evidence the social justice approach to service-learning appears to have a greater impact on students’ cognitive development than service-learning without a social justice emphasis (Wang & Rodgers, 2006). Social justice service-learning has been called critical service-learning and multicultural service-learning (Mitchell, 2008; Pasquesi, 2013; Rice & Pollack, 2000). Critical service-learning is a progressive pedagogical approach that supports the political nature of service, seeks social justice over traditional views of citizenship, and requires educators to focus on critical community issues (Mitchell, 2008). Although social justice service-learning and critical service-learning are related, the two approaches are different because critical service-learning generates more lasting social change for the community and its members (Chupp & Joseph, 2010). Multicultural service-learning is designed to combine
multicultural education and service-learning in an effort to build community and challenge inequality (Boyle-Baise, 2002). The multicultural approach is focused on helping students develop the skills necessary to manage conflict and interact across difference (Pasquesi, 2013). Student affairs educators committed to increasing student learning must be multi-culturally competent professionals with the ability to sensitively and effectively convey values of equity and social justice (NASPA & ACPA, 2004). Social justice service-learning gives student affairs educators a forum to apply social justice theories (ACPA et. al., 2006).

The United States educational system has historically sought to promote the principles of democracy and civic engagement by preparing students to form well-thought-out public judgments, support local and regional communities, broaden access to ensure a diverse democracy, and create ethical leaders in the public sectors (Duncan & Kopperud, 2008; Kezar, 2005b; Sponsler & Hartley, 2013). The increasing inequality, regional tensions, and cultural clashes in the United States have increased society’s expectation for higher education to educate socially responsible and engaged citizens (Pollack, 2013). Many present-day college students do not develop civic competencies and demonstrate unprecedented levels of political nonparticipation (Checkoway, 2013). Service-learning regularly garners national and international attention because it is viewed as a means of reengaging today’s youth with both academic and civic values (Daniels, Patterson, & Dunston, 2010; Holland, 2005; Mattson, 1998). The civic engagement approach to service-learning provides students opportunities to understand the importance of their participation in society and to develop civic habits for engagement (Beatty, 2010; Lowery et. al., 2006). Civic engagement service-learning also attempts to prepare students to assume a civic-minded outlook in their careers and to acquire the knowledge needed to be active citizens in their communities (Bringle & Steinberg, 2010; Watson, 2004). There is
evidence service-learning helps faculty members form the civic and moral values and
dispositions of their students, including civic agency, civic responsibility, an appreciation for the
dignity of human life, and a commitment to lifelong service (O'Meara & Niehaus, 2009).
Service-learning courses represent the most common approach colleges and universities have
taken to engage students civically. Student affairs educators can play a significant role in
making civic learning and democratic engagement a part of every student’s collegiate experience
through facilitated dialogues and conversations with peers in service-learning courses (Sponsler
& Hartley, 2013).

Many service-learning researchers argue service-learning should be a value-neutral
pedagogy and contend that several modern service-learning approaches promote progressive
values while occasionally silencing moderate, conservative, and other perspectives (Butin, 2010;
Butin, 2011; Rocheleau, 2004; Speck & Hoppe, 2004). Ultimately, service-learning course
instructors decide whether the service-learning course goals will or will not include social
justice, civic learning, or any other values (Beere, Votruba, & Wells, 2011). It is important for
service-learning practitioners and upper-level administrators to support service-learning
instructors with diverse approaches to service-learning because this diversity of thought helps
generate rich learning opportunities for students.

Service-Learning Institutionalization

Throughout the 1990s and 2000s, service-learning became the most tangible and
widespread expression of higher education’s civic mission (Bringle, Hatcher, Hamilton, &
Young, 2001; Pollack, 2013). Service-learning expansion across institutions of higher education
as a pedagogy has connected students' academic study with problem-solving experiences in local
community settings (Saltmarsh, Zlotkowski, & Hollander, 2002). Many colleges promote
student learning, civic engagement, and community engagement by providing funding for service-learning and designating a period of time during the academic year to highlight civic engagement and/or service-learning (Campus Compact, 2013). In response to service-learning’s increased use and acceptance at colleges and universities, institutions have developed physical and organizational structures for service-learning to raise the pedagogy’s visibility and establish its academic credibility (Beatty, 2010).

Early student affairs divisions were administrative organizations focused on student life and student development. Teaching, research, and curriculum design during the same time period were exclusively in the organizational domain of divisions of academic affairs (Hamrick, Evans, & Schuh, 2002). Contemporary student affairs divisions are usually predominately hierarchal and increasingly insular organizations where student affairs educators are rewarded for their expertise in a particular student affairs functional area (Tull & Kuk, 2012). As funding for colleges and universities has decreased and the roles student affairs educators play in the student learning process have increased, many student affairs educators have initiated collaborations with other student affairs educators and faculty members to optimize limited resources and expand the learning environment at their institutions. Student affairs divisions have grown in complexity throughout the years and have consistently introduced new functional areas, like service-learning, to meet ever-changing student needs.

During the past 15 years, there has been a philosophical shift in the service-learning field to move from issues involving the pedagogy’s academic legitimacy to those of institutionalization (Butin, 2010). With a new emphasis on institutionalization, colleges and universities began to integrate civic and community engagement work into their core activities across their research, teaching, and service missions (Furco, 2010; Stanton, Giles, & Cruz, 1999).
Institutionalization is defined as “the point when an innovative practice, having been implemented, loses its 'special project' status and becomes part of a routinized behavior of the institutional system (Berman & McLaughlin, 1974, p. 16). When service-learning is completely institutionalized, it becomes an essential aspect of a college’s institutional mission and vision, a permanent aspect of the curriculum, influences faculty roles and rewards, and earns the widespread support, acceptance and involvement of students, faculty, administrators, and the community (Bringle & Hatcher, 2000; Bringle, Hatcher, Hamilton, & Young, 2001; Holland, 2009; Young, Shinnar, Ackerman, Carruthers, & Young, 2007).

**Academic Affairs Institutionalization**

A service-learning office’s administrative location or its reporting relationship in an institution’s organizational structure has a profound impact on its likelihood of becoming institutionalized (Holland & Langesh, 2010; Rubin, 2010; Young, Shinnar, Ackerman, Carruthers, & Young, 2007). Service-learning offices housed organizationally in academic affairs are more likely to garner institutional and faculty buy-in because academic affairs divisions are seen as the institutional home of academic rigor and are therefore more respected by faculty members (Beere, Votruba, & Wells, 2011; Forbes, Washburn, Crispo, & Vandeveer, 2008; Hinck & Brandell, 2000; Vogelgesang, 2004). Organizationally placing a centralized service-learning office under the chief academic affairs officer is beneficial to service-learning institutionalization because chief academic affairs officer leadership is assumed to be important to maintaining the integrity of service-learning as a curricular activity and to promoting the value of service-learning and community outreach in campus forums (Bringle & Hatcher, 2000; Kronick, Dahlin-Brown, & Luter, 2011; Stater & Fotheringham, 2009; Welch & Saltmarsh, 2013).
In a study that surveyed 147 institutionalized community engagement office directors, researchers found 77.6 percent of the community engagement offices reported to academic affairs and most of the offices were directed by an educator professionally aligned with academic affairs (Welch & Saltmarsh, 2013). Service-learning practitioners working in service-learning programs in academic affairs are able to modify and implement academic policy that supports service-learning, create mechanisms that reward faculty participation in service-learning, and integrate faculty development for service-learning into ongoing faculty development programs more readily than student affairs service-learning educators (Jacoby, 2010b). The student development and student learning work practiced by student affairs educators is often misunderstood or not understood at all by faculty members. Although service-learning goals can align with faculty created learning outcomes, faculty members are less likely to engage in service-learning and more likely to think it does not relate to them and their role on campus if they view service-learning as a student development practice (Holland & Langesh, 2010). It is clear the prevailing narrative in the service-learning literature is that service-learning should be institutionalized in academic affairs. This belief has existed in the service-learning field partly because the case for institutionalizing service-learning in student affairs is almost non-existent in the service-learning literature. Student affairs educators have not done a good job providing evidence through publications and presentations that service-learning can be institutionalized in student affairs without lessening the pedagogy’s academic rigor or impact.

**Student Affairs Institutionalization**

Service-learning’s role in the student affairs profession is well-documented in the student affairs literature. In *Learning Reconsidered*, the authors cited service-learning as a new learning model student affairs educators should consider as colleges and universities are challenged by
the learning styles of new generations and populations of students (NASPA & ACPA, 2004).
The authors of *Learning Reconsidered* identified service-learning as a transformational and holistic educational opportunity typically unmatched by similar approaches in the traditional curriculum. Service-learning was also identified in *Learning Reconsidered* as an ideal opportunity for student affairs educators and faculty members to collaborate and promote complex educational outcomes and learning. In *Powerful Partnerships*, the authors explained student affairs educators and faculty members can collaboratively enhance student learning by placing it in the context of compelling situations that balance challenge and opportunity (ACPA & NASPA, 1998). The authors wrote service-learning provided the aforementioned compelling situations and encouraged student learning by affording students opportunities to confront complex social issues, apply their abilities to marginalized communities, and interact with diverse populations. Additionally, the authors stated a great deal of student learning takes place during casual student interactions with student affairs educators, faculty members, and peers. Service-learning was mentioned in *Powerful Partnerships* as a practice and pedagogy student affairs educators and faculty members can collaboratively employ to increase the likelihood of informal and incidental learning situations.

The decision to institutionalize service-learning in student affairs may depend on an institution’s organizational reporting structure. There are colleges where the chief student affairs officer reports to a president, colleges where the chief student affairs officer reports to a provost, and colleges where a provost oversees student affairs functional areas because a chief student affairs officer does not exist. A chief student affairs officer reporting directly to a president can readily explain to a president the reasons service-learning should be institutionalized in student affairs. Presidential support for institutionalizing service-learning in student affairs is especially
important at Campus Compact member institutions since a college cannot join Campus Compact without its president’s approval. A student affairs division could benefit from a chief student affairs officer reporting to a provost if the provost values student affairs practice and understands student affairs educators have the skillset needed to lead a college’s service-learning efforts. Given the provost’s positional and political power, her or his support for service-learning institutionalized in student affairs could increase service-learning collaborations between student affairs educators and faculty members.

The rapid growth and complexity of student affairs divisions during the last 50 years and the rising demand for diverse programs, services, and facilities have created a vital connection between student affairs divisions, student learning, and students’ overall educational experience (Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education, 2012; Kuk & Banning, 2009). The ascension of service-learning as the preeminent form of civic engagement on college campuses also occurred during the same timeframe (Sigmon, 1999; Stanton, Giles, & Cruz, 1999; Titlebaum, Williamson, Dapran, Baer, & Brahler, 2004). Service-learning is consistent with the goals and foundations of student affairs practice and can provide student affairs educators with opportunities to encourage active student engagement in academic life (Caruso, Bowen, & Adams-Dunford, 2006). Student affairs educators have the skills needed to successfully practice service-learning, including, the ability to design and facilitate group reflections, administration and logistics, risk management, conflict mediation, and the ability to develop relationships with faculty members (Jacoby, 2010a). Although many of the student affairs profession’s seminal documents support the use of service-learning in student affairs practice, there is very little literature on how service-learning is institutionalized in student affairs divisions. In a study that surveyed 147 institutionalized community engagement office
directors, researchers found only a third of the respondents had a student affairs background (Welch & Saltmarsh, 2013). Collaborative relationships between student affairs educators, faculty members, and other service-learning practitioners are cited in the service-learning literature as beneficial to service-learning efforts, but student affairs educators are expected to take subordinate roles in the aforementioned collaborations (Bringle & Hatcher, 2000; Henderson, Fair, Sather, & Dewey, 2008; Myers & Goodwin, 2011).

An online search for literature on institutionalized service-learning offices housed organizationally in student affairs yielded two case studies. The first case study explained the process service-learning practitioners at the Lowell Bennion Community Service Center (Lowell Bennion Center), which is organizationally positioned in student affairs, went through to institutionalize service-learning at the University of Utah (Buchanan, 1998). In 1988, the Lowell Bennion Center was established to encourage lifelong service and civic participation by engaging the internal university community and the greater community in action, change, and learning (Bennion Center, 2008; Buchanan, 1998). In order to ensure service-learning’s permanence at the University of Utah, the Lowell Bennion Center’s leadership launched an initiative in 1995 to institutionalize service-learning (Buchanan, 1998). The institutionalization process included creating service-learning standards, gradually increasing the number of service-learning course offerings, forming and collaborating with a faculty advisory committee comprised of representatives from each college to steer the direction of service-learning, earning ongoing financial and administrative support from upper-level administrators, contributing to the creation of Utah Campus Compact, developing a plan to implement service-learning into academic units, and receiving campus-wide faculty support by meeting with faculty members from each college and explaining how the Center’s goals aligned with faculty goals (Bennion Center, 2008;
The Lowell Bennion Center is cited throughout the service-learning literature for its contributions to the service-learning field and many Lowell Bennion Center professionals have published service-learning research (Basinger & Bartholomew, 2006; Bringle & Hatcher, 1996; Casey & Springer, 2006; Torres, Sinton, White, & Berg, 2000; Vincent, 2010).

The second case study’s authors provided a detailed description of Western Carolina University’s (WCU) Service-Learning Department and explained why service-learning should be institutionalized in student affairs divisions (Caruso, Bowen, & Adams-Dunford, 2006). The Service-Learning Department operated as WCU’s service-learning clearinghouse and its staff organized and managed an all-inclusive program in collaboration with faculty members, administrators, staff, students, and community members to foster academic excellence and civic responsibility (Caruso, Bowen, & Adams-Dunford, 2006). The Service Learning Department’s staff also published a faculty resource manual and assisted faculty members in revising syllabi, developing projects, and integrating service learning into their courses. In 2007, the Service-Learning Department was relocated to academic affairs and renamed the Center for Service-Learning (Western Carolina University, n.d.). WCU joined North Carolina Campus Compact in 2005, two years before the Service-Learning Department was transferred to academic affairs (Western Carolina University, n.d.). The reason for relocating the centralized service-learning office to academic affairs was not found on WCU’s website or in the service-learning literature.

The WCU case study also included four assumptions student affairs educators usually have about student learning and explained how those assumptions linked student affairs practice and service-learning (Caruso, Bowen, & Adams-Dunford, 2006). The first assumption is learning consists of both cognitive and emotional components, which means psychosocial and cognitive-structural student development theories can be used during service-learning. Student
affairs educators can assign service-learning reflection assignments to help students explore their identities and moral development. The second assumption is students enter college with a variety of learning styles. Since service-learning is a malleable pedagogy, student affairs educators can use it to accommodate an array of learning styles. Third, student affairs educators should respect each student’s individuality in on-and-off campus environments. Service-learning can be employed to create a learning environment where students’ unique interests and skills are matched with community needs. The final assumption is students should understand learning is a lifelong process. Student affairs educators can use service-learning activities to help students develop an enduring commitment to civic engagement, community engagement, and self-reflection. Ultimately, the authors concluded student affairs divisions are uniquely qualified to house service-learning programs because many student affairs educators are resourceful, responsive to cross-training, comfortable with faculty collaborations, and able to move with the strategic demands of their respective institutions.

Campus Compact History

There was a time when institutionalized service-learning offices were not housed organizationally in student affairs (Sandmann & Plater, 2009). This is no longer the case. For example, nine of North Carolina Campus Compact’s 36 institutions organizationally position service-learning in student affairs and two have a dual-reporting structure where service-learning is organizationally positioned in student affairs and academic affairs. Student affairs educators at Campus Compact institutions observe the organization’s mission and vision while simultaneously supporting the mission of their respective institutions. Founded in 1985 by the presidents of Brown University, Georgetown University, Stanford University and the Education Commission of the States, Campus Compact is the only national higher education association
exclusively dedicated to campus-based civic engagement and is partly responsible for the growth of service-learning at colleges and universities (Beatty, 2010; Campus Compact, 2013; Hatcher & Erasmus, 2008; Pollack, 2013). As the premier civic and community engagement organization, Campus Compact has provided the student affairs educators, faculty members, and other institutional representatives at its 34 state affiliates with the resources, infrastructure, and technical assistance needed to develop and institutionalize service-learning, community service, and volunteerism programs of varying depth and scope (Chambers, 2005; Hartley, Harkavy, Benson, 2005; Mercer & Brungardt, 2007; O'Meara & Niehaus, 2009).

There are approximately 1,100 two- and four-year Campus Compact institutions and 95 percent of them offer service-learning courses (Campus Compact, 2013). Campus Compact holds annual institutes where service-learning groups comprised of administrators, faculty members, and staff members develop campus plans for implementing service-learning. There is evidence service-learning practitioners who attend a Campus Compact planning institute are more likely to institutionalize service-learning at their institution than constituencies that do not attend a Campus Compact planning institute (Bringle & Hatcher, 2000). Most Campus Compact institutions, 96 percent, have at least one institutionalized community or civic engagement office and more than 60 percent have more than one office (Campus Compact, 2013). Campus Compact institutions provide faculty members a great deal of service-learning support (Banerjee & Hausafus, 2007; Saltmarsh, Zlotkowski, & Hollander, 2002). More specifically, 79 percent of Campus Compact institutions offer faculty development/workshops, 76 percent present faculty with curricular models and sample syllabi, 75 percent supply faculty with reflection and assessment materials, and 68 percent reward faculty for service-learning and community-based research (Campus Compact, 2013). Campus Compact’s resources and service-learning advocacy
attract faculty members to service-learning pedagogy, help student affairs educators collaborate with faculty, and assist institutional representatives seeking to institutionalize service-learning (Prins, 2002; Torres, Sinton, White, & Berg, 2000; Watson, 2004).

**North Carolina Campus Compact and South Carolina Campus Compact History.**

North Carolina Campus Volunteers (NCCV), an alliance of students and staff founded in 1993 to unify campus volunteerism across North Carolina, merged with NCCC when NCCC was founded in 2002. Headquartered on Elon University’s campus, NCCC is a coalition of 36 colleges that brings together a diverse collection of North Carolina colleges and universities around a common commitment to higher education’s civic purposes; serves as an ally for civic engagement, public service and campus-community partnerships; and helps sustain the momentum for higher education’s public service role in North Carolina (North Carolina Campus Compact, n. d.).

South Carolina Campus Compact (SCCC) was founded in 2008 and is headquartered on Winthrop University’s campus. It is a coalition of 17 South Carolina colleges and universities that provides, promotes, evaluates, and sustains civic engagement, service-learning, and community service initiatives that provide college students in South Carolina with the skills needed to be engaged citizens (South Carolina Campus Compact, n. d.). Although the SCCC’s primary goal is to help college students in South Carolina to become active citizens, the organization also seeks to build the capacity of SCCC member institutions to work collaboratively with their local communities, support faculty and staff who seek to incorporate civic engagement into their teaching and research, and promote opportunities for college students to engage in service-learning, community-service, and civic-engagement activities that address areas of need in the state of South Carolina (South Carolina Campus Compact, n. d.).
Assessment of Institutionalization

Researchers have given considerable attention to assessing service-learning institutionalization and the institutionalization of other types of civic and community engagement (Holland, 1997; Furco, 2006; Furco & Muller, 2009). The literature on service-learning institutionalization and the institutionalization of other types of civic and community engagement is influenced, in part, by researchers recognizing community engagement requires change to organizational structures and values in order to ensure success (Holland, 2009; Jeandron & Robinson, 2010). Andrew Furco’s Self-Assessment Rubric for the Institutionalization of Service-Learning in Higher Education (Furco, 2006) and Campus Compact’s Service-Learning Pyramid (Campus Compact, 2002) are service-learning assessment tools cited extensively in the service-learning literature (Chadwick & Pawlowski, 2007; Hartley, Harkavy, & Benson, 2005; Holland, 2009; Jeandron & Robinson, 2010; Prins, 2002). These two tools are meant to help service-learning practitioners, faculty members, and administrators develop intentional plans for institutionalizing engagement based on an examination of engagement goals, organizational actions, community context, and institutional history (Gelmon, Sherman, Gaudet, Mitchell, & Trotter, 2004; Holland, 2009).

Furco Rubric

Andrew Furco created the Self-Assessment Rubric for the Institutionalization of Service-Learning in Higher Education to help service-learning practitioners, faculty members, administrators, and other engaged scholars assess their campus’s institutionalization efforts (Furco, 2006; Gelmon, Sherman, Gaudet, Mitchell, & Trotter, 2004). The Rubric is beneficial because it concisely outlines the step-by-step increments that may be taken to institutionalize service-learning (Butin, 2010; Jeandron & Robinson, 2010). It was first published in 1998 and
was subsequently revised in 1999, 2002, 2003, and 2006 (Furco, 2006; Furco, Muller, & Ammon, 1998). Since its original publication, the Rubric has been used at more than 200 institutions in the United States and abroad (Furco, 2006; Chadwick & Pawlowski, 2007).

The Furco Rubric is divided into five dimensions: philosophy and mission of service-learning, faculty support for and involvement in service-learning, student support for and involvement in service-learning, community participation and partnerships, and institutional support for service-learning (Furco, 2006). Each dimension in the Rubric is comprised of several components that describe the dimension. The philosophy and mission of service-learning dimension includes four components: definition of service-learning, strategic planning, alignment with institutional mission, and alignment with educational reform efforts. The faculty support for and involvement in service-learning dimension is also comprised of four components: faculty awareness, faculty involvement and support, faculty leadership, and faculty incentives and rewards. The third dimension, student support for and involvement in service-learning, has four components as well: student awareness, student opportunities, student leadership, and student incentives and rewards. The community participation and partnerships dimension consists of three components: community partner awareness, mutual understanding, and community agency leadership and voice. The fifth dimension, institutional support for service-learning, includes seven components: coordinating entity, departmental support, policy-making entity, staffing, funding, administrative support, and evaluation and assessment. Each component can take years to fully develop (Furco, 2006). The Furco Rubric is located in Appendix C.

The aforementioned components develop on a continuum with three stages: Critical Mass Building, Quality Building, and Sustained Institutionalization (Furco, 2006). During the Critical
Mass Building stage, service-learning begins to gain recognition and on-campus professionals start to build campus-wide support for service-learning. The second stage is Quality Building. At this stage, those charged with planning and implementing service-learning efforts are more focused on ensuring the development of quality service-learning activities than the quantity of service-learning activities. In the third stage, Sustained Institutionalization, service-learning is completely institutionalized. There is evidence it takes five to seven years for an institution to advance from one institutionalization stage to the next (Bell, Furco, Ammon, Muller, Sorgen, 2000). Progression from stage one to stage three on the continuum suggests an institution is moving closer to the full institutionalization of service-learning (Furco, 2006).

**Campus Compact Service-Learning Pyramid**

In the late 1990s, service-learning practitioners at many colleges and universities sought guidance and expertise as they dealt with the difficult issues associated with service-learning institutionalization (Campus Compact, 1999). Although there were a small number of colleges whose missions were inextricably tied to their civic engagement efforts, most institutions were in the embryonic stages of adopting service-learning pedagogy or in the early stages of service-learning institutionalization. In response to the demand for service-learning institutionalization resources, Campus Compact officials developed the Service-Learning Pyramid (Campus, Compact, 1999).

The initial Service-Learning Pyramid consisted of three levels: introductory, intermediate, and advanced (Campus Compact, 1999). The introductory level is at the bottom of the Pyramid. Colleges at the introductory level typically do not have a designated service-learning contact person or campus policies to support faculty teaching service-learning courses on an ad hoc basis. The intermediate level is in the middle of the Pyramid. Institutions at this
level are typically characterized by the presence of a community service center and/or a service-learning center, a network of community members, communication among service-learning practitioners, and enough service-learning courses in various disciplines for service-learning to be thought of as a mainstream practice.

In 2002, an advanced intermediate level was added to the Service-Learning Pyramid (Campus Compact, 2002). The Pyramid was revised because an increasing number of institutions had transitioned to the intermediate and advanced level (Campus Compact, 2002). An institution at the advanced intermediate level has, among other things, a president that supports service-learning, an increasing number of faculty members involved in engaged scholarship, and service-learning courses with learning outcomes that are aligned with their institutional mission. The top of the Pyramid is reserved for colleges at the advanced level. Colleges at the advanced level have a substantial number of service-learning courses, abundant support from upper-level administrators, a tenure and promotion process that rewards service-learning and community engagement, and sophisticated community involvement. The Service-Learning Pyramid further demonstrates Campus Compact’s ongoing advocacy for service-learning institutionalization and service-learning as pedagogy and practice. The Service-Learning Pyramid is located in Appendix D.

**Synthesis of Assessment Practices**

Colleges and universities institutionalize and place service-learning programs in a number of divisions within their organizational structures. Some institutions have comprehensive service-learning offices led by faculty members, other institutions have service-learning offices housed organizationally in student affairs, and some service-learning offices have dual-reporting relationships with student and academic affairs (Rue, 1996; Vogelgesang,
Although the Furco Rubric (Furco, 2006) and the Campus Compact Pyramid (Campus Compact, 2002) differ in their descriptions of what is needed for institutionalization, these assessment tools have a number of similarities. More specifically, these assessment tools provide evidence service-learning institutionalization occurs at institutions where five intrinsically tied entities are present: an institutional mission statement that emphasizes the importance of community and civic engagement, upper-level administrative support, faculty member involvement and backing, institutional funding, and a centralized on-campus office.

**Institutional Mission Statements**

The explicit articulation of service in an institution’s mission statement is critical to institutionalization (Casey & Springer, 2006; Nicotera, Cutforth, Fretz, & Summers, 2011). A clear and compelling mission statement clarifies an institution’s priorities. Community and civic engagement typically resonates at institutions where practitioners, faculty members, and administrators can clearly express their respective institutional mission and address competing institutional visions (Holland, 2005). Many colleges were established with a civic mission and, over time, have developed multiple missions while deemphasizing their civic focus (Boyer, 1990; Checkoway, 2013; Saltmarsh, Zlotkowski, & Hollander, 2002).

Increasingly, colleges and universities have reconnected with their historical missions by developing institutional mission statements that reflect institutional commitments to creating a community of scholarship dedicated to community building, neighborhood resource development, and benefiting society as a whole (Burke, 2007; Henderson, Fair, Sather, & Dewey, 2008; Saltmarsh, Zlotkowski, & Hollander, 2002; Verducci & Pope, 2001; Vogelgesang, 2004). Integrating community and civic engagement into an institutional mission statement involves expanding campus-wide participation and altering institutional structures, policies, and
culture to reflect an institution’s engagement standards (Brukardt, Holland, Percy, & Zimpher, 2004). Since service-learning and other types of community and civic engagement are essential to the historic goals of higher education, engagement can be a way for colleges to strengthen their mission statements among competing demands for traditional research and teaching methods (Brukardt, Holland, Percy, & Zimpher, 2004; Pollack, 1999).

Institutional mission statements vary according to institutional type and are informed by the unique history and needs of the institutions where they were created (Brukardt, Holland, Percy, & Zimpher, 2004; Nicotera, Cutforth, Fretz, & Summers, 2011; O'Meara & Niehaus, 2009; Pollack, 1999; Sponsler & Hartley, 2013). At some institutions, community engagement is used to advance faith-based missions and at others it improves town-gown relations and develops an ethic of service among students (Furco & Miller, 2009). A minority serving institution has a rationale for engagement that differs significantly from that of a land-grant university, which differs again from that of an urban private university. The mission of a rural private liberal arts college or a rural community college will look different from that of a research-intensive university (Beatty, 2010; Brukardt, Holland, Percy, & Zimpher, 2004).

Colleges and universities without a research-extensive mission are more likely to develop service-learning activities and initiatives that become meaningful aspects of faculty work, student life, and external partnerships than service-learning efforts at other institutional types (Bringle & Hatcher, 2000; Holland, 2005). While individual teachers deploy service-learning in a variety of ways and may reflect different values, colleges as an aggregate employ mission-driven service-learning efforts.
Upper-Level Administrative Support

Presidents, chancellors, chief student affairs officers, provosts, and other upper-level administrators at colleges and universities face conflicting messages from elected officials, alumni, parents, students, and donors about the purpose and mission of higher education. Many internal and external higher education constituencies believe institutionally-sanctioned service is superfluous and that colleges should be focused on their learning and research missions (Brukardt, Holland, Percy, & Zimpher, 2004; Furco, 2010; Watson, 2004). There are also community leaders that expect upper-level administrators to show they value community and civic engagement by incorporating engagement into their institution’s culture and infrastructure (Leiderman, Furco, Zapf, & Goss, 2002). The service-learning literature is replete with evidence that upper-level administrative support for community and civic engagement is needed to fully institutionalize service-learning (Bringle & Hatcher, 2000; Buchanan, 1998; Henderson, Fair, Sather, & Dewey, 2008; Kronick, Dahlin-Brown, & Luter, 2011; Vogel, Seifer, & Gelmon, 2010; Welch, 2010).

Upper-level administrators have the ability to bring legitimacy to service-learning, to include service initiatives in institutional strategic plans, and to further institutionalize community and civic engagement’s role in advancing research, teaching, and service activities (Eckardt & Eisman, 2006; Furco, 2010; Sandmann & Plater, 2009). Few campus-wide initiatives have the power to positively impact an institution as thoroughly as service-learning and civic engagement initiatives (Clayton & O’Steen, 2010). Understanding the importance upper-level administrative support plays in institutionalization, Campus Compact created a policy that requires the president of each of its member institutions to actively support service-
learning through financial support, attendance at Campus Compact meetings, and the recruitment of other college presidents to join Campus Compact (Hinck & Brandell, 2000).

At some colleges, service-learning institutionalization begins with executive leadership (top-down) and at others in begins with faculty-driven initiatives (bottom-up) (Gelmon, Holland, Driscoll, Spring, & Kerrigan, 2001). Although faculty support for service-learning is essential, the sustained commitment of service-learning may not be feasible without commitment from upper-level administrators (Gelmon, Sherman, Gaudet, Mitchell, & Trotter, 2004; Holland, 2009; Sponsler & Hartley, 2013). In order to catalyze service-learning institutionalization, upper-level administrators must have a clear understanding of service activities, identify service as an essential component of the university mission statement, and create policies that encourage faculty members to link service to teaching and research (Casey & Springer, 2006; Doberneck, Glass, & Schweitzer, 2010; Forbes, Wasburn, Crispo, & Vandeveer, 2008; Ward, 2005). Service-learning institutionalization efforts can also benefit from enthusiastic upper-level administrators, and at some colleges trustees, who are committed to raising funds to support civic engagement and using their positional power to foster it (Holland, 2009; Saltmarsh, Zlotkowski, & Hollander, 2002; Vogelgesang, 2004).

**Faculty Involvement**

At many institutions of higher education, the initial stages of service-learning are led by faculty champions and supported by civic-minded students and community partners (Sandmann & Plater, 2009). These faculty service-learning enclaves are a collection of individual faculty members who conduct service-learning with little to no institutional support (Hartley, Harkavy, & Benson, 2005; Singleton, Burack, & Hirsch, 1997). Service-learning’s spread in higher education has primarily been spearheaded by individual faculty members who embraced service-
learning as an effective strategy to teach the traditional knowledge of their discipline (Pollack, 2013). In an effort to move service-learning from the margins of a college or university to its core through institutionalization, the faculty members in service-learning enclaves had to link service-learning to their respective institutional mission and garner support from students, additional faculty members, and upper-level administrators (Holland 2009). It took a considerable amount of time for faculty members in the first service-learning enclaves to find each other, conceptualize their work, and start the process of institutionalizing service-learning as pedagogy and as a field (Buchanan, 1998; Stanton, Giles, & Cruz, 1999).

Today, service-learning is employed by a growing number of faculty members across a wide range of academic disciplines (Butin, 2010; Exley, 2004; Henderson, Fair, Sather, & Dewey, 2008). Faculty involvement in service-learning is essential because service-learning is usually course-driven (Bringle & Hatcher, 1996). Service-learning’s success at institutions of higher education is largely dependent on how well it is institutionalized and how faculty members adopt and implement it (Fitzgerald, Bruns, Sonka, Furco, & Swanson, 2012; Forbes, Wasburn, Crispo, & Vandeveer, 2008; Verducci & Pope, 2001). Unfortunately, many faculty members lack the training and expertise needed to establish and sustain relationships with community members or to work with students outside of a traditional classroom setting (Beere, Votruba, & Wells, 2011; Cushman, 2002). Therefore, many upper-level administrators and service-learning practitioners focus on persuading faculty to teach service-learning courses and providing them with the logistical and pedagogical support needed to add a service-learning component to a course (Banerjee & Hausafus, 2007).

Contemporary community engagement practices have prompted many upper-level administrators and faculty members to rethink their faculty reward structures and tenure and
Faculty responsibilities are generally divided into three categories: teaching, research, and service. The present reward structure at many institutions emphasizes the use of research and teaching as a means for faculty members to focus on and address problems and initiatives defined by their departments (Checkoway, 2013). The loosely defined service category typically has at least two meanings: internal service to the institution and discipline and external service to the community, the public and private sectors, and society in general (Rue, 1996; Ward, 2005). A college’s reward structure plays an important role in determining how faculty members decide to allocate their time among teaching, research, and service (Fitzgerald, Bruns, Sonka, Furco, & Swanson, 2012; Forbes, Wasburn, Crispo, & Vandeveer, 2008). Many faculty members perceive service-learning as a time-intensive and unquantifiable pedagogy with little academic value. These perceptions are regularly reinforced by promotion and tenure committees, professional peers, and journal editors who view faculty involvement in service as nonessential (Checkoway, 2013).

Faculty members devote time to scholarly activities supported by the institutional environment under which they were hired and usually resist changes that do not mesh with their institution’s mission (Forbes, Wasburn, Crispo, & Vandeveer, 2008). Institutional support for service-learning can include statements of support in promotion and tenure guidelines and faculty handbooks that clearly explain what service-learning is and how it will be rewarded (Hinck & Brandell, 2000; Ward, 2005). There is evidence tenure and promotion committee members create their own standards of what is acceptable scholarship outside of the written policies (Schnaubelt & Statham, 2007). If service-learning is rewarded in a department’s written tenure and promotion guidelines, academic deans and department chairs must work to ensure
tenure and promotion committee members follow the written policies. If service-learning and other community-based work is not addressed in written tenure and promotion policies and explicitly rewarded, there will probably be minimal faculty member involvement and a very small likelihood service-learning will be institutionalized (Lowery et al, 2006; Saltmarsh, Zlotkowski, & Hollander, 2002).

**Institutional Funding**

Service-learning institutionalization stems from an institutional mission-driven and campus-wide commitment to service that transcends various changes in academic and administrative leadership (Gelmon, Sherman, Gaudet, Mitchell, & Trotter, 2004). The commitment of permanent financial resources to service-learning provides evidence an institution views service-learning as a core component of its academic work (Leiderman, Furco, Zapf, & Goss, 2002; Welch & Saltmarsh, 2013). Colleges and universities that allocate institutional funds to service-learning show greater institutionalization than institutions that support service-learning through non-institutional funds (Bringle & Hatcher, 2000). At many institutions, upper-level administrators provide faculty members and service-learning practitioners with soft or temporary funding in the form of grants, gifts, or contracts provided by external agencies to introduce service-learning into a curriculum (Buchanon, 1998; Rubin 1996; Young, Shinnar, Ackerman, Carruthers, & Young, 2007). Soft funds can assist with the initial establishment of a service-learning program, but soft funding alone will not provide the resources needed to institutionalize service-learning (Forbes, Wasburn, Crispo, & Vandeveer, 2008; Young, Shinnar, Ackerman, Carruthers, & Young, 2007). Service-learning begins to move towards institutionalization when an institution dedicates hard or permanent funding to its sustained implementation. Hard funding is controlled by an institution of higher education and is
derived from state funds, tuition and fees, and certain income from endowments (Young, Shinnar, Ackerman, Carruthers, & Young, 2007). Institutionalized community engagement center directors cited permanent institutional funds as the most essential component for the sustained success of community engagement center operations (Welch & Saltmarsh, 2013).

Centralized Office

The presence of an institutionally-funded centralized service-learning office shows an institutional commitment to institutionalizing service-learning and promoting its academic credibility (Beatty, 2010; Bringle & Hatcher, 2000; Eckardt & Eisman, 2006; Sandmann & Plater, 2009; Stater & Fotheringham, 2009). The number of institutionally-funded centralized service-learning offices providing pedagogical, programmatic, and research support for community partnerships has gradually increased at institutions of higher education (Holland & Langesh, 2010; Nicotera, Cutforth, Fretz, & Summers, 2011). Almost all Campus Compact member institutions, 96 percent, have at least one on-campus center devoted to community and civic engagement and more than 60 percent have more than one on-campus center (Campus Compact, 2013). Practitioners in many centralized offices seek to obtain the Carnegie Engaged Classification, which is a prestigious elective designation presented on a five-year cycle to institutions with a documented commitment to community engagement (New England Resource Center for Higher Education, n. d.). In a study designed, in part, to provide an overview of campus community engagement center infrastructures, researchers found 90.9 percent of institutions with the Carnegie Engaged Classification currently have a centralized community engagement office or that one is in process of being established (Welch & Saltmarsh, 2013). In addition to advancing service-learning, many centralized offices are also responsible for
community service, volunteerism, and other types of community and civic engagement (Beere, Votruba, & Wells, 2011; Ikeda, Sandy, Donahue, 2010; Torres, Sinton, White, & Berg, 2000).

The service-learning practitioners and faculty members serving in centralized offices are charged with serving their campus communities in a number of ways (Beere, Votruba, & Wells, 2011). At some institutions, centralized offices are primarily focused faculty development and support (Clayton & O’Steen, 2010). Faculty development and support may include assisting with course design, gathering syllabi and other relevant resources, and planning faculty development workshops (Bringle & Hatcher, 1996; Vogel, Seifer, & Gelmon, 2010; Welch & Saltmarsh, 2013; Young, Shinnar, Ackerman, Carruthers, & Young, 2007). There are also centralized offices that focus primarily on technical assistance, logistical support, and placing students in the community while offering little support to faculty developing courses (Bringle & Hatcher, 2000; Clayton & O’Steen, 2010). Since service-learning is perceived as being time-consuming and labor-intensive by many faculty members, service-learning practitioners in some centralized offices help facilitate the faculty members’ work and reduce the administrative burden associated with service-learning efforts (Beere, Votruba, & Wells, 2011). Service-learning practitioners in centralized centers who dedicate time and resources to handling the administrative aspects of service-learning help faculty members focus on teaching, and prevent faculty members from becoming overwhelmed by additional service-related responsibilities (Vogel, Seifer, & Gelmon, 2010). The staff working in a centralized office plays a pivotal role in its success (Eckardt & Eisman, 2006; Welch & Saltmarsh, 2013). When service-learning is institutionalized, centralized offices have enough qualified staff members to handle the scope and scale of their respective service-learning efforts (Leiderman, Furco, Zapf, & Goss, 2002).
Hard institutional funding is typically used to support the office staff, but the level of staffing varies (Welch & Saltmarsh, 2013).

**Conclusion**

Service-learning is a multi-faceted practice and pedagogy with a number of definitions and practices. When employed correctly, service-learning enhances student learning, helps students actively reflect on their service-learning experiences, helps institutions of higher education develop mutually beneficial relationships with community organizations, and creates a culture where community members’ opinions are consistently valued. Institutionalizing service-learning requires an institutional mission that values community and civic engagement, permanent institutional funding, a centralized office, and strong support from upper-level administrators, faculty members, students, and members of the community. Although housing a centralized office organizationally in academic affairs is cited consistently in the service-learning literature as the best structure for institutionalization, there is evidence service-learning can be successfully institutionalized in student affairs. The institutionalization of service-learning in a student affairs division may be an alternative upper-level administrators and faculty members never considered. In effort to provide evidence institutionalizing service-learning in student affairs is a viable option, student affairs educators must contribute to the service-learning literature and the field as a whole by sharing their service-learning definitions, learning outcomes, approaches, and practices.
CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

This chapter presents the methodology used for exploring how and why service-learning is institutionalized in student affairs divisions at some Campus Compact institutions. A description of the participants, data collection procedures, and data analysis procedures are included in this chapter.

Statement of Purpose

The purpose of this study was to explore how institutionalized student affairs service-learning offices define service-learning; the process upper-level administrators, student affairs educators, and faculty members go through to institutionalize service-learning in student affairs divisions; and the faculty development practices employed by student affairs educators in student affairs divisions.

Research Questions

This study addressed three research questions:

- How do student affairs educators at Campus Compact institutions where service-learning is institutionalized in student affairs define service-learning?
- What process do upper-level administrators, student affairs educators, and faculty members at Campus Compact institutions go through to institutionalize service-learning in student affairs?
• What faculty development practices are employed by student affairs educators at Campus Compact institutions where service-learning is institutionalized in student affairs to support faculty members teaching service-learning courses?

Research Approach and Design

A qualitative multiple case study methodology was used in this study. Qualitative methods, which are commonly used in case study research, seek to understand social action at a greater depth and attempt to explore a host of factors that may be influencing a situation (Feagin, Orum, & Sjoberg, 1991; Gillham, 2000). A case study is “an empirical inquiry that investigates a contemporary phenomenon in depth and within its real-life context, especially when the boundaries between phenomenon and context are not clearly evident” (Yin, 2009, p. 18). A case is normally a person, an organization, a behavioral condition, an event, or another social phenomenon that serves as the main unit of analysis in a case study (Yin, 2012). In this study, the student affairs office that organizationally housed institutionalized service-learning at each institution was a case. Case study research permits researchers to gather information from a number of sources over a period of time in order to produce a more holistic study of complex social networks, social actions, and social meanings (Hancock & Algozzine, 2006; Feagin, Orum, & Sjoberg, 1991).

Case study research is not intended to be generalizable since determining the uniqueness of a case is its primary purpose (Hays, 2004). Nevertheless, case study research can yield generalizable findings when the research is based on multiple case studies of the same phenomenon (Hays, 2004). This study did not seek to prove service-learning should be exclusively institutionalized in student affairs. The goal was to provide evidence student affairs can be the most appropriate organizational home for institutionalized service-learning. Multiple
case studies or collective case studies are empirical studies containing two or more cases (Yin, 2012). Multiple case studies are considered stronger than single case studies because multiple case studies provide a broader array of evidence than do single cases and allow the researcher to cover either the same issues more intensely or a wider range of issues (Johnson & Christensen, 2004; Yin, 2012, Yin 2014). Therefore, a multiple case study approach was conducted to address the research questions.

**Sample Selection**

The administrators and faculty members who participated in this study were employees at North Carolina Campus Compact (NCCC) and South Carolina Campus Compact (SCCC) member institutions. NCCC and SCCC are state affiliates of a national organization known as Campus Compact. Campus Compact is the only national higher education association exclusively dedicated to campus-based civic engagement and is partly responsible for the growth of service-learning at colleges and universities (Beatty, 2010; Campus Compact, 2013; Hatcher & Erasmus, 2008; Pollack, 2013). As state affiliates of the national Campus Compact, NCCC and SCCC member institutions observe the national organization’s mission and vision while simultaneously supporting the mission of their respective institutions. Campus Compact member institutions are ideal for researching service-learning institutionalization because all Campus Compact colleges have committed to institutionalizing service-learning, civic engagement, and/or community engagement.

Participants in this study were selected using purposeful and snowball sampling (Berg, 2007). There are eight NCCC member institutions and four SCCC institutions that organizationally house institutionalized service-learning exclusively or partially in student affairs. Fifty percent of the aforementioned institutions are represented in this research. More
specifically, this study included 13 total participants from three NCCC institutions and three SCCC institutions. In an effort to ensure anonymity, each institution represented in this study was given a pseudonym and its institutional type was not disclosed. A total of six pseudonyms were assigned: Alpha College, Bravo College, Charlie University, Delta University, Echo University, and Foxtrot University. The institutional type of each college represented in this study was excluded in attempt to maintain each college’s anonymity. Each participant’s anonymity was maintained by the use of a pseudonym. This study includes 13 participant pseudonyms: Alpha College Administrator, Alpha College Faculty Member, Bravo College Administrator, Bravo College Faculty Member, Charlie University Administrator I, Charlie University Administrator II, Charlie University Faculty Member, Delta University Administrator, Delta University Faculty Member, Echo University Administrator, Echo University Faculty Member, Foxtrot University Administrator, and Foxtrot University Faculty Member. Additionally, I maintained the anonymity of each document by not citing the Uniform Resource Locator (URL) where each document was found.

At five of the six institutions described in this study, an administrator and a faculty member were interviewed. Two administrator interviews were needed at Charlie University to fully address the interview questions. Through purposeful sampling, I selected and interviewed administrators who were directors or assistant directors of offices at NCCC or SCCC institutions where service-learning was institutionalized. Six of the seven administrator interviewees were identified on the NCCC website or the SCCC website as their respective institution’s Campus Compact representative. One of the administrators at Charlie University was identified on the Charlie University website since that administrator was not listed as an institutional Campus Compact representative.
Each director of an office at an NCCC or SCCC institution where service-learning was institutionalized in student affairs was contacted by e-mail. The e-mail explained the purpose of this study, requested an interview, and requested a referral to a faculty member who had taught a service-learning course at their respective institutions. The e-mail also explained the referred faculty member must be willing to be interviewed as well. Two directors responded to the initial call for participation via e-mail and agreed to participate in this study. Two weeks later, a follow-up e-mail was sent to the directors who did not respond to the original e-mail. Three directors and one assistant director responded to the follow-up e-mail and agreed to participate in this study.

Six faculty members participated in this study. The Alpha College administrator was not able to identify a faculty member willing to be interviewed for this study. As a result, I searched the Alpha College website for the names and e-mail addresses of faculty members who taught service-learning classes. My search yielded the names and e-mail addresses of three faculty members. I sent all three faculty members an e-mail that explained the purpose of this study and requested an interview. Two of the three Alpha College faculty members I contacted agreed to participate in this study. One of the Alpha College faculty members who responded had only taught three service-learning courses in 10 years. Therefore, I selected the other faculty member to participate in this study since that faculty member had more experience teaching service-learning courses.

Each administrator at Bravo College, Charlie University, and Echo University gave me a name and an e-mail address of a faculty member at their respective institution. I sent the faculty members identified by the administrators an e-mail that explained the purpose of the study and requested an interview. All three faculty members responded by e-mail and agreed to participate
in this study. Instead of giving me a faculty member’s contact information, the Delta University administrator arranged for me to interview the Delta University faculty member in-person on the Delta University campus after I conducted an interview with the Delta University administrator. The Foxtrot University administrator referred me to Foxtrot University’s service-learning website to find faculty members to participate in this study. I identified a faculty member on Foxtrot University’s service-learning website and sent the faculty member an e-mail that explained the purpose of this study and requested an interview. The Foxtrot University faculty member agreed via e-mail to participate in this study.

Data Collection

The data for this study were gathered through document analysis and semi-structured interviews. Document analysis is a “systematic procedure for reviewing or evaluating documents, both printed and electronic material” (Bowen, 2009, p. 27). Document analyses and interviews are two of the most commonly used data collection methods in case study research (Yin, 2009). The importance of documents was highlighted by Prior (2003) who wrote “a university (any university) is in its documents rather than its buildings. The charter together with other documents names the university, provides warrant to award degrees, and legitimizes the officers of the university and so on” (p. 60). Case study findings or conclusions are usually more convincing and accurate if they are based on several different data sources (Hays, 2004; Yin, 2012). Therefore, two data collection methods were used in this multiple case study to increase the study’s construct validity. When used separately or together, documents provide information that may corroborate and supplement data collected through interviews (Mason, 2002; Yin 2009). The documents analyzed in this study, including the interview transcripts, were saved in a password-protected electronic folder.
Prior to conducting interviews, I searched each participating institution’s website for documents related to service-learning. During the search, I looked for organizational charts, strategic plans, mission statements, service-learning resources, service-learning course listings, faculty-focused service-learning materials, memoranda, and other documents related to service-learning institutionalization. The documents collected during the website search at each institution varied, but all the documents were chosen based on their relevance to the research questions. Foxtrot University’s strategic plan, for example, was found on the institution’s website. Foxtrot University’s strategic plan specifically mentions the expansion of service-learning opportunities as one of the institution’s objectives. Moreover, my Charlie University website search yielded a charge for the institution’s service-learning committee. This committee makes recommendations to the college’s faculty senate regarding proposed changes in the school’s service-learning requirements and the college’s service-learning designation for individual courses. At the conclusion of each interview, I searched website of each interviewee’s institution for documents the interviewee mentioned during the interview that were not captured during the initial website search. Administrators at Bravo College, Charlie University, and Delta University handed me physical documents that were identical to electronic documents I gathered during my initial document search. The documents identified during the website reviews coupled with the documents obtained after the interviews were conducted were used to corroborate and expand on the interviewees’ answers.

Interviews are an essential source of case study evidence because well-informed interviewees can provide vital insights, which may help the researcher identity other relevant sources of evidence (Yin, 2014). I used a digital audio recorder to record 13 semi-structured interviews: seven administrator interviews and six faculty member interviews. I conducted semi-
structured interviews because semi-structured interviews give a researcher the opportunity to ask predetermined but flexibly worded questions and probe more deeply into interviewees’ responses (Hancock & Algozzine, 2006; Gillham, 2000). Additionally, semi-structured interviews give interviewees opportunities to express themselves openly and to define the world from their own perspectives. The seven administrators selected to participate in this study were chosen because, as leaders of their respective offices, they were the most qualified to address the research questions. Six of the seven administrators were interviewed in-person at their respective institutions and the remaining administrator was interviewed over the phone. The six faculty members who participated in this study were selected because they taught service-learning courses and collaborated with service-learning administrators at their respective institutions on service-learning tasks. Five of the six faculty members were interviewed over the phone and the remaining faculty member was interviewed in-person on that faculty member’s campus. The administrator interviews and the faculty interviews were conducted over the same two-month span.

The questions and inquisitive statements presented to the administrators who participated in this study are listed in Appendix A. The questions and inquisitive statements presented to the faculty members who participated in this study are located in Appendix B. The interview questions were informed by the research questions and designed to explore the participants’ perspectives on service-learning institutionalization in student affairs.

**Data Analysis**

I approached data analysis with a social constructivist philosophical worldview. The social constructivist worldview is focused on the collective generation of meaning among people and suggests reality is created through processes of social exchange (Au, 1998). Moreover,
social constructivism places an emphasis on the inter-subjectivity established through group interactions (Au, 1998). Since a multiple-case study design was being used, I analyzed each case study’s data individually, conducted a cross-case analysis, and then identified patterns that emerged from the documents and the interviews (Huberman & Miles, 2002). Within-case/individual case analysis allows a researcher to become intimately familiar with each case and allows each case’s patterns to emerge before the researcher can generalize patterns across cases (Huberman & Miles, 2002). In each within-case analysis, I read each interview transcript three times, identified the interviewee responses that addressed the research questions, and used the Furco Self-Assessment Rubric for the Institutionalization of Service-Learning in Higher Education (Furco, 2006) and the Campus Compact Service-Learning Pyramid (Campus Compact, 2002) to identify each participating institution’s commitment to institutionalized service-learning. I also read each document three times and used the Furco Rubric and the Campus Compact Pyramid to assess each participating institution’s commitment to institutionalized service-learning. The Furco Rubric’s philosophy and mission of service-learning dimension, faculty support and involvement in service-learning dimension, and institutional support for service-learning dimension were used to analyze the data. The Rubric’s student support and involvement dimension as well as the community participation and partnerships dimension were excluded from the analysis because I did not interview any students or community agency representatives. The Campus Compact Pyramid was created to help college and university administrators develop the necessary administrative support for institutionalizing service-learning and developing effective campus-community partnerships. The Furco Rubric and the Campus Compact Pyramid were appropriate data analysis tools for this
study because they are designed to exclusively assess service-learning institutionalization. The Furco Rubric is located in Appendix C and the Campus Compact Pyramid is in Appendix D.

A cross-case analysis was conducted after the within-case analysis in each individual case study. Cross-case analyses help a researcher look at the data in divergent ways and move beyond initial impressions of the data (Huberman & Miles, 2002). During the cross-case analysis, I identified the similarities and differences among the participating institutions’ interviewee responses to the same interview questions. Additionally, I noted the similarities and differences between among the documents at each participating institution. Descriptive coding and evaluative coding were used to analyze the documents and interview transcripts. Two sources of evidence were used to triangulate this study’s findings: documents and semi-structured interviews. Triangulation involves the use of multiple data gathering techniques to investigate the same phenomenon (Berg, 2007). The use of documents and semi-structured interviews helped me answer the research questions in different ways, corroborate one source or method with another, and explore different parts of the service-learning institutionalization process (Mason, 2002). I also utilized member checks to help ensure the accuracy and credibility of each interview transcript (Taylor & Bogdan, 1998). When member checking, I provided each administrator and faculty member participating in this study with the opportunity to review her or his interview transcript. None of the interviewees requested an interview transcript revision.

As I analyzed each document, I attempted to get an understanding of each institution’s espoused commitment to the service-learning. Each document’s author, meaning, publication date, purpose, and relevance to the research questions were considered during the analysis. When analyzing the interview transcripts, I remained cognizant of the political realities
associated with this research. Administrators and faculty members may feel uncomfortable being critical of their institution’s service-learning efforts. Presidents elect to join Campus Compact and delegate the responsibility of meeting the Compact standards to other institutional representatives. Though unstated, there may be a participant in this study who is not as invested in service-learning or the institutionalization of service-learning in student affairs as the president of the participant’s institution. This incongruence could lead a participant to be less forthright when answering questions during her or his interview. I attempted to minimize participant discomfort by asking questions that were less likely to put each participant in an uncomfortable position. For example, I was told by a participant that the service-learning institutionalization process at the participant’s institution was immensely political and involved several staffing changes. The participant provided a detailed account of the highly contentious institutionalization process and I refrained from asking any follow-up questions I felt would make the participant uncomfortable.

The first research question was addressed during the interviews by asking each administrator how the participant’s office defined service-learning. For each institution, I compared the service-learning definitions provided during each administrator interview with the service-learning definition or definitions found on each participating college’s website and institutional documents. The second and third research questions were addressed during the interviews by asking all the participants a series of questions about the service-learning institutionalization process and the institution’s faculty development practices. I used the Furco Self-Assessment Rubric for the Institutionalization of Service-Learning in Higher Education (Furco, 2006) and the Campus Compact Service-Learning Pyramid (Campus Compact, 2002) to help address the research questions and to gauge where each participating institution is located.
on these community engagement institutionalization spectrums. I explored the presence of service-learning institutionalization indicators - an institutional mission that values community and civic engagement, permanent institutional funding, a centralized office, and strong support from upper-level administrators, faculty members, students, and members of the community – at each participating institution. Institutional type was not considered during the data analysis. Using the research questions as a guide, I remained open-minded while collecting documents and deferred analysis until all the data were gathered (Gillham, 2000).

**Conclusion**

The depth and breadth of the responses provided by the participants exceeded my expectations and successfully addressed this study’s research questions. The documents I gathered complemented the interview responses and provided me with historical and philosophical insight into how service-learning was institutionalized. Fifty percent of the NCCC and SCCC member institutions that organizationally house service-learning exclusively or partially in student affairs are represented in this study. I believe the data found in this multiple case study strengthens the argument that service-learning should be considered as the organizational home for institutionalized service-learning.
CHAPTER 4
FINDINGS AND ANALYSIS

The findings presented in this chapter answer the three research questions that guided this collective case study. Each of the thirteen participants and six institutions identified in the findings were given a pseudonym to maintain anonymity. Table 1 provides a description of each institution represented in this study and includes the inaugural year each institution began its service-learning institutionalization process. The institutional types and undergraduate enrollment figures were not considered when I analyzed the findings. This chapter is organized by institution and includes a brief characterization of participants, the definition of service-learning at each institution, a summary of the documents related to service-learning at each institution, a description of the process upper-level administrators, student affairs educators, and faculty members went through to institutionalize service-learning, an explanation of the faculty development practices employed by student affairs educators at each institution, a within-case analysis of each institution, a cross-case analysis of the six participating institutions, and a conclusion summarizing the findings.
### Table 1

**Participating Institution Descriptions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participating Institution</th>
<th>Organizational Placement of Service-Learning</th>
<th>Institutional Type</th>
<th>Undergraduate Enrollment</th>
<th>Inaugural Service-Learning Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alpha College</td>
<td>Student Affairs</td>
<td>Four-Year Private</td>
<td>1,300</td>
<td>2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bravo College</td>
<td>Student Affairs</td>
<td>Two-Year Public</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td>2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlie University</td>
<td>Student Affairs</td>
<td>Four-Year Public</td>
<td>27,500</td>
<td>1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delta University</td>
<td>Student Affairs</td>
<td>Four-Year Private</td>
<td>5,700</td>
<td>1995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Echo University</td>
<td>Student Affairs</td>
<td>Four-Year Public</td>
<td>32,900</td>
<td>2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foxtrot University</td>
<td>Student Affairs-Academic Affairs</td>
<td>Four-Year Public</td>
<td>5,300</td>
<td>2015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Alpha College

**Participant Descriptions**

Alpha College Administrator (ACA) had been employed at Alpha College for nine years and had led the college’s service-learning efforts for five years. The administrator was hired to serve in a role in the student affairs division unrelated to service-learning, but assumed responsibility for service-learning, volunteer programs, and alternative spring break programs when the student affairs educator responsible for the aforementioned service programs vacated the position. ACA served in the position unrelated to service-learning and the position responsible for service-learning, volunteer programs, and alternative spring break programs concurrently for five years before a new staff member was hired one month before my interview with ACA to lead the institution’s service-learning and community engagement programs. Alpha College’s service-learning efforts were still being led by ACA when the interview was conducted because the person hired to lead service-learning and community engagement programs was still transitioning into the position. Alpha College Faculty Member (ACFM) had
also been employed at Alpha College for nine years. ACFM began teaching a freshman
composition service-learning course at the college six years ago and has taught the course five
times in those six years.

**Service-Learning Documents**

A thorough search of Alpha College’s website yielded six relevant documents: Alpha
College’s Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP), Alpha College’s mission statement, an Alpha
College’s service-learning program overview, and three archived news articles that referenced
service-learning. Published in 2007, the QEP was developed during the college’s reaffirmation
of Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS) accreditation and intended to promote
the integration of writing and speaking across the college’s undergraduate curriculum. The QEP
was also designed to improve the students’ ability to communicate effectively through a variety
of academic and co-curricular programs. The 30-member committee that created the QEP
included the college’s president, senior vice president, vice president for student life, and vice
president for academic affairs. The QEP provided a detailed overview of how the document was
created. According to the QEP, committee members and select faculty members met to discuss
what should be included in the QEP. The QEP committee, led by upper-level administrators and
faculty members, decided service-learning should be included because the pedagogy’s focus on
reflection could improve students’ ability to communicate in writing and through oral
presentations.

Alpha College’s mission statement referenced the importance of preparing students for
roles of service and citizenship. The mission statement was created by unidentified Alpha
College officials. The mission statement did not explicitly mention community engagement or
service-learning, but it did underscore the importance of creating a culture of active citizenship
among students. Additionally, a news article with an unlisted author published in 2005 on the institution’s website stated the office where service-learning is institutionalized helped provide students with opportunities to serve in accordance with the college's mission by preparing students for lives of service to their community.

The Alpha College service-learning program overview was developed by ACA’s predecessor and published on an unidentified date. The document stated Alpha College has added 27 service-learning courses between 2012 and 2015. It also stated academic departments had plans to add more service-learning courses in the future. According to ACA, Alpha College offered 18 service-learning courses during the 2013-2014 academic year. The administrator did not know the number of service-learning courses offered during the 2014-2015 semester and that information was not available online. The service-learning overview also included a brief description of four service-learning courses and identified the professors who taught each course.

Alpha College’s public relations staff published three articles that addressed service-learning: one published in 2005, one published in 2012, and one published in 2015. The 2005 article, referenced earlier related to the college’s mission, focused on the establishment of a centralized office created to house all civic engagement, community engagement, and leadership programs on Alpha College’s campus. The article also disclosed student affairs educators in the centralized office would assist faculty with integrating service-learning into their curriculum by facilitating training sessions and discussion groups.

The 2012 article focused on Alpha College’s national ranking in two publications as one of the best values among similar sized institutions. The article stated Alpha College was awarded the national rankings, in part, because of the college’s contribution to the public good and its students’ commitment to giving back to their community. The article cited service-
learning as an institutional priority and noted that during the 2012-2013 academic year, approximately 43% of Alpha College students enrolled in service-learning courses. The 2015 article included Alpha College’s institutional profile and an updated list of Alpha College student accomplishments. According to the 2015 article, three-fourths of Alpha College’s students were involved in service projects during the 2014-2015 academic year and the student affairs educators in the office where service-learning was institutionalized helped students tie leadership opportunities with service-learning projects.

**Service-Learning Definition**

Identifying Alpha College’s official service-learning definition was challenging. ACA did not know if the institution had an official service-learning definition. Service-learning was not defined in the QEP, the service-learning overview, or the two articles related to service-learning. ACA explained Alpha College’s definition may have been in a grant application written by another Alpha College student affairs educator, but I did not receive access to that document or a definitive answer on whether or not the grant application included a service-learning definition. I analyzed an article in this study published by the college in 2005 that defined service-learning as “a teaching and learning strategy that combines meaningful community service with structured opportunities for self-reflection, self-discovery, and the acquisition and comprehension of values, skills, and knowledge.” The 2005 article did not cite the source of the service-learning definition included in the article or confirm the service-learning definition included in the article was the college’s official definition.

**Faculty Development Practices**

Alpha College intermittently offered faculty members several resources to develop their service-learning instruction abilities. ACA offered faculty members introductory service-
learning workshops for faculty members and instructors who were new to service-learning or interested in learning service-learning basics. When I asked ACA to expound on what was presented during the workshops, the administrator gave the following response:

It’s been probably about a couple of years [since the workshops have been offered], but… we [student affairs educators] did offer workshops where faculty were invited, we came and just talked about the different resources we have and the connections to different community partners, things like that. Nobody from outside has been brought in as an expert to talk about how they incorporate service learning into your curriculum or the benefits of it or studies or anything like that, to my knowledge, that has not happened.

ACA also helped match faculty members teaching service-learning courses with suitable community agency representatives. The administrator was unable to provide a detailed explanation of the service-learning resources offered to faculty members by student affairs educators. ACFM was aware of the service-learning faculty workshops, but never attended a workshop due to scheduling conflicts and because the faculty member believed the workshops were geared towards faculty members who were new to teaching service-learning courses.

ACFM said the following when addressing the utility of the workshops:

They [student affairs educators] have offered workshop kinds of things which I think…can be really useful because it [service-learning] can be such a different experience in the classroom that I think having somebody sort of work through it with you and having an opportunity just to get together with colleagues who are also trying to come up with similar kinds of assignments or similar kinds of approaches can be really, really productive.
The administrator and faculty member’s responses did not mention two of the faculty development opportunities listed in the 2005 article. The 2005 article revealed student affairs educators in the office where service-learning is institutionalized offered faculty members funding to attend regional conference opportunities and individual service-learning consultations.

**Service-Learning Institutionalization**

ACA’s interview responses and the QEP helped me gain an understanding of the process Alpha College officials went through to institutionalize service-learning. ACA explained service-learning began as a collaborative student affairs and academic affairs grant-funded initiative. The grant application was written by the administrator’s predecessor in the community engagement role and an academic dean. ACA did not know the exact year Alpha College officials received the grant, but the grant funding ended in 2006. In 2005, the office where service-learning was organizationally housed was given a physical space in Alpha College’s student union. In 2009, student affairs and academic affairs administrators decided to use recurring funds to maintain the Alpha College’s service-learning programs once the grant funding ended. The decision to allocate recurring funding to the college’s service-learning efforts was followed by the QEP’s publication in 2007. The QEP identified service-learning as a valuable pedagogy and practice that could be used to help the college meet its student learning goals. Recurring funding for the office where service-learning was institutionalized, the QEP, and upper-level administrative support for service-learning helped catalyze the Alpha College’s service-learning institutionalization process. Between the 2011-2012 academic year and the 2014-2015 academic year, Alpha College annually offered as few as 18 service-learning courses and as many as 27 service-learning courses. The hiring of a full-time student affairs educator in
2015 who was focused on service-learning and community engagement seemed to symbolize Alpha College’s continued commitment to institutionalizing service-learning.

The office where service-learning was institutionalized at Alpha College was organizationally housed in student affairs and academic affairs. Its physical location in Alpha College’s student union was easily accessible for students, faculty members, and community members. The office’s recurring student affairs funding came from student activity fees and its recurring academic affairs funding came from the college’s provost office. ACA and an AmeriCorps Volunteer In Service To America (VISTA) were the office’s two full-time employees. The administrator stated the college did not have any immediate plans to add part-time or additional full-time staff members.

Within-Case Analysis

The Alpha College participants in this study and the documents collected provided similar perspectives on service-learning at the institution. ACA and ACFM believed upper-level administrators supported service-learning. The administrator stated the provost was very supportive of service-learning. ACFM echoed ACA’s comments by stating the following:

I mean they're [upper-level administrators] very supportive. I mean there's not a lot of funding for it, but anything that we want to do as faculty, as long as we can come up with justification for doing it in the classroom so that it makes sense with the course objectives, they're very open to different approaches with experiential learning in particular.

The upper-level administrative support service-learning receives at the college was also reflected in an academic dean’s contribution to the grant that brought service-learning to the institution and in the presence of upper-level administrators advocating for service-learning on the QEP
committee. Faculty support for service-learning at the college was evidenced in the QEP and in ACFM’s continued use of service-learning as a pedagogy. ACFM explained service-learning was typically viewed like any other course initiative, but there was a possibility that teaching a service-learning course could help a faculty member’s case for tenure and promotion.

ACA and ACFM spoke favorably about the presence and quality of the service-learning workshops offered by ACA and the VISTA. However, neither participant mentioned the regional conference opportunities or individual service-learning consultations referenced in the 2005 article as faculty development opportunities. ACA assumed responsibility for Alpha College’s service-learning program five years after the 2005 article was published. It is possible the administrator elected to postpone the aforementioned faculty development options until a full-time student affairs educator was hired to lead the institution’s service-learning and community engagement efforts. ACFM’s lack of knowledge about the regional conference opportunities or the individual service-learning consultations is not surprising since the faculty member expressed disinterest in other faculty development opportunities offered by the institution’s student affairs educators.

Alpha College’s mission statement did not mention or explicitly address service-learning, but it did reference the importance of preparing students for roles of service and citizenship. ACA and ACFM explained that service-learning supported the institution’s mission by providing students with multiple avenues to lead and serve. ACFM mentioned the following when asked if Alpha College’s mission impacted the way the campus community viewed service and service-learning:

I think that we [Alpha College] tend to attract students who are very interested in doing service in general…a lot of our students would want to do it [service] anyway whether
they're getting course credit or not. A lot of them have been very active in their church communities or have been very active in service in high school and so many of them are looking to continue that sort of engagement with the community anyway.

The Alpha College participants in this study were content with service-learning’s organizational placement in student affairs and academic affairs. ACA explained student affairs was an appropriate shared organizational home for service-learning because the office’s staff used its strong connections to the community to develop service-learning partnerships. The administrator, however, admitted many Alpha College faculty members may not know the institution had a service-learning director. ACA stated service-learning initiatives would have a more clear and expansive presence at Alpha College if the administrator shared leadership responsibilities for service-learning with a faculty member. ACFM approved of service-learning’s shared organizational placement because of ACA’s student-centered approach to service-learning. The faculty member explained student affairs educators were able to meaningfully connect with students in ways many faculty members are unable to connect with students.

**Service-learning institutionalization assessment tools.** I used the Furco Rubric (Furco, 2006) and the Campus Compact Pyramid (Campus Compact, 2002) to assess Alpha College’s commitment to institutionalizing service-learning. The Rubric’s first dimension is centered on an institution’s service-learning philosophy and mission. I positioned Alpha College in stage one for the definition of service-learning component, stage two for the alignment with educational reform efforts component, and stage three for institutional mission and alignment component and the strategic planning component. ACA did not know if the institution had a service-learning definition. I also could not identify a formal service-learning definition in any Alpha College’s
documents. Therefore, the college was in stage one of the definition of service-learning component. Service-learning was linked in the QEP to improving students’ ability to communicate verbally and in writing, but I was unable to identify the pedagogy’s connection with any other high profile efforts. Therefore, Alpha College was in stage two of the aligning with educational reforms component because service-learning was only formally tied to one high profile effort at the institution. Since service-learning is aligned with the Alpha College’s mission and included in the college’s strategic planning, the institution was in stage three of the alignment with institutional mission component. Similarly, Alpha College was in the stage three of the strategic planning component because the college developed an official plan for advancing service-learning through its QEP, which included short-range and long-range service-learning institutionalization goals.

The Furco Rubric’s (Furco, 2006) second dimension is concerned with faculty support for and involvement in service-learning. I placed Alpha College in stage two for all four of the dimension’s components: faculty awareness, faculty involvement and support, faculty leadership, and faculty incentives and rewards. Alpha College offered well over five service-learning courses the between the 2009-2010 academic year and the 2014-2014 academic year. Furthermore, ACA explained most faculty members are not teaching multiple service-learning courses and there were two faculty members on the QEP committee who championed service-learning’s value. Alpha College was positioned in stage two of the faculty awareness component because I inferred more than five faculty members know how service-learning is defined and how the pedagogy differs from other forms community engagement. Alpha College was in stage two of the faculty involvement and support component and the faculty leadership component since only a few faculty members actively participate as service-learning instructors and provide
leadership to the college’s service-learning effort. The institution was in stage two in the faculty incentives and rewards component because ACFM stated service-learning was typically viewed college-wide like any other course initiative and as not always recognized during the review, tenure, and promotion process.

The Furco Rubric’s (Furco, 2006) fifth dimension is dedicated to institutional support for service-learning. I placed Alpha College in stage four in three of the dimension’s six categories: coordinating entity, policy-making entity, administrative support, and funding. I also positioned the institution in stage two in two categories: staffing, and evaluation and assessment. Alpha College was placed in stage two of the coordinating entity component because the college had a physical office devoted, in part, to the institutionalization of service-learning. The institution was in stage three of the policy-making entity component and the administrative support component because the QEP committee acknowledged the importance of service-learning and implemented policies that furthered service-learning at the college. In regards to funding, Alpha College funded service-learning with recurring institutional funds and the funding met the office’s needs. Therefore, the institution was in stage three of the funding component.

Assessing the staffing component was challenging because ACA split time between leading the institution’s service-learning efforts and serving in another role within student affairs. Also, ACA did not seem to have much influence on the advancement of service-learning at Alpha College. The college was in stage two of the staffing component because it did not have a staff member completely focused on service-learning or a staff member who had enough influence to advance service-learning. A full-time student affairs educator was hired at the college to exclusively focus on service-learning and community engagement, but that educator had not assumed leadership for service-learning during my data collection period. ACA was able to
account for the number of service-learning courses offered at the institution each year, but there was no formal mechanism to assess the quality of the service-learning courses. Consequently, Alpha College was in stage two of the evaluation and assessment component.

The Campus Compact Pyramid (Campus Compact, 2002) was also used to assess Alpha College’s commitment to institutionalizing service-learning. I positioned Alpha College in the intermediate level of the Pyramid. According to the Pyramid’s creators, between 35 and 40 percent of Campus Compact institutions are in the intermediate or advanced intermediate level. Alpha College was in the intermediate level for several reasons. Its presidential support for service-learning and community engagement was reflected in the college’s mission and in the recurring funds assigned to service-learning initiatives. Alpha College also had a physical office that supported faculty members who taught service-learning courses and a student affairs educator with strong connections to community agencies.

**Bravo College**

**Participant Description**

Bravo College Administrator (BCA) was the director of the office where service-learning was institutionalized and had been employed at Bravo College for 11.5 years. BCA was responsible for developing relevant faculty development opportunities, establishing community partnerships, cultivating student leadership, coordinating numerous campus-wide community service events. The administrator was very active in the institution’s Campus Compact state-affiliate and was the recipient of a Campus Compact state-affiliate civic engagement professional of the year award. This award is presented to a staff member at a Campus Compact institution who had worked towards the institutionalization of service, supported faculty and students involved in community engagement, and formed innovative campus-community partnerships.
Bravo College Faculty Member (BCFM) was chair of an academic department and began teaching courses at the college for 22 years ago. The faculty member began teaching service-learning courses at the institution in 2004 as an instructor in a pilot program. BCFM taught at least one service-learning course a year at Bravo College since 2004. In addition to instructing classes, BCFM also served as a faculty service-learning liaison. In this role, the faculty member imparted service-learning best practices during one-on-one meetings to faculty members who expressed interest in service-learning.

**Service-Learning Documents**

An in-depth search of Bravo College’s website yielded seven relevant documents: the 2013-2014 Serve-Learning Annual Report, the 2015-2016 Faculty Handbook, the 2015-2016 Community Partner Handbook, the spring 2015 Service-Learning Newsletter, the institution’s mission statement, a list of service-learning courses being offered at the institution, and a flyer for a service-learning workshop. Bravo College’s service-learning website included nine years of Service-Learning Annual Reports dating back to the 2005-2006 academic year. The annual reports were published in a similar format and included the following information: a summary of the service-learning office’s accomplishments written by BCA, student testimonials on the benefits of service-learning, the cumulative number of service hours conducted by Bravo College students during the academic year, descriptions of noteworthy service-learning projects and partnerships, a list of service-learning professional development opportunities offered to faculty and staff members during the academic year, a list of the community agencies that collaborated with Bravo College during the academic year, a list of faculty members who taught a service-learning course during the academic year, and the name and position of each member of the service-learning staff.
The 2013-2014 Service-Learning Annual Report was written by a coordinator in Bravo College’s service-learning office. The report included a summary written by BCA highlighting a state-wide civic engagement conference hosted on Bravo’s campus and a visit by a state senator who joined the Bravo College community in a day of service. The annual report also featured quotes from seven students who spoke glowingly about their service-learning experiences. Furthermore, the report’s author wrote that 1240 Bravo College students enrolled in service-learning courses and conducted approximately 21,876 service hours during the 2013-2014 academic year. The report featured ten service-learning project descriptions, seven professional development opportunities for faculty and staff members, ten community agencies where students conducted the most service, and the names of the forty-eight instructors who taught service-learning courses. The 2014-2015 annual report was not available during my data collection period.

The 2015-2016 Faculty Handbook and the 2015-2016 Community Partner Handbook were authored by the coordinator who wrote the Service-Learning Annual Report. The Handbooks were organized with the same three headings: General Service-Learning Center Information and Resources, Service-Learning Information and Resources, and Service-Learning Forms. The Faculty Handbook included, among other things, information on how the service-learning office’s staff supported faculty members, service-learning definitions, types of service, service-learning projects, guiding principles for service-learning, and community partner profiles. The Community Partner Handbook contained similar information, but its content placed more focus on the needs of community agency representatives. For example, the Community Partner Handbook included resources for community partners, Bravo College’s
academic calendar, and distinctions between service-learning and volunteerism. The aforementioned community-centered information is not found in the Faculty Handbook.

Bravo College also had a service-learning newsletter which had been published for 11 years dating back to the 2004-2005 academic year. The newsletters were published bi-annually and authored by members of the service-learning staff, students who were enrolled in service-learning courses, and community agency representatives. Each newsletter included pictures and summaries of service-learning projects conducted during a specific semester. The spring 2015 newsletter included eight summaries written by an assortment of service-learning staff members, students, and community agency representatives. The summaries were replete with pictures of students in service-learning courses conducting service.

The Bravo College mission statement was written by unspecified Bravo College officials and did not include a publication date. The statement explicitly mentioned Bravo College’s commitment to supporting the economic, social, and cultural life of its surrounding community. The institution’s vision statement, which was reaffirmed in 2013 by the college’s governing board, was coupled with the mission statement and did not mention community or civic engagement. Bravo College also had an extensive service-learning course list. The service-learning course list, which was compiled by the service-learning office’s staff, included the name, campus phone number, and e-mail address of the instructor who taught each course. The list did not include a publication date, but BCA stated the list was updated regularly. It encompassed 68 service-learning courses being offered by several academic departments at the institution. In addition to the mission statement and the service-learning course list, I found a flyer for an annual one-day civic engagement conference hosted by the institution in 2007. I was unable to identify the flyer’s creator and the date it was published. According to the flyer, the
conference was sponsored by Bravo College, the institution’s Campus Compact state affiliate, and two other national civic engagement organizations. The one-day conference featured workshops designed to help faculty members, service-learning program practitioners, and other college administrators learn more about civic engagement, establish new service-learning programs, and strengthen collaborations with community agencies.

**Service-Learning Definition**

Bravo College’s official service-learning definition was easily identifiable. BCA stated “service-learning is a teaching method that combines service to the community with academic instruction. Service-learning has a focus on critical and reflective thinking” (personal communication, June 25, 2015). According to the administrator, Bravo College’s Dean of Student Life and the institution’s first service-learning coordinator created the college’s service-learning definition after reviewing the service-learning literature. BCA expounded on the definition’s origin by stating the following:

> There are hundreds of definitions about service-learning out there. But we adapted it [Bravo College’s service-learning definition] from…Campus Compact’s model and the Corporation for National Community Service (CNCS). So we kind of combined that and then we looked up the core competencies that Bravo College would like students to have which is critical thinking and personal growth, and so we tried to address that as well.

The Corporation for National Community Service adopted the service-learning definition found in the National and Community Service Trust Act of 1993. According to the National and Community Service Trust Act of 1993 (1993), service-learning is:

> A method under which students or participants learn and develop through active participation in thoughtfully organized service that is conducted in and meets the needs of
a community, coordinated with…[Service-learning] helps foster civic responsibility that is integrated into and enhances the academic curriculum of the students or the educational components of the community service program in which the participants are enrolled and provides structured time for the students or participants to reflect on the service experience (p. 59).

BCA stated the core competencies were critical thinking and personal growth. Bravo College’s official service-learning definition was present on its website and published in all the institutions’ Service-Learning Annual Reports, Faculty Handbooks, and Community Partner Handbooks.

**Faculty Development Practices**

Bravo College’s service-learning office offered faculty members numerous professional development opportunities. During the 2013-2014 academic year, the service-learning office offered seven professional development opportunities, including a three-part introduction to service-learning workshop series, a three-part civic engagement film series, and a networking event designed to connect faculty members with community agency representatives. The office also had an extensive service-learning library faculty members could access to learn more about service-learning and strengthen their ability to instruct service-learning courses. BCA stated the service-learning staff led online and in-person service-learning workshops for faculty members who were interested in service-learning. The staff also organized and facilitated on-campus meetings between faculty members and community agency representatives. During the meetings, service-learning office staff members provided each attendee with a meal and sought to build partnerships between faculty members and community members by establishing trust and expectations for all parties. Additionally, the service-learning staff hosted an annual service-
learning and community engagement awards luncheon for students, community agency representatives, and faculty members. The faculty member honored at each awards luncheon received recognition for her or his exemplary service-learning practice.

The service-learning office staff collaborated with individual faculty members and Bravo’s College professional development staff to offer additional faculty development opportunities. For example, seasoned faculty members led service-learning course assessment workshops and service-learning reflection workshops on the service-learning office’s behalf. The service-learning staff worked closely with the faculty members who led the aforementioned workshops to ascertain the proper information was being distributed. In addition to the faculty-led service-learning workshops, BCFM served as a faculty liaison who met individually with faculty members who were interested in service-learning and helped them increase their command of service-learning pedagogy. The service-learning staff and the institution’s professional development staff collaborated to create a service-learning certificate program for full-time faculty members. Bravo College required full-time faculty members to complete at least 20 hours of job-related professional development training each year. Faculty members who attended one or two-hour service-learning workshops could use those hours toward the acquisition of a service-learning certificate and to fulfill their professional development requirement.

**Service-Learning Institutionalization**

Service-learning institutionalization at Bravo College was a top-down administrative process. BCA provided me with a detailed account of how service-learning was institutionalized at the college. According to the administrator, Bravo College’s Vice President for Student Affairs (VPSA) was the person who spearheaded the effort to bring service-learning to the
institution. The VPSA secured state funds in 2004 to start the service-learning program in the student affairs division at Bravo College and delegated leadership of the program to the institution’s dean of student life. During the same year, the dean of student life used the state funding acquired by the VPSA to hire a service-learning coordinator, finance some service-learning programs, and purchase office supplies. External one-time grants were procured to supplement the state funding and to pay for the college’s first service-learning initiatives. The newly created service-learning program was physically housed in a building that no longer exists on the Bravo College campus. In 2005, the service-learning office was moved into a building among other student affairs offices.

BCA was hired during the second semester the service-learning program existed and worked on a part-time basis with the dean of student life and the service-learning coordinator. The dean of student life made BCA a full-time employee and director of the service-learning program in order to address the program’s growing number of initiatives. Once BCA became the service-learning director, the administrator worked with the dean of student life to help the college join Campus Compact and hired an AmeriCorps VISTA. Bravo College was awarded the VISTA by its Campus Compact state affiliate. The VISTA, who was employed at Bravo College for six years, helped the service-learning staff grow the program. When the VISTA’s term ended, BCA secured recurring funding for a full-time position responsible for sustaining the initiatives started by the VISTA. The service-learning institutionalization process continued when the service-learning program began to receive recurring funding in the form of student activity fees. BCA used the increased funding to hire two additional full-time service-learning coordinators. As this study was being conducted, the service-learning office included six full-
time staff members: a full-time dean of student life, a full-time director, three full-time service-
learning coordinators, and a full-time administrative assistant.

**Within-Case Analysis**

The Bravo College participants agreed on most matters related to service-learning institutionalization. BCA and BCFM believed service-learning received a considerable amount of upper-administrative support. The administrator explained Bravo College’s chief student affairs officer was responsible for bringing service-learning to the institution, hiring the staff to lead the institution’s service-learning efforts, and providing the service-learning staff with the recurring funds needed to institutionalize service-learning. BCA also works very closely with the institution’s dean of students to devise ways to further service-learning on their campus. BCFM explained many upper-level administrators including the VPSA and the dean of students supported service-learning and some of the upper-level administrators attended service-learning faculty committee meetings.

BCFM cited the service-learning office’s workshops, seminars, and supportive service-
learning staff as the reasons why faculty members were content with service-learning being housed organizationally in student affairs. The faculty development resources provided by the service-learning staff were mirrored on the institution’s website and BCA’s responses. BCFM’s thoughts on the service-learning staff and service-learning courses are captured in the following quote:

I think we [Bravo College] have a really strong student life [student affairs division] and that’s been the best thing. I always joke with [Bravo Administrator], I say, you know anything you guys [service-learning staff] want me to do, I'll do it, just because they're so available and I know the impact that these things [service-learning courses] have on
students and that’s what I'm all about is the students, anything that they support, I support too.

The Bravo College participants slightly disagreed on how Bravo College’s mission impacted service-learning at the institution. BCA explained civic engagement and service were a part of Bravo College’s mission and the institution’s upper-level administrators are happy to see staff members and students working collaboratively with community agency representatives. The administrator’s thoughts on the Bravo College’s mission statement as it relates to service-learning underscore the importance of community engagement espoused in the mission statement. While BCFM agreed with BCA’s statement about the institution’s mission, the faculty member stated the college’s mission had no impact on how the faculty member taught service-learning courses.

BCA and BCFM agreed service-learning should remain institutionalized exclusively in student affairs at Bravo College. The administrator cited the monetary advantages of service-learning being housed organizationally in student affairs. Upper-level administrators gave the service-learning staff flexibility with the recurring funding the staff received. The administrator explained state funds and student activity fees were used to fund student-centered programs and hire-full time staff members. Through assessment, BCA was able to determine faculty members believed student affairs educators advancing service-learning at the institution were meeting faculty needs. Nevertheless, BCA did acknowledge the organizational placement of service-learning in student affairs presented challenges by stating the following:

It’s [service-learning) only something that we can encourage instructors to do, so it’s all about building relationships. And because I'm not on the academic side, you have to show faculty that you're not trying to come in there and tell them how to teach their class
and tell them what to do because faculty are very, very protective over their courses and that academic freedom that comes along with teaching and I have learned that. So I walk that very fine line of I'm here to support you and I want to help you and you tell me what I can do to do that...I've talked to colleges that had it [service-learning] on the academic side and I think it can be easier when the vice president for academic affairs says this is something we should do, but because it's housed under student services side, it can be a little bit more challenging.

BCFM’s strong working relationship with BCA was the primary reason the faculty member supported Bravo’s College service-learning office remaining institutionalized in student affairs. The faculty member admired the approach student affairs educators took to advancing service-learning at the institution.

**Service-learning institutionalization assessment tools.** I used the Furco Rubric (Furco, 2006) and the Campus Compact Pyramid (Campus Compact, 2002) to assess Bravo College’s commitment to institutionalizing service-learning. The Rubric’s first dimension was centered on an institution’s service-learning philosophy and mission. I positioned Bravo College in stage three of the definition of service-learning component and in stage two of the dimension’s other three categories: strategic planning, alignment with institutional mission, and alignment with educational reform efforts. The institution was in stage three of the definition of service-learning component because it had a formal, universally accepted definition for service-learning. BCA stated the institution’s service-learning definition during our interview and the same definition was found in several documents I collected. Bravo College was in stage two of the strategic planning component because I was unable to identify an official strategic plan for service-learning that outlined the institution’s short-term and long-term service-learning goals. The
college’s placement in stage two is surprising given the institution’s heavy investment in service-learning. BCA mentioned plans to expand service-learning into more academic colleges and hire additional service-learning staff members, but those plans were not formally written on any documents. Similarly, Bravo College was in stage two of the dimension’s remaining categories because service-learning was not included in the institution’s mission or formally linked to high profile efforts at the institution. The college’s mission did not explicitly mention service-learning, but it did highlight the importance of community engagement. Service-learning helped Bravo College strengthen its community partnerships, but I was unable to find any additional linkages between service-learning and other high profile efforts at the college. In this dimension, the institution’s enacted investment in service-learning was greater than what was espoused in the college’s mission statement and educational reform efforts.

The Furco Rubric’s (Furco, 2006) second dimension was concerned with faculty support for and involvement in service-learning. I placed Bravo College in stage two for all four of the dimension’s components: faculty awareness, faculty involvement and support, faculty leadership, and faculty incentives and rewards. According to BCA, the college had approximately 90 faculty members and instructors teaching service-learning courses. BCFM demonstrated an awareness of how service-learning was defined and how the pedagogy differed from other forms of community engagement. The service-learning staff offered a multitude of professional development opportunities where faculty members could learn how service-learning is defined. Bravo College was positioned in stage two of the faculty awareness component based on the BCFM’s service-learning knowledge and the inferred knowledge of the college’s 90 or so faculty members teaching service-learning courses.
Bravo College was in stage two of the faculty and involvement and support component and the faculty leadership component because the institution only had a few faculty members who advocated for infusing service-learning into the institution’s mission and who provided leadership to the campus’ service-learning effort. BCA explained planned to increase the number of service-learning faculty liaisons. Like BCFM, the faculty liaisons would serve as service-learning advocates and representatives for the service-learning staff. Bravo College was in stage two of the faculty incentives and rewards component since service-learning is not always recognized during the tenure and promotion process. BCA and BCFM explained faculty members were encouraged to teach service-learning courses, but service-learning was not given serious consideration in the tenure and promotion process.

The Rubric’s (Furco, 2006) fifth dimension addressed institutional support for service-learning philosophy. I positioned Bravo College in stage three in all six of this dimension’s categories: coordinating entity, policy-making entity, staffing, funding, administrative support, and evaluation and assessment. The institution was in stage three of the coordinating entity component because the college had a physical office devoted primarily to assisting campus constituencies in the implementation, advancement, and institutionalization of service-learning. There were formal polices in place to encourage faculty members to use service-learning as a pedagogy. Therefore, I positioned the college in stage three of the policy-making component. Bravo College was placed in stage three of the staffing component because the campus’s service-learning office had an appropriate number of permanent staff members who understood service-learning and who had the positional power to advance and institutionalize service-learning. The service-learning office received recurring funding and upper-administrative support that increased service-learning’s visibility on campus. Consequently, I positioned the institution is
stage three of the funding component and the administrative support component. The college was in stage three of the evaluation and assessment component because student affairs educators annually assessed the quantity and quality of the institution’s service-learning courses.

The Campus Compact Pyramid (Campus Compact, 2002) was also used to assess Bravo College’s commitment to institutionalizing service-learning. I positioned Bravo College in the advanced intermediate level of the Pyramid. According to the Pyramid’s creators, between 35 and 40 percent of Campus Compact institutions are in the intermediate or advanced intermediate level. Bravo College was in the advanced intermediate level for several reasons. Bravo’s College’s President approved of the VPSA’s desire to introduce service-learning to the institution. There were approximately 90 faculty members at the institution using service-learning to foster civic education. There was also evidence service-learning was aligned with the institutional mission and evidence the college had established service-learning course assessments. Moreover, Bravo College’s service-learning staff and many of its faculty members formed strong community partnerships through service-learning courses.

**Charlie University**

**Participant Descriptions**

Charlie University Administrator I (CUAI) had been an associate director for two years in the office where service-learning is housed at the institution. CUAI was responsible for supporting faculty members who were involved in service-learning work, overseeing community partner development and assessment, service-learning course assessment, and service-learning syllabus design. Charlie University Administrator II (CUAII) had been the director for five years of the office where service-learning was organizationally housed. CUAII was responsible for the administrative oversight and strategic direction of the office at Charlie University that
organizationally housed service-learning. Both administrators planned to attend the 30th Anniversary National Campus Compact conference. Charlie University Faculty Member (CUFM) had been at the institution for 15 years and had been teaching service-learning courses at the university approximately 14 years. The faculty member had been a member of the university’s service-learning committee for eight years and served as chair of the service-learning committee for three years. In addition, CUFM received numerous institutional, state, and national awards for teaching and community-engaged service.

**Service-Learning Documents**

A thorough search of Charlie University’s website yielded six relevant documents: the 2014-2019 Division of Academic Affairs Strategic Plan, the 2014-2019 Division of Student Affairs Strategic Plan, the 2014-2015 Service-Learning Committee’s Charge, the 2013-2014 Service-Learning Committee Annual Report, the institution’s mission statement, and the institution’s assessment of its commitment to its public service mission.

The 2014-2019 Division of Academic Affairs Strategic Plan was developed by unspecified professionals in the institution’s Division of Academic Affairs. The strategic plan included three institutional commitments: maximize student success, serve the public, and lead regional transformation. Each of the strategic plan’s commitments contained a subsection of actions and metrics for each action. The most relevant commitment to this study was the commitment to serve the public, which represented Charlie University’s plan to expand service-learning, undergraduate research, and creative activity across the entire campus in an effort to inspire its students to be engaged citizens. One of the three institutional actions in the serve the public commitment focused on expanding service-learning, undergraduate research and creative activity at Charlie University by providing students, faculty, and staff with opportunities to serve.
the state where the university is located. In order to reach this commitment, the strategic plan charged professionals in the Division of Academic Affairs to work with student affairs educators in the office where service-learning was institutionalized to establish an institutional database of public service, to develop interdivisional collaboration for engagement in public service initiatives, and to incorporate service-learning courses into each academic college, school, and department to incorporate service-learning. The aforementioned institutional actions specifically addressed the Division of Academic Affairs’ commitment to service-learning and collaborations with the Division of Student Affairs. According to the plan, progress towards assessing the serve the public commitment would be based on the Division’s ability to increase the number of students, faculty, and staff participating in volunteer and/or service-learning programs, the number of hours logged for community outreach, and the number of hours logged for community-engaged service. The plan did not address how much of an increase in each action would be satisfactory.

The 2014-2019 Division of Student Affairs Strategic Plan was similar in structure to the Division of Academic Affairs Strategic Plan. The student affairs strategic plan was composed by unnamed student affairs educators in the institution’s Division of Student Affairs. Similar to the Division of Academic Affairs Strategic Plan, the Division of Student Affairs Strategic Plan’s serve the public commitment was the most germane to this study. Two of the three institutional actions in the serve the public commitment related to service-learning. One of the aforementioned actions stated the Division of Student Affairs would expand its commitment to integrating community engagement throughout its operations and programs. According to the plan, student affairs educators at Charlie University were charged with executing this action by integrating a community engagement assessment system to advance the university’s community
engagement efforts. Student affairs educators were also charged with enhancing the quality and range of community-based service and learning opportunities throughout student affairs departments. The success of this action was based on the ability of student affairs educators to track student service experiences and community engagement partnerships/projects. Service-learning was aligned with this action because it provided students with community-based service and learning opportunities through community engagement partnerships and projects.

The second serve the public institutional action relevant to this study stated the Division of Student Affairs would celebrate and publicly recognize its exemplary university-community partnerships and its positive reciprocal relationships. The strategic plan charged student affairs educators with recognizing exemplary university-community partnerships and positive reciprocal relationships by implementing a division-wide recognition process for community partners, collaborating with public service stakeholders across the university, and establishing criteria for university-community partnerships. This institutional action promoted service-learning since it celebrates reciprocal university-community collaborations. According to the strategic plan, student affairs educators were asked to use four metrics to assess this action: a community partner assessment instrument, an annual student affairs division community partnership inventory, an annual tracking of partnership activities, and student stories of involvement and impact in the community.

Charlie University’s service-learning committee charge was published in 2015 and authored by select members of the university’s faculty senate. The document included each committee member’s title and voting status, the committee’s responsibilities, the name of the entity the committee reports to organizationally, the number of times the committee reported to the aforementioned entity, and the committee’s standard meeting time. The 19-member service-
learning committee was comprised of nine elected faculty members and ten ex-officio members. The faculty members on the committee are elected by the faculty senate. The ex-officio members included Charlie University’s president or an appointed representative, the provost or an appointed representative, the vice president for health sciences or an appointed representative, the vice president for research & graduate studies or an appointed representative, the faculty senate chair or an appointed representative, one faculty senator selected by the faculty senate chair, one student member from the Student Government Association, one member from the Graduate and Professional Student Senate, and the director of the office that organizationally housed service-learning. As the administrative leader of the office that organizationally housed service-learning, CUAI served on the service-learning committee as a non-voting member. During my interview with CUAI, I learned CUAI was also a non-voting member of the committee. CUAI and CUAI are the only ex-officio committee members without voting privileges. The two administrators are non-voting members because they are not full-time faculty members. The committee’s chair had the authority to invite additional faculty and staff members to serve on the committee and the authority to appoint subcommittees as she or he deemed necessary.

The service-learning committee charge listed the committee’s four primary responsibilities. First, the committee was responsible for making recommendations to the faculty senate regarding proposed changes to the university’s service-learning requirements and to individual courses carrying a service-learning designation. The committee’s recommendations were reported to the University Curriculum Committee and the Graduate Curriculum Committee. Second, the committee was responsible for serving as a liaison between the office where service-learning was organizationally housed and the faculty senate, reviewing the activities of the office
where service-learning is organizationally housed and advising CUAII about matters concerning service-learning. Third, the committee was charged with annually reviewing the service-learning course sections within the Charlie University’s course catalogs and recommending changes as necessary. Finally, the committee was responsible for sponsoring Charlie University’s annual service-learning conference and promoting and advocating for service-learning across the curriculum by examining learning outcomes and the development of service-learning courses. The service-learning committee was charged to meet once a month and to report all of its recommendations to the faculty senate at least once a year.

Charlie University’s 2013-2014 Service-Learning Annual Report was authored by the institution’s service-learning committee members and submitted to the university’s faculty senate prior to the completion of the school’s spring 2014 semester. The 2014-2015 service-learning annual report had not been submitted to Charlie University’s faculty senate when I collected this study’s data. The 2013-2014 service-learning annual report included the name and academic unit of each committee member, the committee’s meeting dates and attendance records, a description of each service-learning subcommittee, a list of the committee’s goals and accomplishments, and a list of courses that received the service-learning designation during the 2013-2014 academic year. During the 2013-2014 academic year, the 13-member service-learning committee consisted of regular members and five ex-officio members. CUAII was one of the ex-officio members and the only non-voting committee member. Each committee member represented a different academic unit. The service-learning committee met once a month for six months during the academic year. It should be noted CUAII was one of three committee members who attended every meeting.
According to the 2013-2014 Annual Report, the service-learning committee elected to form subcommittees for three content areas during the academic year: service-learning designation, assessment, and professional development. The service-learning designation subcommittee was created to review and evaluate service-learning course proposals submitted by faculty members seeking the service-learning course designation. The four-member assessment committee was created to assess data gathered from service-learning designated courses. The assessment subcommittee developed an assessment tool for service-learning designated courses and presented the assessment tool to the faculty senate. The professional development subcommittee was charged with planning service-learning professional development opportunities for the Charlie University community. This five-member subcommittee hosted the institution’s inaugural service-learning faculty fellows retreat. The fifteen faculty members who participated in the retreat received training and follow-up trainings. The professional development subcommittee also hosted a workshop to help faculty members develop service-learning courses. CUAI and CUAIi served on the assessment and professional development subcommittees.

The 2013-2014 Annual Report included six goals identified by the service-learning committee: (a) promote the awareness of service-learning pedagogy as an innovative learning strategy at Charlie University, (b) increase the participation of the campus community in professional development opportunities in the area of service-learning locally, across the state, and nationally, (c) support the integration of service-learning in undergraduate and graduate curricula to provide student opportunities to apply knowledge, skills and values so they can succeed in a global, multicultural society, (d) simplify and promote the service-learning course designation process for undergraduate and graduate courses, (e) provide committee-level
oversight to the office that organizationally housed service-learning, and (f) support the
development of sustainable community partnerships to give Charlie University students
experience with diverse stakeholders. The service-learning committee’s accomplishments were
related to each of the committee’s goals. In regards to accomplishments, the committee garnered
faculty participation in external professional development opportunities relevant to service-
learning, collaborated with the office organizationally housed service-learning to host the
inaugural service-learning faculty fellows retreat, worked collaboratively with CUAI and CUAII
on service-learning curriculum matters, provided mentorship to faculty engaged in the
integration of service-learning into their curriculum, and designed an assessment process that
captured the impact of student engagement in service-learning experiences. The service-learning
committee annual report also included the name and course number of each service-learning
course that was granted the service-learning designation. The service-learning designation
subcommittee approved 14 service-learning designation proposals in 11 academic disciplines and
forwarded the approved proposals to the faculty senate. Additionally, the report indicated
Charlie University offered 43 designated service-learning courses not including the 14 service-
learning designation proposals approved during the 2013-2014 academic year.

Charlie University’s mission statement was written by unspecified authors, approved by
the university’s governing board in 2013, and reapproved by the same governing body in 2014.
The statement did not explicitly mention service-learning, but it did address the institution’s
commitment to public service. Public service was not defined in the mission statement, but
Charlie University’s public service definition did appear in the institution’s assessment of its
commitment to its mission statement. In 2013, Charlie University administrators conducted an
assessment of the institution’s mission statement as the university went through the SACS
reaffirmation process. According to the assessment, public service included community engagement, service-learning, field or clinical work, internships, volunteerism, co-curricular service, and extracurricular service. There were portions of the assessment focused on the Charlie University office where service-learning was organizationally housed. The assessment noted the office was founded at the institution 25 years ago with a mission to, among other things, support faculty involved in service-learning and strengthen the resources available to students relative to public service. It also stated the office was moved in 2011 from academic affairs to student affairs. Furthermore, the assessment included the university’s official service-learning definition, a description of the faculty senate’s role in service-learning, an explanation of the institution’s service-learning course designation process, a brief notation on how the institution’s tenure and promotion process was revised in 2011 to reward community engaged scholarship, and a list of service-learning course sections offered between the 2006-2007 and 2010-2011 academic years. The assessment provided evidence Charlie University’s administrators, faculty members, and student affairs educators worked collectively to support the institution’s public service mission through service-learning.

Service-Learning Definition

Charlie University’s website included several service-learning definitions. The office where service-learning was institutionalized used the Barbara Jacoby (1996) service-learning definition as the university’s official service-learning definition. Jacoby (1996) defined service-learning as “a form of experiential education in which students engage in activities that address human and community needs together with structured opportunities for reflection intentionally designed to achieve desired learning outcomes” (p. 5). The Jacoby definition underscored the importance of two service-learning cornerstones: reflection and meeting community needs.
CUAI and CUAII were not employed at Charlie University when the Jacoby definition was selected as the institution’s official service-learning definition and neither administrator knew what process was used to select the service-learning definition.

The institution’s service-learning task force also developed a service-learning definition for the university as it sought to institutionalize service-learning. CUAFM served on the aforementioned task force, which existed prior to the formation of the faculty senate service-learning subcommittee. The faculty member was unable to provide the task force’s definition during our interview. CUAFM was surprised the service-leaning definition created by the task force was not adopted as the campus’s official service-learning definition. Charlie University’s faculty senate service-learning committee also created a service-learning definition. In 2012, the service-learning committee generated the following service-learning definition for the institution:

Service-learning is a method of instruction that has the benefit of meeting academic course objectives and helping students develop a sense of engagement and social responsibility…and is structured within a course and has a formal, academic curriculum that is rooted in the discipline in which the course is being offered.

The committee wrote that service-learning courses should contain a set of organized community-based learning activities through which students directly serve a constituency as a means to address an identified community need. Furthermore, the committee wanted service-learning courses to provide structured opportunities for students to formally connect their service activities to the course curriculum and to reflect. The faculty senate service-learning committee definition and service-learning course suggestions are found in the 2014-2015 Service-Learning Committee’s Charge, the 2013-2014 Service-Learning Committee Annual Report, and the institution’s assessment of its commitment to its public service mission. I did not ask the Charlie
University participants why the institution had two service-learning definitions because I identified the faculty senate service-learning committee definition after I completed the interviews. However, the service-learning definition utilized by the office where service-learning was institutionalized and the faculty senate service-learning committee’s service-learning definition could coexist because both definitions highlighted the importance of reflection and reciprocity.

**Faculty Development Practices**

The office where service-learning was organizationally housed provided faculty members with a number of professional development opportunities. CUAI explained the office offered a service-learning presentation at each Charlie University new faculty orientation in an effort to explain to new faculty members what service-learning courses are, inform new faculty members the office exists, and persuade new faculty members to consider teaching service-learning courses. The student affairs educators in the office also partnered with Charlie University’s center for teaching excellence to give presentations to any faculty member interested in learning how to integrate service-learning into a pre-existing course and how to successfully navigate the service-learning course designation process. CUAI and CUAIi offered service-learning overviews in service-learning courses where they talk to the students about what service-learning is and the importance of respectfully initiating partnerships. Additionally, the student affairs educators provided faculty members with website links to sample service-learning syllabi, website links to service-learning webinars, service-learning syllabi consultations, and Campus Compact resources.

In 2013, the office started a service-learning faculty fellows program designed to share service-learning best practices with faculty members who were either teaching a service-learning
course that was not officially designated as a service-learning course or faculty members who had an idea for a service-learning course. Each faculty member had to submit an application to be considered for the faculty fellows program. CUAI and CUAII selected the faculty members who participated in the program. Additionally, the administrators hosted an off-campus weekend retreat for the faculty fellows where retreat attendees discussed the history of service-learning, best practices in service-learning, community partnerships, and other service-learning related material. Funding for the retreat was provided by the office where service-learning was institutionalized and other offices at the institution. The funding allowed the retreat to be offered at no cost to the faculty members who attended it. The faculty fellows retreat was intended to help faculty members submit a service-learning course proposal capable of earning Charlie University’s service-learning designation. The faculty fellows program and the retreat assisted CUAI and CUAII as they sought to increase the number of service-learning courses, provide support to faculty members teaching service-learning, develop a campus-wide understanding of service learning, and endorse the potential positive impact the pedagogy could have on the institution. CUAI stated the following when asked about the faculty fellow retreat:

We [CUAI and CUAII] see a lot of great collaboration that happens as faculty from across the disciplines come together and realize that they have similar interests and passions and there have been some really interesting interdisciplinary service-learning projects that have come out of conversations at the retreat.

CUFM explained the service-learning faculty retreat was proposed while the faculty member was serving as a faculty senate service-learning committee member. CUFM was pleased CUAI and CUAII were receiving resources to consistently support faculty members and further institutionalize service-learning at the institution. Charlie University’s service-learning
administrators also partnered with professionals in academic affairs to promote a broad scale faculty-centered initiative on the variability in ways students learn in service-learning courses. This student affairs and academic affairs collaboration shared practical instructional practices with faculty members teaching service-learning courses and helped faculty members explore service-learning’s impact on student learning.

**Service-Learning Institutionalization**

The Charlie University participants and the institution’s assessment of its commitment to its public service mission helped me understand the grassroots process Charlie University officials went through to institutionalize service-learning. According to CUAII, the service-learning institutionalization process was started in the mid-1980s by a faculty member who was very interested in working with local community partners and helping students get engaged in volunteer projects. This faculty member coordinated volunteer projects for students in addition to the faculty member’s teaching and research opportunities without the support of institutional resources. Charlie University joined its Campus Compact state affiliate during the same time period the faculty member was leading the aforementioned volunteerism efforts.

After the institution’s president noticed the faculty member’s students were experiencing transformative experiences in the community and bringing positive publicity to the university, the president awarded the faculty member a small recurring budget to support the students’ involvement in the community. According to the institution’s assessment of its commitment to its public service mission, Charlie University’s president elected to further institutionalize community engagement in 1990 by investing resources into the establishment of an office designed to support faculty members involved in service-learning, coordinate university-community partnerships, and facilitate student volunteerism. The office, which was
organizationally housed in the faculty member’s academic department, was led by the faculty member. CUFM explained the faculty member who coordinated the volunteer projects served as the office’s part-time director assisted by an intern who coordinated the volunteer projects on a part-time basis. CUFM also stated the office was located in the bottom of an academic building that was located on the outskirts of campus.

In the late 1990s, upper-level administrators recognized a significant increase in service-learning use at Charlie University and across the country. In response to service-learning’s growing popularity, the office was moved organizationally within academic affairs in 2004 from the faculty member’s academic department to the provost’s office. The office’s leadership shifted from the inaugural director of the office to an administrator in the provost’s office who was responsible for the institution’s emerging academic initiatives. CUFM stated the office was physically located in an administrative building near Charlie University’s student union. The new director reported to the associate provost for academic affairs and helped garner additional support for the office by regularly sharing with the provost and the president the positive impact service-learning and community engagement had on the university community. The office was exclusively backed financially by recurring state funds and included five full-time staff members: full-time one director, two full-time coordinators, a VISTA provided by Campus Compact, and a full-time office manager. In 2005, the service-learning institutionalization process continued when Charlie University’s ad hoc service-learning committee began working closely with the new director. The 14-member committee included CUFM, an associate vice president for academic affairs, a representative from the institution’s writing center, the director of the office where service-learning was institutionalized, and representatives from each the institution’s academic colleges. The academic college representatives were appointed to the ad
hoc committee by their respective academic deans. CUFM explained the service-learning committee had the following responsibilities:

In this [service-learning] committee we [committee members] defined service-learning, came up with a definition for service-learning, we had a service-learning conference that we sponsored every year on campus, and we would provide…professional development opportunities for faculty. We also put together our service-learning [course] designation and the [service-learning course] approval process and so forth.

Charlie University’s assessment of its commitment to its public service mission included additional information on the establishment of the institution’s service-learning designation process. In 2008, Charlie University’s president approved a faculty senate resolution that outlined criteria for a service-learning course designation process. Prior to 2009, faculty members self-identified a course as a service-learning course and registered their course with the office where service-learning was institutionalized. In 2009, Charlie University formally implemented the institution’s service-learning course designation process.

According to CUAII and the institution’s assessment of its commitment to its public service mission, the office where service-learning was organizationally housed was moved from academic affairs to student affairs in 2011. CUAII stated Charlie University’s provost and vice president for student affairs made the decision to move service-learning from academic affairs to student affairs. These upper-level administrators believed service-learning should be organizationally housed in student affairs because the student affairs educators responsible for leading the institution’s service-learning efforts would have more access to students. The office’s organizational move from academic affairs to student affairs shifted the office’s financial support from recurring state funding alone to both recurring state funding and recurring student...
activity fees. The office’s move from academic affairs to student affairs also included a change in the office’s staff and the staffing structure. Charlie University’s provost and vice president for student affairs wrote new position descriptions for each role in the office where service-learning was institutionalized and hired a completely new staff. In 2012, CUAII was hired to serve as the office’s director. CUAII worked for a year with several full-time interim student affairs educators and an interim part-time administrative assistant to develop the core functions of the office. In 2013, CUAII hired CUAI to serve as an associate director, an additional associate director, a full-time administrative assistant, and a VISTA provided by Campus Compact. In 2015, the office where service-learning was housed organizationally was combined with the student affairs office charged with coordinating the institution’s leadership efforts. This organizational consolidation resulted in the addition of a graduate assistant, a program specialist, and an additional VISTA to the office’s staff. As data was being collected for this study, the office’s the 9-member staff was physically housed in two locations: an administrative building near the student union and the student union. The office remained organizationally housed exclusively in student affairs and continued to receive recurring funding from state fees and student activity fees. CUAI and CUAII stated the entire staff will be housed in the student union no later than 2018.

Within-Case Analysis

The Charlie University participants shared varying perceptions on the institutionalization of service-learning at their institution. The student affairs educators and the faculty member had different views on upper-level administrative support for service-learning. CUAI and CUAII were very pleased with the upper-level administrative support service-learning received at the university. CUAI mentioned Charlie University’s president at the time I collected data for this
study prioritized all forms of community engagement and leadership opportunities for students. The president’s support for community engagement and leadership was evidenced in the president’s decision to merge the office where service-learning was institutionalized with the leadership office. CUAII explained the offices were combined in order to highlight the significance of each office’s core functions and to communicate to students that leadership and community engagement are naturally connected. The administrator also stated the institution’s vice president for student affairs supported service-learning by referencing it in the student affairs division’s annual report and by providing funding for awards given to students who demonstrated leadership through service. CUAII indicated a former Charlie University president provided a faculty member with seed money to lead volunteerism efforts that evolved into the office where service-learning was organizationally housed. In addition, CUAII was grateful Charlie University’s president and provost valued service-learning and its organizational placement in student affairs.

CUFM expressed a different perspective on Charlie University’s upper-level administrative support for service-learning. When service-learning was initially introduced at Charlie University, the faculty member stated an associate vice president for academic affairs served on the ad hoc service-learning committee. The associate vice president for academic affairs acquired the financial and administrative support the committee needed to further service-learning practice at Charlie University. The ad hoc service-learning committee’s accomplishments convinced a former Charlie University provost to support the creation of a faculty senate service-learning committee. CUFM did not believe service-learning received the upper-administrative support it received during the years the CUFM served on the ad hoc service-learning committee. The faculty member cited the upper-level administrators’ lack of
direct involvement on the service-learning committee as the primary reason for believing upper-administrative support for service-learning had waned. CUFM’s involvement in service-learning decreased between 2012 and 2015 and the faculty member acknowledged the relative lack of involvement in service-learning may have contributed to the assessment that upper-level administrator support had decreased.

The Charlie University documents I acquired confirmed many of participants’ statements about service-learning at the institution and provided evidence service-learning could be institutionalized exclusively in student affairs. The 2014-2019 Division of Academic Affairs Strategic Plan and the 2014-2019 Division of Student Affairs Strategic Plan listed public service as a part of Charlie University’s institutional mission. Charlie University’s mission statement incorporated the institution’s commitment to public service. The 2013 assessment of institution’s public service mission included service-learning as one of the practices the university employed to accomplish its public service goals. The institution’s dedication to service-learning and other forms of community engagement was mentioned by CUAI and reflected in all of the documents I gathered from the institution. The academic affairs strategic plan specifically called for student affairs educators and faculty members to collaborate and identify ways to incorporate service-learning courses into each of the university’s departments, schools, and colleges. The academic affairs division’s professed commitment to collaborating with student affairs educators emphasized CUAI’s assertion that the office where service-learning was institutionalized had academic affairs and provost support. The student affairs strategic plan included integrating and promoting community engagement throughout the division as one of its goals. This goal highlighted CUAI’s belief that organizationally housing
service-learning in student affairs was beneficial because the entire division prioritized service-learning and other forms of community engagement.

CUAI, CUAI, and CUFM’s description of the service-learning committee and the committee’s responsibility were essentially mirrored in the 2014-2015 Service-Learning Committee’s Charge, the 2013-2014 Service-Learning Committee Annual Report. The only discrepancy is that CUAI and CUAI stated CUAI was a service-learning committee member, but CUAI’s name did not appear in the service-learning annual report. Nevertheless, CUAI and CUAI were able to use positional power as service-learning committee members to build relationships with influential faculty members and upper-level administrators on the committee. The student affairs educators were also able to bring a student affairs perspective to a committee where every other committee member worked in academic affairs. CUAI’s perfect attendance at all service-learning committee meetings during the 2013-2014 academic year reflected the administrator’s commitment to service-learning. The presence of student affairs educators on the committee could help the committee fulfill its responsibility to review the activities of the office where service-learning was organizationally housed and advise CUAI about matters concerning service-learning.

CUAI and CUFM had similar perspectives on the organizational placement of service-learning in student affairs and the benefits of having service-learning housed in student affairs. I did not ask CUAI any questions about service-learning in student affairs because CUAI’s responses to those questions were very detailed. CUAI explained the appropriate organizational placement of service-learning varies by campus. The administrator worked in a service-learning office at another institution where service-learning was organizationally housed in academic affairs and volunteerism and community service were housed in student affairs. CUAI explained
the service-learning office’s organizational affiliation with academic affairs made it easier for the
service-learning staff to connect with faculty members. The administrator also stated service-
learning could be housed organizationally in academic affairs at Charlie University if the
leadership in academic affairs was willing to match the support currently given to service-
learning by the student affairs leadership. Nevertheless, CUAI believed service-learning should
be organizationally housed in student affairs at Charlie University and mentioned several
benefits to organizationally housing it there. The student affairs educator indicated the office
where service-learning was institutionalized at Charlie University had greater access to students
than faculty members would have, due to its placement in student affairs. CUAI and CUAII
were given physical space at Charlie University’s fall welcome week and all major student
affairs events to promote service-learning and converse with students to determine what attracts
students to community engagement opportunities. Additionally, CUAI stated student affairs
educators in other offices consistently marketed service-learning and community engagement to
students. CUAI also disclosed the following when asked about the advantages of having service-
learning in student affairs:

I think that the main advantage [to organizationally housing service-learning in student
affairs] is the connection or the easier flow between curricular and co-curricular
experiences. I think is important for students because they can see that it’s [campus
involvement] not so siloed, it’s not that this is my service checkbox, this is my club
checkbox, and these are the different parts of my life, but that you can be involved from
being in class to being out of class. So I think for kind of the philosophy that we [office
that organizationally houses service-learning] have about the integration of service and
engagement and the everyday student experience and the access to resources, those
philosophical stances] stand out to me as the top two benefits of being part of student affairs.

CUFM offered a comparable view on the organizational placement of service-learning in student affairs and the benefits of having service-learning housed in student affairs. The faculty member stated volunteerism and co-curricular experiences were closely aligned with student affairs whereas service-learning is more aligned with the academic affairs because it is largely faculty driven. CUFM revealed there were Charlie University faculty members who were concerned about the service-learning moving from academic affairs to student affairs because they believed housing service-learning in student affairs would diminish the pedagogy’s academic rigor. The faculty member could not confirm if the faculty’s concerns about the organizational move still existed. CUFM said the financial support and infrastructure allotted to service-learning was more important than the pedagogy’s organizational placement. When asked about the benefits of housing service-learning in student affairs, the faculty member reiterated the importance of financial support and infrastructure for service-learning and minimized the importance of the pedagogy’s organizational placement. However, CUFM was very impressed with CUAII’s ability to further institutionalize service-learning at Charlie University by building relationships with faculty members, serving on the service-learning committee, starting a service-learning faculty fellows program, contributing to the establishment of a service-learning course designation, and organizing an annual service-learning faculty retreat.

**Service-learning institutionalization assessment tools.** I used the Furco Rubric (Furco, 2006) and the Campus Compact Pyramid (Campus Compact, 2002) to assess Charlie University’s commitment to institutionalizing service-learning. The Rubric’s first dimension was centered on an institution’s service-learning philosophy and mission. Charlie University
was in stage three of the definition of service-learning component, the strategic planning component, the alignment with institutional mission component, and the alignment with educational reforms component. The university was in stage three of the definition of service-learning component because the university’s service-learning committee had a formal service-learning definition that was used consistently to operationalize most service-learning at the intuition. The office where service-learning was institutionalized used another service-learning definition, but it was very similar to the service-learning committee’s definition. The institution was in stage three of the strategic planning component because its academic affairs division and its student affairs division had short-term and long-term strategic plans for advancing service-learning. Charlie University’s mission did not include the term service-learning, but service-learning was considered an integral part of the university’s public service mission. Therefore, the university was in stage three of the alignment with institutional mission component. At Charlie University, service-learning was formally tied with leadership, volunteerism, and other high profile efforts. The pedagogy’s formal connection with other high profile practices put the institution in stage three of the alignment with educational reforms component.

The Furco Rubric’s (Furco, 2006) second dimension was concerned with faculty support for and involvement in service-learning. I placed Charlie University in stage three in three of the dimension’s four components: faculty awareness, faculty involvement and support, and faculty leadership. Charlie University was in stage two of the faculty incentives and rewards component. The university was in stage three of the faculty awareness component because the institution’s faculty senate had a service-learning committee. There were more than five faculty members on the service-learning committee and each member is required to know the institution’s service-learning definition. Charlie University had a substantial number of faculty members.
and staff members, including the institution’s participants in this study, who supported the inclusion of service-learning into the school’s mission and into faculty members’ individual professional work. As a result, the university was in stage three of the faculty involvement and support component and the faculty leadership component. CUFM told me service-learning was valued in many academic departments at Charlie University, but service-learning work as a whole was not always viewed favorably during the tenure and review process. Consequently, the institution was in stage two of the faculty and rewards component.

The Rubric’s (Furco, 2006) fifth dimension addressed institutional support for service-learning philosophy. I positioned Charlie University in stage three in all six of this dimension’s categories: coordinating entity, policy making entity, staffing, funding, administrative support, and evaluation and assessment. Charlie University was in stage three of the coordinating entity component because the institution had a physical office where service-learning was institutionalized and a service-learning committee that served as coordinating entities devoted advancing and institutionalizing service-learning. The university’s academic affairs division, student affairs division, and faculty senate service-learning committee developed formal service-learning policies. Thus, the institution was in stage three of the policy-making entity component. The office where service-learning was institutionalized had staff members with appropriate job titles and enough staff members to meet the institution’s service-learning goals. The full-time student affairs educators responsible for service-learning at Charlie University were provided recurring funds and positional power to advance and institutionalize service-learning. Hence, the university was in stage three of the staffing component and the funding component. Charlie University was in stage three of the administrative support category because CUAI, CUAIII, and the strategic plans I collected for this study provided evidence upper-level administrators
understood and supported service-learning. CUAI was responsible for leading the institution’s ongoing systematic effort to account for the number and quality of service-learning opportunities. Consequently, Charlie University was in stage three of the evaluation and assessment component.

The Campus Compact Pyramid (Campus Compact, 2002) was also used to assess Charlie University’s commitment to institutionalizing service-learning. I positioned Charlie University in the advanced intermediate level of the Pyramid. According to the Pyramid’s creators, between 35 and 40 percent of Campus Compact institutions are in the intermediate or advanced intermediate level. Charlie University was in the advanced intermediate level for several reasons. The university’s president and upper-level administrators were very supportive of service-learning and service-learning was aligned with the institution’s mission. Service-learning student outcomes were measured and engaged scholarship had increased at the university throughout the years. Furthermore, each academic department at the institution valued service-learning in varying levels during the tenure and promotion process.

**Delta University**

**Participant Descriptions**

Delta University Administrator (DUA) was the director of the office where service-learning was institutionalized. DUA began serving as the office’s director in 2005 and provided strategic vision for the university’s academic service-learning, co-curricular service-learning, student leadership development, and community engagement programs. The administrator taught a community engagement course and received a Campus Compact state affiliate civic engagement professional of the year award. This award is presented to a staff member at a Campus Compact institution who has worked towards the institutionalization of service,
supported faculty and students involved in community engagement, and formed innovative
campus-community partnerships (Civic Engagement Professional, n.d.).

Delta University Faculty Member (DUFM) had been employed at Delta University for 10
years and taught more than 30 service-learning courses since arriving at the university. DUFM,
whose research is completely focused on service-learning, served as the institution’s service-
learning faculty scholar and its service-learning research scholar. The faculty member also
provided leadership for a program at Delta University designed to prepare students to become
change agents in their communities and in society. DUFM’s active sense of social responsibility
and civic concern earned the faculty member a Delta University community service award.

Service-Learning Documents

A thorough search of Delta University’s website yielded four relevant documents: the
2010-2020 Delta University Strategic Plan, the 2015-2020 Division of Student Affairs Strategic
Plan, the 2013 Academic Service-Learning Faculty Handbook, and the institution’s mission
statement. The 2010-2020 Delta University Strategic Plan was developed by unspecified
professionals at the institution and adopted in 2009 by the university’s Board of Trustees. The
plan was divided into eight themes:

- An unprecedented university commitment to diversity and global engagement
- Supporting a world-class faculty and staff
- Attaining the highest levels of achievement across our academic programs
- Launching strategic and innovative pathways in undergraduate and graduate education
- Stewarding Delta University’s commitment to remain a best-value university
• Developing innovative alumni programs to advance and support the Delta University graduate
• Establishing a national tournament tradition of athletics success along with the highest academic standards for Delta University athletics
• Significantly enhancing Delta University’s campus with premier new academic and residential facilities and a commitment to protecting our environment

The plan’s central purpose was create an environment at the university that engaged students’ minds and inspired them to act as global citizens. Service-learning was referenced in the plan’s introductory paragraphs and in the category focused on the university’s commitment to diversity and global engagement. The pedagogy was cited in the introductory paragraphs, along with study abroad and sustainability programs, as an academic program that has received national recognition for its excellence. In the diversity and global engagement section, service-learning was mentioned as a hallmark of a Delta University education. In order to further institutionalize service-learning, the plan stated institutional representatives should continue to partner with local, regional, national and global communities to create innovative solutions to society’s most pressing problems. The plan did not specifically state which university representatives would continue those partnerships.

The 2015-2020 Division of Student Affairs Strategic Plan was created with input from everyone in Delta University’s Division of Student Affairs. This institutional mission-driven student affairs strategic plan addressed the content in the 2010-2020 Delta University Strategic Plan that was closely associated with the Division of Student Affairs. Student affairs educators throughout the division participated in revising and defining the student affairs strategic plan
plan’s key strategic themes and formulating action strategies to implement the plan. After the key strategic themes were collectively identified, a seven-member strategic plan task force worked with student affairs educators to refine the proposed action strategies and establish deadlines for achieving each action strategy. The associate director in the office where service-learning was institutionalized served on the task force. The plan was structured around six themes: commitment to student success, residential campus initiative, inclusive environment, holistic well-being, positive social change, and world-class division of student affairs.

Service-learning was mentioned in three of the Division of Student Affairs Strategic Plan’s six themes: commitment to student success, inclusive environment, and positive social change. The commitment to student success theme called for student affairs educators to help students understand and transition into, within, and beyond the university. In this theme, the student affairs educators in the office where service-learning was institutionalized were invited to lead two action strategies. First, these student affairs educators were asked to develop a strategy for helping new students find meaningful connections and community during the first three weeks of the fall semester. Second, the student affairs educators in the office where service-learning was institutionalized were charged with promoting integrative learning and critical reflections by helping students meaningfully integrate their curricular and co-curricular experiences into their personal, academic, and professional lives. The inclusive environment theme called for student affairs educators to promote a campus community where everyone could experience inclusion and develop intercultural competence across all identities. The action strategy in this theme invited student affairs educators in the office where service-learning was institutionalized to strengthen students’ introduction to social justice and update social justice
programs through collaborations with student affairs educators in other offices (personal communication, June 15, 2015).

The positive social change theme called for student affairs educators in the office where service-learning was institutionalized to help students demonstrate socially responsible leadership and civic engagement. This theme called charged these student affairs educators with three action strategies: create a framework to engage students in discussions designed to develop students’ understanding of social justice as a process to create positive societal change, infuse in-depth service-learning experiences throughout the division of student affairs by increasing the depth and strength of community partner relationships based on each student affairs office’s needs, and build on Delta University’s commitment to the community by promoting student mindfulness of being good campus citizens. The positive social change theme charged these student affairs educators with more action strategies than any other theme, presumably because part of the theme’s primary focus was civic engagement (personal communication, June 15, 2015).

The 2013 Academic Service-Learning Faculty Handbook was developed by undisclosed authors and designed to assist faculty members who are new to service-learning. Student learning, reflection, community voice, and reciprocity were referenced throughout the handbook. DUA handed me physical copy of the handbook at the conclusion of our interview. An updated copy of the handbook was not available during this study’s data collection period. The handbook was divided into five sections: engagement, academic service-learning, best practices, connecting service-learning, and resources. The engagement section included an overview of the resources offered in the office where service-learning was institutionalized. The student affairs educators in the office offered faculty members logistical support for service-learning courses,
coordinated opportunities for faculty members to collaborate across academic disciplines, and
provided faculty members with access to a variety of other service-learning resources. The
resources specifically mentioned in the handbook included a service-learning faculty listserv, a
service-learning resource library, a service-learning faculty advisory committee, a service-
learning faculty scholars program, and community partner support.

The academic service-learning section consisted of two service-learning definitions, the
difference between service-learning and community service, an explanation of service-learning
pedagogy, and some service-learning cognitive, psychosocial, and academic outcomes. The
service-learning best practices section included principles of good practice for service-learning,
tips for sustaining community collaborations, and best practices for developing a service-learning
course. The connecting service and learning section was intended to help faculty members
prepare students for their service experiences, effectively incorporate reflection activities into a
service-learning course, and assess a service-learning course. The handbook concluded with a
resources section that consisted of links to service-learning listservs and websites and an
extensive list of service-learning books.

The Delta University mission statement included four commitments and was focused on
the significance of student learning. I was unable to determine who authored the mission
statement or when the university adopted the mission statement. The mission’s four
commitments called for the Delta University community to nurture an academic environment
that inspired student engagement and teaching excellence, provided a challenging curriculum,
integrated student learning across academic disciplines, prepared students to be global citizens
motivated by the common good, and fostered an ethic of work and service. Using context clues,
I determined the ethic of service referenced in the mission statement was synonymous with
community and civic engagement. As an academically rigorous and flexible pedagogy, service-learning could be used by Delta University faculty members who want to align their courses with the institution’s mission.

Service-Learning Definition

After interviewing the Delta University participants and reviewing the documents I gathered, I was able to identify the institution’s service-learning definition. According to DUA, Delta University defined academic service-learning as “fundamentally an academic endeavor in which service is an integrated component of a course. It is a credit-bearing, experiential education approach that involves an established community partnership guided by the expertise of professors and community-based practitioners, working together with students to address community needs” (personal communication, June 15, 2015). DUA explained the service-learning definition was created by the administrator’s predecessor and select faculty members who taught service-learning courses at the university. The administrator did not know the process the service-learning definition’s creators went through to finalize the official definition. DUA said Delta University used the term academic service-learning to differentiate it from co-curricular service-learning. Delta University’s official definition was located on the institution’s website and in the 2013 Academic Service-Learning Faculty Handbook.

The Bringle and Hatcher (1995) service-learning definition was also included in the Handbook to supplement the institution’s definition. DUA explained Delta University’s academic service-learning faculty advisory committee was in the process of revising the institution’s official service-learning definition to include co-curricular service learning. DUA and the academic service-learning faculty advisory committee differentiated course-based academic-service-learning from co-curricular service-learning, which occurs independently of a
course. DUA, who was a member of the academic service-learning faculty advisory committee, stated the new official service-learning definition would be developed during the 2015-2016 academic year and would incorporate curricular and co-curricular service-learning.

Faculty Development Practices

Delta University offered faculty members several resources to develop their service-learning instruction abilities. The faculty development opportunities included a service-learning faculty fellows program, an academic service-learning faculty advisory committee, a bi-annual networking lunch, monthly educational brown bag lunches, a service-learning resource library, a service-learning listserv, and service-learning project consultations. According to DUA, Delta University’s provost appointed a small group of faculty members on the university’s academic service-learning faculty advisory committee to serve on an ad-hoc search committee charged with selecting the institution’s faculty fellow. The faculty fellow was responsible for convening the institution’s academic service-learning faculty advisory committee, serving as a resource for faculty members teaching service-learning courses, updating the university’s service-learning faculty handbook, and working with student affairs educators in the office where service-learning was institutionalized to develop service-learning faculty resources. The faculty fellow reported to an associate provost, served a four-year term, received grant funding, and was considered the university’s official service-learning faculty champion.

The academic service-learning faculty advisory committee was charged with further institutionalizing service-learning at Delta University. The committee had 12 members: DUA, a faculty fellow, and 10 faculty representatives representing different academic disciplines. The committee met once a month and was chaired by the faculty fellow. It regularly created resources for faculty members teaching service-learning courses and was responsible for
reviewing service-learning syllabi to determine which courses would receive the university’s service-learning course designation. Designated service-learning courses, which met Delta University’s highest standard of service-learning, were approved by the committee through an application process. DUA stated some service-learning courses at the university did not carry the service-learning course designation and faculty members did not have to apply for the service-learning course designation. The administrator noted the committee would be developing Delta’s University’s new official service-learning definition during the 2015-2016 academic year.

Delta University’s on-campus service-learning networking lunch was held every academic year in the fall semester and the spring semester. The event was coordinated by a student affairs educator and provided faculty members with an opportunity to have in-person conversations with potential community agency representatives. The lunches were open to all faculty members and community organization representatives. DUFM said the following when addressing the service-learning networking lunches:

The [student affairs educator] who plans the networking lunches does an incredible job at connecting faculty with the community…[the student affairs educator] will go with you [faculty member] the first time you meet the community partner. [The student affairs educator] will give you some background information on the organization so you know what you're going into or if you're trying to decide between organizations. If there is a problem, [the student affairs educator] is the one that you want to call because [the student affairs educator] can fix almost anything…[the student affairs educator] has built the relationships with the community, gone to lunch with them, taken real interest in the different community partners having that bridge in that relationship is tremendous, so
when we [Delta University] do have faculty who come and screw up it doesn’t destroy the relationship.

DUA also convened faculty members for monthly educational brown bag lunches. DUA stated student affairs educators collaborated with the faculty fellow to offer lunches where faculty members were able to converse about pre-determined service-learning topics. DUA and DUFM attended the lunches and both participants believe the lunches benefit faculty members teaching service-learning courses.

Student affairs educators also established a service-learning resource library, which was physically located in the office where service-learning was institutionalized. The library was a collection of service-learning and community engagement articles, books, magazines, and videos. In addition, DUA maintained a service-learning faculty listserv and offered collaborative service-learning project consultations. The listserv was designed to share contemporary service-learning research, service-learning anecdotes, and information on upcoming workshops, programs, and conferences related to service-learning with faculty members. DUA collaborated with the faculty fellow and professionals in Delta University’s center for teaching excellence to offer service-learning project consultations. The one-on-one or group consultations often included guidance on how to improve service-learning syllabi, how to structure service-learning courses, how to incorporate reflection into service-learning courses, and how to identify an appropriate community partner.

**Service-Learning Institutionalization**

DUA explained the process Delta University officials went through to institutionalize service-learning in student affairs. The initial service-learning institutionalization efforts were driven by student affairs educators and faculty members working in service-learning enclaves.
In 1995, Delta University upper-level administrators used grant funding to establish an office in the university’s Division of Student Affairs where service-learning, volunteerism, and leadership programs were organizationally housed. Although the office was organizationally housed in student affairs, the Delta University leadership envisioned the service-learning institutionalization process as a joint venture between student affairs and academic affairs. The office was physically housed in Delta University’s student union and one-full-time student affairs educator served as its director. I was not told why the office was placed in the student union, but I assumed it was in the student union because most of the university’s student affairs offices were in the student union. Recurring student affairs dollars were used to fund the director’s salary. In 1997, the office’s director found a donor to endow the office in exchange for the office’s naming rights.

In 1998, the service-learning institutionalization process continued as Delta University went through the SACS reaccreditation process. The accreditation committee assessed the institution’s experiential learning requirement and recommended ways it could be improved. Delta University’s experiential learning requirement included five core experiential learning pedagogies: service-learning, study abroad, research, internships, and leadership. Using the SACS accreditation committee recommendations as a guide, Delta University officials started revising the institution’s approach to each experiential learning pedagogy within the experiential learning requirement as it redesigned the university’s undergraduate curriculum. I was unable to identify the reaccreditation committee’s recommendations for further institutionalizing service-learning, but all the recommendations were implemented collaboratively by the director of the office where service-learning was institutionalized and a faculty member who championed service-learning. DUA indicated collaborations between professional staff members and faculty
members at Delta University were valued and prized. The administrator added service-learning was the first experiential learning pedagogy to create strong faculty and staff partnerships.

In the early 2000s, the office where service-learning was organizationally housed continued to grow. During the 2002-2003 academic year, the office’s director hired a part-time associate director and a part-time community outreach coordinator. Delta University continued to invest in service-learning institutionalization the following academic year by hosting the university’s first AmeriCorps VISTA to work in the office and by officially establishing its service-learning faculty fellow program. According to DUA, the person serving as the office’s director and the person serving as the faculty fellow have collaborated since the faculty fellow program’s inception to deepen and strengthen service-learning in the university’s undergraduate curriculum. DUA described the first service-learning faculty fellow as a highly regarded educator with tremendous interpersonal strengths. The first faculty fellow was given recurring funding from the provost’s office to pay for networking lunches, educational lunches, workshops, and other service-learning initiatives. The administrator credited the first faculty fellow with building the service-learning program’s foundation while including and respecting the office where service-learning was institutionalized.

During the 2004-2005 academic year, the office where service-learning was institutionalized received recurring student affairs funding to hire a full-time assistant director. The office received additional funding the subsequent academic year when Delta University’s advancement office acquired a renewable grant to support the office’s service-learning and community engagement efforts. During the 2005-2006 academic year, DUA began serving as the office’s director and further institutionalized service-learning with assistance from faculty members. DUA partnered with the university’s first service-learning faculty fellow for
approximately five years to further service-learning. Under DUA’s leadership, the academic service-learning advisory committee was established, the service-learning course designation process was formalized, and various service-learning processes, programs, and resources were solidified. Delta University received several national awards for its exemplary service-learning program during the early-to-mid-2000s.

As I was collecting data for this study, the office where service-learning, volunteerism, and leadership programs were housed organizationally remained physically located in Delta University’s student union. The office staff included a full-time director, a full-time associate director, a full-time assistant director, and a part-time assistant director. The VISTA position was eliminated once the office had enough full-time staff to develop and sustain community partnerships. Although the office was organizationally housed in student affairs, DUA reported to an associate vice provost in academic affairs. The office was funded by its endowment and recurring student affairs funds. The service-learning grant the office received during the 2005-2006 academic year had been renewed for 10 years and was used to fund grants given to faculty members teaching service-learning courses. The faculty fellow program continued to receive a recurring budget from the provost’s office, which was often used in ways that benefited the office’s where service-learning was institutionalized.

**Within-Case Analysis**

There was consistency among DUA and DUFM’s responses to questions regarding Delta University’s service-learning institutionalization process. DUA revealed Delta University’s provost and vice president for student affairs firmly believed student affairs educators and faculty members should permanently share responsibility for service-learning. The office’s reporting structure afforded DUA consistent opportunities to converse with the associate vice
provost about service-learning and sustain the student affairs-academic affairs partnership. DUFM stated the university’s president and provost were service-learning advocates who supported service-learning through administrative decisions and speeches to the campus community. The provost’s financial investment in the service-learning faculty fellows program was invaluable to the university’s service-learning efforts. DUFM stated the provost’s visible presence at service-learning events underscores the pedagogy’s importance at the institution.

The Delta University participants in this study and the documents I gathered referenced the same service-learning faculty development opportunities. DUA mentioned student affairs educators in the office where service-learning was institutionalized provided logistical assistance to service-learning course instructors, coordinated faculty collaborations across disciplines, administered service-learning consultations, supplied community partner connections, hosted networking events, monitored a faculty listserv, and curated a service-learning resource library. The aforementioned faculty development opportunities were represented in the 2013 Academic Service-Learning Faculty Handbook. DUA also worked with the service-learning faculty fellow on the service-learning faculty advisory committee. The committee afforded faculty members the opportunity to assume formal roles in the service-learning institutionalization process. DUFM did not utilize most of the office’s resources because service-learning was the faculty member’s expertise. Nevertheless, the faculty member stated the educational lunches, networking lunches, and community partner connections administered by student affairs educators were very beneficial.

Faculty support for service-learning at Delta University was evident throughout the institution. The university’s administration empowered faculty members to use service-learning pedagogy by offering service-learning grants, course development resources, and opportunities
to build relationships with community partners through university-sanctioned events. Faculty members also had the opportunity to serve on the academic service-learning advisory committee and as a service-learning faculty fellow. In addition, DUA stated every academic department at the institution was charged with including service-learning in tenure and promotion policies. The administrator added tenure and promotion committees considered service-learning a pedagogy and counted a faculty members’ service-learning work as part of teaching in tenure and promotion reviews. DUA also acknowledged some academic department valued service-learning more than other departments. DUFM’s response to my question about tenure and promotion reinforced DUA’s response. DUFM was one of very few faculty members teaching service-learning courses in the faculty member’s department, but DUFM’s colleagues supported the faculty member’s use of the pedagogy. Delta University’s requirement to include service-learning in every academic department was significant since faculty members at many institutions resist using service-learning because it is not typically valued during the tenure and promotion process.

Delta University’s institutional mission statement emphasized integrating student learning across the academic disciplines, preparing students to be global citizens, and fostering an ethic of work and service. Service-learning was cited by DUA, the 2010-2020 Delta University Strategic Plan, and the 2015-2020 Division of Student Affairs Strategic Plan as a pedagogy that advanced student learning at the institution. Service-learning’s connection to fostering student learning provided evidence the pedagogy can be used to support the institution’s mission. DUA explained that strengthening service-learning had been an institutional priority for at least 15 years because of the pedagogy’s impact on student learning and community engagement. Delta University’s 2010-2020 Strategic Plan called for the
The planned integration of service-learning throughout the institution’s academic disciplines was guided by the institutional mission’s call for integrating learning across disciplines. Additionally, service-learning’s placement in the 2010-2010 Strategic Plan’s diversity and global engagement section was meaningful because the plan’s primary purpose was to exhibit how the institution intended to engage students’ minds and inspire them to act as global citizens. The connection between service-learning and global engagement in the 2010-2010 Strategic Plan provided further evidence service-learning could be used as a conduit for the plan’s central purpose.

The mission statement was also included in the Division of Student Affairs Strategic Plan and was employed, in part, by student affairs educators to construct the plan. The student affairs strategic plan charged student affairs educators in the office where service-learning was institutionalized with promoting integrative learning and critical reflections by helping students meaningfully integrate their curricular and co-curricular experiences. The inclusion of student learning in the student affairs strategic plan showed Delta University’s student affairs educators were committed to making meaningful contributions to student learning.

The Delta University participants in this study had different opinions on service-learning’s organizational placement at the university. Prior to arriving at Delta University, DUA directed a service-learning office organizationally housed in academic affairs. DUA admitted being concerned about service-learning being organizationally housed in student affairs at Delta University because the administrator was unsure if a student affairs office would receive sufficient provost and faculty support. DUA’s concerns were alleviated when the administrator found there was a culture of amicable student affairs-academic affairs collaborations that would yield provost support. The administrator believed service-learning should be housed
organizationally in student affairs at Delta University with assistance from academic affairs.

DUA expounded on that belief by saying the following:

I think we're [student affairs educators and faculty members] stronger together and I think it's [the office where service-learning is organizationally housed] a one-stop shop for the community. They [community members] know that we're the hub and whatever their needs are, whether it’s I need general student volunteers or I want to work with an academic service-learning course, this is the place that they come. But it is always possible that [service-learning] could be divided out [to another organizational placement]. We [student affairs educators and faculty members] feel very strongly that we benefit from a coordinated effort.

I was unable to determine why service-learning was initially institutionalized in student affairs. However, DUA’s reasoning for keeping service-learning in student affairs led me to deduce service-learning was originally housed in student affairs and linked with volunteerism to create a community engagement hub for students. DUFM offered a slightly different opinion regarding service-learning’s organizational placement in student affairs. The faculty member stated service-learning should be institutionalized where the pedagogy would receive the most administrative and financial support. DUFM added the person or people responsible for service-learning should have support from the university’s president and the autonomy to make decisions related to service-learning initiatives. The faculty member favored a dual-reporting structure where the director of the office where service-learning was housed reported directly to the vice president for student affairs and the provost.
**Service-learning institutionalization assessment tools.** I used the Furco Rubric (Furco, 2006) and the Campus Compact Pyramid (Campus Compact, 2002) to assess Delta University’s commitment to institutionalizing service-learning. The Rubric’s first dimension was centered on an institution’s service-learning philosophy and mission. Delta University was in stage three of the definition of service-learning component, the strategic planning component, the alignment with institutional mission component, and the alignment with educational reforms component. I positioned the university in stage three of the definition of service-learning component because it had a formal university accepted service-learning definition that was consistently used to operationalize service-learning. Delta University was in stage three of the strategic planning component because short-term and long-term service-learning institutionalization goals were included in the 2010-2020 Delta University Strategic Plan and the 2015-2020 Division of Student Affairs Strategic Plan. Service-learning was a priority at the university, in part because the pedagogy’s principles were extensively aligned with the school’s mission. Therefore, I positioned the institution in stage three of the alignment with institutional mission category. Delta University was positioned in stage three of the alignment with educational reforms category due to service-learning’s formal connection with the university’s high profile experiential education efforts.

The Furco Rubric’s (Furco, 2006) second dimension was concerned with faculty support for and involvement in service-learning. I placed Delta University in stage three for all four of the dimension’s components: faculty awareness, faculty involvement and support, faculty leadership, and faculty incentives and rewards. I placed the university in stage three of the faculty awareness component because I presumed there were more than five faculty members on the academic service-learning advisory committee who knew how service-learning was defined
and how it differed from other forms of community engagement. DUA estimated approximately 45 faculty members taught service-learning courses each academic year at the university. Delta University was positioned in stage three of the faculty involvement and support component and the faculty leadership component due to the number of faculty members annually teaching service-learning courses at the institution combined with the presence of a faculty fellows program and an academic-service-learning advisory committee. The university was positioned in stage three of the faculty incentives and rewards component because the institution offered service-learning grants and because tenure and promotion committees in every academic department were required to consider service-learning during tenure and promotion reviews.

The Rubric’s (Furco, 2006) fifth dimension addressed institutional support for service-learning philosophy. I positioned Delta University in stage three in all six of this dimension’s components. Delta University was positioned in stage three of the coordinating entity component because it had an office primarily devoted to advancing and institutionalizing service-learning. The university was positioned in stage three of the policy-making entity component because its academic service-learning advisory committee developed and implemented formal service-learning policies. The office where service-learning was housed organizationally appeared to have the appropriate number of full-time staff members with the skills needed to help advance and institutionalize service-learning at the university. Consequently, I positioned the institution in stage three of the staffing component. Delta University was positioned in stage three of the funding component because the campus’s service-learning activities were primarily supported by recurring institutional funding. The institution’s president, provost, and vice president for student affairs understood and actively supported service-learning. I positioned the university in stage three of the administrative support
component because of its upper-level administrators were service-learning advocates who prioritized the pedagogy and helped make it visible to the campus community. Delta University was positioned in stage three of the evaluation and assessment component because the student affairs educators in the office where service-learning was institutionalized had an established systematic effort to account for the number and quality of service-learning activities.

The Campus Compact Pyramid (Campus Compact, 2002) was also used to assess Delta University’s commitment to institutionalizing service-learning. I positioned Delta University in the advanced level of the Pyramid for several reasons. First, service-learning was widespread and valued across academic disciplines. Second, service-learning was formally recognized during tenure and promotion reviews in every academic department. Third, upper-level administrators supported the university’s mutually beneficial service-learning partnerships. Finally, service-learning and other forms of community engagement were aligned with the Delta University mission.

Echo University

Participant Descriptions

Echo University Administrator (EUA) was director of the office where service-learning was institutionalized for eight years. EUA provided support and direction for an office committed to facilitating service-learning, domestic study away, peer leadership, and sophomore-year experiences. The administrator also taught service-learning first-year experience courses, served as the institution’s Campus Compact campus coordinator, and received several awards from the university’s Division of Student Affairs. Echo University Faculty Member (EUFM) began teaching courses at the university in 2001 as an adjunct instructor and returned to the university in 2005 as a full-time senior instructor. EUFM started
teaching service-learning courses in 2008 after receiving a service-learning grant. The faculty member taught at least one service-learning course each academic year between the 2007-2008 academic year and the 2014-2015 academic year. In addition, EUFM received three teaching excellence awards from the Echo University administration.

**Service-Learning Documents**

A thorough search of Echo University’s website yielded five relevant documents: the 2011 Echo University Strategic Plan, the 2011 Echo University QEP, the university’s mission statement, the 2014-2015 Service-Learning Overview, and a service-learning faculty resource list. During the 2011-2012 academic year, Echo University’s strategic plan was created by a committee comprised of upper-level administrators in academic affairs, student affairs educators, professors, alumni, and students. The plan had an undetermined duration, included seven focus areas, and was designed to guide the institution’s decision making. Community engagement was one of the seven focus areas and service-learning was highlighted within the community engagement area as an institutional priority. The community engagement area also referenced Echo University’s commitment to sustaining university-community partnerships and expanding community engaged learning opportunities for its students. In order to strengthen university-community partnerships, the plan’s authors listed five community engagement goals: develop service-learning opportunities and courses, create connections with people in local and international communities, increase students’ life-long commitment and involvement in the community, develop engaging and educational outreach programs that inspire various communities, and expand the use of university resources to advance access to creative community performances. Service-learning courses and opportunities were offered at the Echo University prior to 2009 so I was a little surprised the plan did not clearly call for an increase in
service-learning courses. Nevertheless, service-learning’s inclusion in the strategic plan provided evidence the pedagogy was an institutional priority.

Echo University’s 2011 QEP contained an in-depth explanation of how the document was created. In 2009, Echo University officials began developing the 2011 QEP during the institution’s SACS reaccreditation process. A broad range of upper-level administrators, faculty members, student affairs educators, and students contributed to the creation of the plan through student government meetings, faculty senate meetings, and other university-sanctioned forums. In 2010, a 15-member QEP committee was formed and charged with developing a QEP informed by the campus community’s feedback and the university’s institutional mission. The committee’s membership involved seven faculty members representing different academic disciplines, three staff members, one undergraduate student, and four upper-level administrators including the vice president for student affairs. Echo University’s president worked with the QEP committee to consolidate the QEP contributions provided by campus constituents, created a five-year implementation timeline for the plan, developed a budget for implementing the plan, and solidified the plan’s student learning outcomes, student performance assessments, institutional objectives, criteria for success, and processes for evaluation.

The QEP committee decided integrative learning would be the QEP’s overarching focus. In 2011, the final version of the QEP was published. The 2011 QEP was organized into 11 sections and represented the university’s pledge to encourage students to intentionally engage in a broad array of within and beyond the classroom experiences. The QEP revealed integrative learning would be an institution-wide commitment focusing on four core areas: service-learning, leadership, global engagement, and research. According to the plan, the overall goal of the QEP was to help students become lifelong learners capable of effectively integrating their knowledge
and skills in personal and professional contexts. In order to help the university realize its QEP goal, the QEP committee established a timeline for the creation of an on-campus office dedicated to coordinating all the university’s beyond the classroom experiences and the enhancement of integrative learning and assessment. Echo’s University vice president for student affairs and its provost were listed as the administrators responsible for supervising the aforementioned office’s director.

Service-learning was cited throughout the QEP as one of the plan’s core areas. Service-learning was considered a form of integrative learning that aided student learning within a traditional classroom context and in the university’s surrounding community. Although specific numbers were not cited, Echo University’s 2010 National Survey for Student Engagement results (NSSE) were referenced in the plan as evidence the institution was doing a good job promoting service-learning. A number of student affairs offices and academic affairs units were mentioned in the plan as service-learning facilitators. The office where service-learning was institutionalized was listed in the QEP as one of the primary offices responsible for facilitating service-learning and integrative learning. The institution’s living and learning communities were named as a place where integrative learning occurred through service-learning opportunities, study abroad experiences, and undergraduate research. Echo University’s center for teaching excellence was charged in the QEP with offering faculty members service-learning workshops and seminars. In addition, the office coordinating the institution’s first-year experience program planned to incorporate service-learning into select first-year experience courses. The QEP revealed all of the aforementioned student affairs offices and academic units were required to report their service-learning activity to the office created by the QEP committee to coordinate integrative learning opportunities.
Echo University’s institutional mission statement was written by an unspecified author and approved by the university’s governing board in 2010. According to the document, Echo University had a responsibility to promote the dissemination of knowledge, cultural enrichment, and an enhanced quality of life. Although community engagement was addressed in the mission statement, the majority of the document championed the institution’s teaching and research efforts. The document listed the degree programs offered at Echo University and acknowledged the university’s commitment to teaching excellence through traditional classroom instruction and distance learning. The mission statement also detailed the university’s high research activity, which had a large economic impact on the state where the institution is located. However, the mission statement did not provide any specific information on how Echo University’s pledge to community engagement was realized at the institution or how community engagement contributed to the campus community.

The 2014-2015 Service-Learning Overview was authored by EUA and the assistant director in the office where service-learning was institutionalized. EUA mentioned the office where service-learning was institutionalized published a service-learning overview every year since the 2009-2010 academic year. The document was published in May 2015 and served as an assessment of the service-learning courses offered at Echo University during the 2014-2015 academic year. According to the overview, the student affairs educators in the office where service-learning is institutionalized identified 98 service-learning course sections, which represented a 12% increase in the number of sections offered during the 2013-2014 academic year. The university’s service-learning courses were featured in 30 different academic departments representing all but one of the institution’s colleges and schools.
The 2014-2015 Service-Learning Overview also included quantitative and qualitative pre-and post-course service-learning survey results. The quantitative results revealed 93 percent of the students agreed or strongly agreed their service-learning course improved the community, 71 percent of the students agreed or strongly agreed volunteerism/community service was an integral part of their life up to this point, and 71 percent of the students agreed or strongly agreed they were aware of volunteer opportunities within the community where Echo University is located. The qualitative results revealed many students believed their service-learning course experience helped them develop a strong connection to their local community and provided them with first-hand experiences that helped them understand their course material. EUA explained the service-learning overview was conducted annually and published on the institutionalized service-learning office’s website.

In 2010, EUA and the assistant director in the office where service-learning was institutionalized created a list of their service-learning faculty development resources. The document included a detailed description of three resources: a service-learning handbook and faculty resource guide, a community partner service-learning handbook and resource guide, and a service-learning newsletter. The service-learning handbook and faculty resource guide was written in 2010 by EUA and the assistant director in the institutionalized service-learning office. The document was described on the faculty development resource list as a tool for Echo University faculty and instructors who have not been involved in service-learning. The service-learning handbook was a comprehensive service-learning pedagogy introduction, course development instructions, reflection activities, and steps to initiate and sustain community partnerships.
The community partner service-learning handbook and resource guide was also written in 2010 by EUA and the assistant director in the institutionalized service-learning office. EUA explained the community partner service-learning handbook and resource guide was created to provide community agency representatives with guide to enable successful service-learning partnerships and experiences. The community partner service-learning handbook and resource guide included a brief service-learning pedagogy introduction and information on what community agency representatives should consider throughout the duration of a service-learning partnership. I could not locate an electronic copy of the service-learning handbook or the community partner handbook on Echo University’s website. EUA explained the publications had not been updated in a few years and were no longer being given to faculty members teaching service-learning courses. According to EUA, the assistant director in the office where service-learning was institutionalized was in the process of updating both handbooks. The service-learning listserv and newsletter were established in 2010. EUA stated the electronic newsletter was distributed bi-weekly to Echo University service-learning listserv subscribers. The newsletter was described on the faculty development resource list as a document that provided faculty members with university service-learning updates, professional development events, and service-learning grant and award information. EUA admitted the service-learning newsletter may be discontinued because the newsletter’s open rate was relatively low.

Service-Learning Definition

In 2007, the creation of Echo University’s official service-learning definition coincided with the construction of the university’s institutionalized service-learning office. Echo University’s service-learning definition was developed by EUA and a graduate assistant in the office where service-learning was institutionalized. The service-learning definition was
informed by Youth Service California’s (2006) seven elements of high quality service-learning: integrated learning, high quality service, collaboration, student voice, civic responsibility, reflection, and evaluation. These seven elements were intended to serve as a framework for evaluating service-learning. EUA and the graduate assistant adapted Youth Service California’s elements for their office’s purposes and developed six Echo University service-learning hallmarks: integrated learning, robust community service, collaborative development and management, community responsibility, contemplation, and evaluation and discourse.

EUA clarified what each Echo University service-learning hallmark meant during our interview. The integrated learning hallmark called for the learning goals associated with the service project in a service-learning course to align with the course’s academic content. The high quality service hallmark was described as service that responds to a community recognized need. The collaboration hallmark was characterized by mutually beneficial university-community collaborations. The student voice hallmark was created to ensure students actively participate in choosing service projects, planning service-learning reflection activities, and celebrating service related accomplishments. The civic responsibility hallmark was intended to promote a campus culture where students are motivated to care for and contribute to the community. The reflection hallmark emphasized the importance of using reflection before, during, and after a service-learning project to establish connections between students’ service experiences and a course’s academic content. The evaluation hallmark called for all participants in university-community collaborations to measure progress toward service-learning course goals. The six hallmarks instituted by EUA and the graduate assistant were consistent with several service-learning course principles, including reflection, reciprocity, and community voice.
EUA and the graduate assistant constructed Echo University’s service-learning definition using the six service-learning hallmarks as a guide. Service-learning was defined as the institution as “a form of active learning that integrates meaningful community service with academic coursework and purposeful reflection in an effort to create an out of the classroom experience that enhances academics and benefits the community and students involved” (personal communication, August 5, 2015). According to EUA, the service-learning definition was used by the office where service-learning was institutionalized to explain service-learning to the campus community and to evaluate service-learning courses. Although this definition served as the university’s official service-learning definition, I was surprised it was not located in any of the documents I analyzed for this study.

**Faculty Development Practices**

The Echo University participants in this study shared a number of the faculty development resources offered by the office where service-learning was institutionalized. EUA explained the office provided faculty members and instructors with an array of service-learning resources. The administrator mentioned the office where service-learning was institutionalized annually partnered with the university center for teaching excellence to offer several workshops. The workshops typically focused on incorporating reflection into service-learning courses and introducing service-learning pedagogy to new faculty members and instructors. Student affairs educators also partnered with the integrative learning coordinating office referenced in the 2011 QEP to offer service-learning course development grants and integrative learning grants. EUA explained the grants were primarily used to pilot service-learning courses in several academic disciplines.
In regards to assessment, student affairs educators administered pre-post service-learning surveys to students in service-learning courses and coordinated an ad hoc service-learning faculty advisory board. The service-learning surveys asked students close-ended and open-ended questions about their service-learning course experiences. Faculty members received the survey results connected to their respective service-learning courses. The service-learning faculty advisory board met once or twice each academic year to share service-learning assessment data and to discuss faculty perspectives on service-learning. The office where service-learning was organizationally housed also hosted an annual community partner breakfast, which was designed to connect community agency representatives, faculty members, student affairs educators, and students who were dedicated to improving the community where the university was located. EUA explained this networking event spawned several service-learning partnerships.

EUFM’s perspective on Echo University’s service-learning faculty resources was favorable. The faculty member was an experienced service-learning instructor who did not utilize most of the faculty development resources. However, EUFM appreciated the pre-post service-learning surveys administered by student affairs educators, the connections with community agencies facilitated by student affairs educators, and the funding for service-learning courses offered jointly by Echo University’s center for teaching excellence and the institutionalized service-learning office. EUFM explained the pre-post service-learning surveys were very important because they let the faculty member know what impact the service component of the course had on student learning. The faculty member allowed student affairs educators in the office where service-learning was institutionalized to administer the surveys every semester the faculty member taught a service-learning course. EUFM also valued the partnerships EUA was able to facilitate for the faculty member’s service-learning courses. The
faculty member usually taught four courses a semester and did not have time to identify a community agency for service-learning courses. EUA was able to identify an appropriate community partner for EUFM every semester the faculty member taught a service-learning course.

Echo University awarded some faculty members funding to teach service-learning courses. EUFM received a $3500 service-learning grant from Echo University’s center for teaching excellence and the office where service-learning was institutionalized. The grant funded the faculty member’s first service-learning course. EUFM received $1750 an academic year for two academic years to teach a service-learning course. In addition to the funding, EUFM and the other grant recipients attended five or six service-learning workshops presented by EUA and educators in the university’s center for teaching excellence. The workshops afforded grant recipients opportunities to learn more about service-learning pedagogy and other service-learning courses being taught at the institution.

**Service-Learning Institutionalization**

EUA provided me with a detailed explanation of Echo University’s service-learning institutionalization process. The administrator’s perspective was supported by the 2011 Echo University strategic plan and the university’s 2011 Echo University QEP. According to EUA, the service-learning institutionalization process began in 2006 when Echo University’s provost formed a task force to explore service-learning. The task force, which was chaired by two faculty members, worked with the university’s faculty and staff to collect service-learning recommendations to give the provost. The faculty and staff universally recommended the formation of a service-learning support office. In 2007, Echo University’s provost and vice president for student affairs reorganized the university’s division of academic affairs and its
division of student affairs. The upper-level administrators agreed to move offices previously in academic affairs into student affairs and to create a new office in the division of student affairs to advance student learning. The new office established during the reorganization institutionalized four high impact practices: service-learning, peer leadership, sophomore programs, and domestic study away. The office was physically located among residence halls and received funding from student activity fees, state appropriated funds, and auxiliary funds.

EUA was hired in 2007 and charged with further institutionalizing each of the office’s high impact practices. The initial staff in the office included four employees: one full-time director, one full-time coordinator, and two part-time graduate assistants. The coordinator was responsible for peer leadership, sophomore programs, and domestic study away initiatives. One of the graduate assistants had experience working in a service-learning office and the other graduate assistant previously coordinated service-learning efforts at a Campus Compact state-affiliate’s headquarters. EUA worked with the graduate assistants to identify service-learning resources, create a service-learning definition, track service-learning course data, and develop service-learning resources for faculty members. Within the same year, Echo University became a founding member of its Campus Compact state-affiliate and the university’s center for teaching excellence began offering service-learning workshops and faculty support groups.

Echo University continued its service-learning institutionalization process during the 2008-2009 academic year. Throughout the 2008-2009 academic year, EUA and the student affairs educators in the office hosted the office’s inaugural community partner breakfast, added an AmeriCorps VISTA to the office’s staff, and published the office’s first faculty service-learning manual and resource guide. EUA said the addition of the VISTA to the staff helped the office strengthen its relationship with community agency representatives. Later in the 2008-
2009 academic year, the university’s center for teaching excellence began offering service-
learning course grants and several of the university’s first-year experience courses included a
service-learning component for the first time. EUFM was one of the inaugural faculty recipients
of the aforementioned service-learning course grant. During the 2010-2011 and 2011-2012
academic years, service-learning began appearing in Echo University’s strategic planning
documents. Echo University officials went through the SACS reaccreditation process during the
2010-2011 academic year. The reaccreditation process resulted in the development of the
university’s 2011 QEP, which was an institution-wide commitment focused on four core areas:
service-learning, leadership, global engagement, and research. Echo University published its
most recent strategic plan during the 2011-2012 academic year and community engagement was
listed as one of the institution’s priorities. Service-learning was explicitly mentioned in the
strategic plan as a pedagogy that could be used to help the institution realize its commitment to
community engagement.

The office where service-learning was institutionalized experienced staffing and physical
location changes during the 2012-2013 academic year. EUA hired an assistant director to help
further service-learning at the university and the office’s physical location moved to a building
near Echo University’s student union. The move was made to accommodate the staff’s growth
and to position the office closer to the university’s student union. At the conclusion of this
study’s data collection period, the office where service-learning is institutionalized included
seven employees: one-full-time director, one full-time assistant director, one full-time
coordinator, a full-time VISTA, and three graduate assistants. The office remained funded by
student activity fees, state appropriated funds, and auxiliary funds. During the 2015-2016
academic year, EUA wanted to gain upper-administrative support for a service-learning course
designation. The course designation would make it easier for students and academic advisors to identify service-learning courses and help student affairs educators in the office where service-learning was institutionalized track service-learning courses.

**Within-Case Analysis**

The Echo University participants’ interview responses and the service-learning information found in the Echo University documents gathered for this study shared several similarities. EUA stated service-learning received consistent support from upper-level administrators. According to EUA, Echo University’s president was an advocate for service-learning who periodically met with the administrator to discuss the institution’s Campus Compact involvement. The administrator added Echo University’s president vocally advocated for service-learning by including the pedagogy’s positive impact on the campus community in public addresses. Moreover, EUA explained the university’s provost created a faculty-led task force during the initial service-learning institutionalization stages and charged the task force’s co-chairs with gathering suggestions on how to advance service-learning at the institution. The provost did not actualize the recommendations, but the task force’s work provided evidence there was support for service-learning. Support for service-learning was also evidenced in the joint decision by the provost and vice president for student affairs to establish a physical service-learning support office. EUFM mentioned the university’s president supported service-learning by attending on-campus service-learning events, but asserted other upper-level administrators seemed ambivalent about service-learning. However, EUA’s assertion that service-learning received upper-administrative support was corroborated by Echo University’s 2011 strategic plan and the Echo University’s 2011 QEP. The university’s president, provost, and vice president for
student affairs were involved in the creation of the aforementioned documents, which clearly support service-learning.

The interview and document data collected indicated there was faculty support for service-learning at the university. Faculty members co-chaired the university’s original service-learning task force and recommended the creation of a service-learning support office. Faculty members also favored service-learning during the development of Echo University’s 2011 strategic plan and Echo University’s 2011 QEP. During the 2014-2015 academic year, faculty members collectively taught 98 service-learning course sections in 30 different academic departments. Service-learning courses were offered in all but one of the university’s colleges and schools. Although the number of faculty members teaching service-learning was not tracked at Echo University, the number of service-learning course sections offered throughout the institution’s colleges and schools indicated there was campus-wide faculty support for service-learning. Moreover, faculty support for service-learning was found in the cohort of faculty members who received two-year service-learning course grants and in faculty attendance at the institutionalized service-learning office’s community partner breakfast. The data I collected also provided a little evidence Echo University’s mission statement impacted service-learning at the institution. The university’s mission statement casually addressed community engagement and did not explicitly mention service-learning. EUA, however, stated the university’s mission statement was used to create the institution’s official service-learning definition.

The Echo University participants were pleased with service-learning’s organizational placement in student affairs. EUA explained service-learning was positioned well in student affairs because student affairs educators have a more holistic perspective on student learning than most faculty members. The administrator added the aforementioned holistic perspective
guided student affairs educators as they used service-learning to promote student learning within and outside of traditional classroom settings. EUA explained by stating the following:

I think that it [a holistic perspective on student learning] gives us [student affairs educators] a degree of understanding what is happening both on the volunteer side which has been clearly situated in student affairs for over the past 30 years as well as the ability to communicate with our academic colleagues. It [a holistic perspective on student learning] also gives us the ability to talk about service on a continuum from the entry point of maybe a volunteer experience through a service-learning course that is offered.

EUFM believed the student affairs educators responsible for service-learning at the university did an exceptional job coordinating the institution’s service-learning efforts. The faculty member appreciated student affairs educators for always being willing and able to assist with anything related to service-learning course development. EUFM added service-learning could be faculty-led and institutionalized in academic affairs at Echo University, but the faculty member did not think service-learning needed to be moved to academic affairs since student affairs educators were exceedingly proficient service-learning administrators.

EUA provided a nuanced response when asked if service-learning’s organizational placement mattered at Echo University. The administrator acknowledged student affairs educators will never hold complete authority over service-learning because incorporating service-learning into a course is ultimately a faculty decision. The administrator also admitted student affairs educators at Echo University have struggled to increase service-learning’s value in each department’s tenure and promotion process. EUA believed moving service-learning from student affairs to academic affairs would make sense at the university if the move to academic affairs meant service-learning criteria would be included in each academic
department’s tenure and promotion process. Nevertheless, EUA maintained service-learning was thriving in student affairs at Echo University. The administrator attributed the university’s flourishing service-learning efforts to student affairs-academic affairs collaborations that have yielded mutual respect for what each group brings to the institution. More specifically, EUA argued service-learning can be organizationally housed in student affairs because many student affairs educators have earned credibility among their faculty counterparts by demonstrating service-learning’s effectiveness through service-learning resources and assessment driven practices.

The beginning of Echo University’s service-learning institutionalization process was very important. Service-learning was formally institutionalized at the university less than a decade ago. The commonly accepted view within the service-learning literature prior to the formation of the institution’s service-learning support office was service-learning should be organizationally housed in academic affairs. Despite this prevailing belief, Echo University’s provost and vice president for student affairs agreed to institutionalize an office to support service-learning in student affairs. The upper-level administrators could have elected to create a service-learning office in academic affairs where most authors producing service-learning literature believe service-learning offices should be organizationally placed. The decision to institutionalize service-learning in student affairs provided evidence the university’s upper-level administrators trusted student affairs educators to lead the university’s service-learning efforts.

**Service-learning institutionalization assessment tools.** I used the Furco Rubric (Furco, 2006) and the Campus Compact Pyramid (Campus Compact, 2002) to assess Echo University’s commitment to institutionalizing service-learning. The Rubric’s first dimension was centered on an institution’s service-learning philosophy and mission. Echo University was in stage three of
the definition of service-learning component, the strategic planning component, the alignment with institutional mission component, and the alignment with educational reforms component. Echo University was positioned in stage three of the definition of service-learning component because the institution had a formal service-learning definition used consistently by the campus community to operationalize many service-learning efforts. The university was positioned in stage three of the strategic planning component because short-term and long-term service-learning goals were present in the institution’s 2011 strategic plan and its 2011 QEP. Similarly, Echo University was positioned in stage three of the alignment with institutional mission component since service-learning was included in the university’s strategic planning. EUA explained service-learning was grouped with three high impact practices at the university: peer leadership, sophomore programs, and domestic study away. Service-learning’s connection to Echo University’s high profile efforts was the reason the institution was placed in stage three of the alignment with educational reform efforts component.

The Furco Rubric’s (Furco, 2006) second dimension was concerned with faculty support for and involvement in service-learning. Echo University was in stage three of the faculty awareness component, the faculty involvement and support component, and the faculty leadership component. The university was in stage two of the faculty incentives and rewards component. There were 98 service-learning course sections offered at the university during the 2014-2015 academic year. Based on the number of service-learning courses sections offered during the aforementioned academic year, I concluded a substantial number of faculty members had a thorough understanding of service-learning. Therefore, I positioned the university in stage three of the faculty awareness component. I positioned the institution in stage three of the faculty involvement and support component because faculty service-learning advocacy was
demonstrated through the service-learning task force, the number of service-learning course sections offered during the 2014-2015 academic year, and the faculty cohort that received service-learning course development grants. Echo University was positioned in stage three of the faculty leadership component because there was a highly respected, influential group of faculty members at the institution who served as the campus’s service-learning leaders. I positioned the university in stage two of the faculty incentives and rewards component because faculty use of service-learning pedagogy was seldom rewarded in tenure and promotion processes or incentivized in most academic departments.

The Rubric’s (Furco, 2006) fifth dimension addressed institutional support for service-learning philosophy. I positioned Echo University in stage three in all six of this dimension’s components. The university was in stage three of the coordinating entity component because the institution had a coordinating entity in the form of a centralized office devoted primarily to the advancement and institutionalization of service-learning. Service-learning was formally recognized as an essential educational goal in the Echo University’s 2011 strategic plan and 2011 QEP. Consequently, I positioned the university in stage three of the policy-making entity component. Echo University was in stage three of the staffing component and the funding component because the office where serving-learning was institutionalized received recurring funding and was staffed by student affairs educators who had the skills to help advance and institutionalize service-learning. The university’s president, provost, and vice president for student affairs actively worked to make service-learning an important part of the campus’s work, which was why I positioned the institution in stage three of the administrative support component. Echo University was placed in stage three of the evaluation and assessment component because the office where service-learning was institutionalized published an annual
service-learning overview that documented the university’s systematic effort to assess service-
learning activities.

The Campus Compact Pyramid (Campus Compact, 2002) was also used to assess Echo
University’s commitment to institutionalizing service-learning. I positioned Echo University in
the intermediate level of the Pyramid. According to the Pyramid’s creators, between 35 and 40
percent of Campus Compact institutions were in the intermediate or advanced intermediate level.
Echo University was in the intermediate advanced level for several reasons. The university’s
president and provost were service-learning advocates and service-learning course quality and
impact was measured. The institution has a physical office faculty members could visit to
receive assistance with their service-learning courses and the student affairs educators in the
office had strong relationships with community agency representatives. Student affairs educators
working in the office where service-learning was institutionalized also offered several resources
designed to help faculty members design service-learning courses.

**Foxtrot University**

**Participant Descriptions**

Foxtrot University Administrator (FUA) was employed at Foxtrot University for six
years and served as co-director of the office where service-learning was institutionalized. Prior
to serving as co-director, FUA worked in a Foxtrot University student affairs office where the
administrator coordinated the institution’s volunteerism efforts. In addition to FUA’s co-director
duties, the administrator served as the university’s Campus Compact campus coordinator and
contributed to the student affairs profession as president-elect of a regional student affairs
organization. Foxtrot University Faculty Member (FUFM) was also employed at Foxtrot
University for six years and served the institution in two official capacities. FUFM served as a
faculty member and as the other co-director of the office where service-learning was institutionalized at the university. The faculty member’s research was focused on civic education, community involvement, neighborhood engagement, and livable communities in the state where Foxtrot University is located.

**Service-Learning Documents**

A thorough search of Echo University’s website yielded four documents: the 2009-2014 Foxtrot University Strategic Plan, 2014-2017 Foxtrot University Strategic Plan, a fall 2015 Foxtrot University magazine article on service-learning, and the university’s mission statement. The 2009-2014 Foxtrot University Strategic Plan was written by unspecified university officials and published during the 2009-2010 academic year. The plan included the university’s institutional vision statement, the university’s institutional mission, six strategic goals, and an array of strategic objectives for each goal. The document’s authors did not specify the relationship between Foxtrot University’s mission statement and the strategic plan’s strategic goals and objectives. The strategic goals listed in the document focused on six key areas: student success, engagement and inclusion, excellence in academia, institutional stature, enrollment management, and operational excellence, management, and accountability. Service-learning’s sole mention in the strategic plan was found in one of the engagement and inclusion goal’s strategic objectives. The engagement and inclusion strategic goal was centered on developing engaged campus communities in the city where Foxtrot University is located. The strategic objective dedicated to service-learning stated the university would like to create a variety of service-learning opportunities which appeal to a variety of student interests. The document did not include information on who would create the service-learning opportunities, how the opportunities would be created, or how the strategic objective would be assessed.
The 2014-2017 Foxtrot University Strategic Plan was developed by fifty of the university’s employees who met in focus groups during the 2013-2014 academic year. The focus groups were comprised of upper-level administrators, faculty members, and student affairs educators. Foxtrot University’s commitment to shared governance was highlighted in document’s opening paragraphs and reflected in the diversity of the focus groups. FUA contributed to the strategic plan’s development as a member of a focus group. According to the document, focus groups used the university’s institutional mission as a guide to discuss the institution’s identity, priorities, and practices. Focus group members created the three-year strategic plan in four months and divided the plan into four categories: student success, excellence in teaching and learning, community engagement, and institutional effectiveness. Each strategic plan area was comprised of goals and objectives for each goal. Foxtrot University’s board of trustees approved the final draft of the strategic plan during the fall 2014 semester.

Service-learning was referenced in the strategic plan’s excellence in teaching and learning area and the community engagement area. The excellence in teaching and learning area called for Foxtrot University faculty members to pursue the highest level of instruction, to actively engage in scholarship, and to benefit their profession and their community. The excellence in teaching and learning area included four goals: increase the capacity and effectiveness of academic enrichment programs, align instruction with the needs of 21st century learners, increase opportunities and support for faculty and staff professional development, and enhance the curriculum. The capacity and effectiveness of academic enrichment programs goal had an objective dedicated to the university’s plan to establish service-learning as a signature experience for the institution’s students. Service-learning, study abroad, and honors college
programs were listed within the aforementioned strategic plan goal as essential academic enrichment programs. Service-learning was also mentioned in the community engagement area. The community engagement area expressed Foxtrot University’s desire to strengthen its relationships with community agency representatives and local business leaders in an effort to address community needs and realize the university’s mission. The community engagement area included three goals: increase community engagement, expand the reach and impact of community-engaged research, and expand the reach and impact of the university’s athletic programs. Service-learning, translational research, and engaged scholarship were listed in the community engagement area as valued institutional practices. The 2014-2017 strategic plan included more service-learning related strategies than the 2009-2014 strategic plan. The increase in service-learning plans found in the university’s most strategic plan provided evidence the pedagogy had become an institutional priority.

Foxtrot University published a quarterly online and in-print magazine that focused on the university’s student, faculty, and staff accomplishments. The magazine’s fall 2015 issue included an article on the institution’s new service-learning and community engagement office written by the university’s assistant vice president for university communications and media contact. According to the article, the office began operations during the summer 2015 semester. Service-learning courses were offered at the institution prior to the office’s existence. The article provided Foxtrot University student accounts of service-learning’s benefits, the office’s purpose, and quotes from FUA, FUFM, and the university’s senior vice president for academic affairs. The two students quoted in the article explained how the service they conducted in service-learning courses allowed them to gain invaluable real-world experience and helped them learn the importance of fostering reciprocal relationships with community agency representatives. The
office’s purpose was to develop reciprocal relationships among Foxtrot University faculty, students and community agency representatives in order to provide students with meaningful service-learning opportunities.

FUA and FUFM were cited as the service-learning and community engagement office’s co-directors and their contact information was listed at the end of the article. FUA’s quote highlighted how the service-learning experience empowered Foxtrot University’s students to become actively involved in the community surrounding the institution. FUFM’s quote announced how the service-learning office’s presence could help Foxtrot University recruit prospective students who are interested in applying what they learn in college to serve in the community. Foxtrot University’s senior vice president for academic affairs was quoted in the article as saying the office was a student affairs and academic affairs collaboration designed to unite volunteerism and academics. The upper-level administrator added the office would benefit the community by addressing community identified needs with institutional resources. It should be noted the article did not include a service-learning definition. The article’s author seemed to assume prospective readers would already be familiar with service-learning. This assumption may mean service-learning institutionalization at Foxtrot University had reached a point where including a service-learning definition in university publications was not needed because many people in the university community knew service-learning’s meaning.

Foxtrot University’s institutional mission statement was written by unspecified institutional officials and approved by the university’s board of trustees in 2006. The mission statement did not specifically mention service-learning, but it did cite the university’s commitment to community engagement and public service. More specifically, the statement declared Foxtrot University would actively partner with education, corporate and service
organizations in the state where Foxtrot University is located. Additionally, the statement addressed the faculty’s commitment to promote economic, social, and cultural development at the university through teaching, professional and public service, scholarship, and creative endeavors. This mission statement also included three core values: people, stewardship, and integrity. The people core value addressed the university’s commitment to creating an inclusive environment wherein students, faculty, and staff respect differences as they pursue a common academic purpose. The stewardship core value underscored the university’s desire to be an honest and fiscally responsible steward of institutional resources. The integrity core value focused on the institution’s responsibility to provide a learning environment that supported and encouraged employee growth and personal and professional development. These core values served as the philosophical underpinnings of the institution’s mission and were intended to govern stakeholder attitudes, behaviors, and decisions in daily activities. Two service-learning core principles, reciprocity and community voice, coincided with the Foxtrot University mission statement’s core values.

Service-Learning Definition

FUA and FUFM stated Foxtrot University had an official service-learning definition and both participants provided nearly identical accounts of how Foxtrot University’s service-learning definition was developed. At Foxtrot University, service-learning was defined the following way:

A method of teaching and learning that integrates student participation in organized service activities into credit-bearing courses. By collaboratively addressing identified community needs with a community partner, the service experience enhances student learning by providing an opportunity to observe, test and apply discipline-based theories,
concepts and skills. The academic context enriches the service experience by raising questions about real world issues and by providing a forum to reflect upon them. Further, service-learning is a mechanism to achieve a broader appreciation of the discipline, to sharpen problem solving skills, and to develop an enhanced sense of civic responsibility.

The university’s service-learning definition highlighted the importance of reflection, reciprocity, and community voice in service-learning. According to FUFM, the university’s official service-learning definition was created by a faculty senate committee. The committee was co-chaired by FUA and FUFM and included six faculty members who represented each college at the institution. FUA explained the committee considered the institution’s mission statement, the university’s 2014-2017 Foxtrot University strategic plan, the institution’s campus culture, and service-learning definitions developed by other universities to develop the Foxtrot University service-learning definition. FUFM noted service-learning definitions vary greatly among colleges with service-learning offices. The committee took approximately four months to develop the university’s service-learning definition. Foxtrot University’s faculty senate approved the definition during the spring 2015 semester.

**Faculty Development Practices**

The office where service-learning was institutionalized at Foxtrot University was in its third week of existence during my data collection period. Therefore, The Foxtrot University participants in this study had not developed any service-learning resources for the university’s faculty. FUA and FUFM, however, explained they wanted to discover which faculty members were teaching service-learning courses and ascertain what service-learning resources those faculty members wanted. During the 2014-2015 academic year, FUFM mentioned the co-directors planned to meet with faculty members and community agency representatives in an
effort to determine the aforementioned constituencies’ needs and to let the constituents know what resources the co-directors would like to provide. FUA stated the co-directors had meetings with academic deans and department chairs where the co-directors explained how service-learning was a beneficial pedagogy capable of being utilized in a variety of ways. FUFM hoped the office would offer the institution’s faculty members service-learning curriculum development consultations, service-learning course implementation workshops, and service-learning grants in the future. FUA informed me the co-director model found in the office where service-learning was institutionalized helped FUA and FUFM provide faculty members and community agency representatives with individualized attention. The administrator believed giving the aforementioned service-learning stakeholders individualized attention would help FUA and FUFM effectively address stakeholder needs.

Service-Learning Institutionalization

The Foxtrot University participants’ interview responses, the 2014-2017 Foxtrot University strategic plan, and the fall 2015 Foxtrot University magazine article on service-learning helped me identify Foxtrot University’s service-learning institutionalization process. FUA and FUFM played pivotal roles in the university’s service-learning institutionalization process. The service-learning institutionalization process was initiated and driven by faculty and staff members. Faculty members collaborated with student affairs educators to form a faculty senate service-learning committee charged with determining how to institutionalize service-learning at the university. The committee met for the first time in August 2014 and continued to meet for six months. During the six month time period, the committee developed a service-learning definition for the institution, proposed a staffing structure for the office where service-learning would be institutionalized, and created goals and assessment measures for that office.
The committee also decided service-learning should be organizationally housed jointly in student affairs and academic affairs. Committee members believed this aligned with Foxtrot University’s culture of shared governance. The 2014-2017 Foxtrot University strategic plan cited the importance of community engagement and making service-learning a signature experience at the institution. Service-learning committee members were emboldened by the strategic plan because it provided them with political support to catalyze the service-learning institutionalization process. Foxtrot University’s faculty senate approved the service-learning committee’s recommendations in February 2015.

After the service-learning committee’s recommendations received faculty senate approval, Foxtrot University’s vice president for student affairs and its senior vice president for academic affairs developed a job description for each prospective institutionalized service-learning co-director. FUA and FUFM were hired in May 2015 to lead the university’s service-learning efforts and the office officially opened in July 2015. The office was physically located in Foxtrot University’s student union and served as the organizational home for alternative spring breaks and other volunteerism initiatives. FUA and FUFM expressed their happiness about the office being located in an easily accessible building where service-learning would be highly visible to students, faculty members, and community agency representatives. Student affairs and academic affairs provide the office with recurring funding. Student affairs funds come from student activity fees and were used to pay for student initiatives. Academic affairs funds were used for faculty development resources. The office was staffed by four employees: a student affairs co-director, a faculty co-director, an AmeriCorps VISTA, and a graduate assistant. FUA reported to an upper-level administrator in student affairs and FUFM reported to an upper-level administrator in academic affairs. The Foxtrot University’s participants in this study
passionately advocated for the co-director model. FUA and FUAM thought the office benefited from having a director with student affairs expertise and a director with faculty expertise.

**Within-Case Analysis**

The Foxtrot University participants and documents in this study provided evidence service-learning was a priority at the institution. The university’s official service-learning definition was not found in any of the documents gathered for this study, but it did highlight the importance of reciprocity, reflection, and community voice. There was significant upper-level administrative support for service-learning. Although the service-learning institutionalization process was started by faculty and staff members, there were several upper-level administrators who provided support throughout the process. The university’s senior vice president for academic affairs served on the service-learning committee and functioned as a vocal and avid service-learning advocate. Foxtrot University’s vice president for student affairs and the institution’s provost assisted the service-learning institutionalization process by readily answering service-learning committee questions. The university’s president voiced support for service-learning, but did not have any regular communication with committee members. FUA and FUFM acknowledged upper-level administrative support helped the service-learning committee get its recommendations approved by the university’s faculty senate. Upper-level administrative support also helped the office where service-learning was institutionalized receive two recurring funding sources and an ideal physical location in the university’s student union. FUA stated the office where service-learning was institutionalized was established during the 2014-2015 academic year when several Foxtrot University programs were eliminated or had their funding reduced. The service-learning institutionalization process had enough upper-level administrative support to flourish despite dwindling institutional resources.
The Foxtrot University participants and documents in this study also provided evidence the institution’s 2014-2017 strategic plan and mission statement assisted the service-learning institutionalization process. Service-learning’s significance at Foxtrot University increased significantly from the institution’s 2009-2014 strategic plan to its 2014-2017 strategic plan. The 2009-2014 strategic plan called for an increase in service-learning opportunities at the university. The 2014-2017 Foxtrot University strategic plan called for the institution to make service-learning a signature experience for all Foxtrot University students. FUA and FUFM explained how the call to make service-learning a signature experience for all students aided the faculty senate service-learning committee tremendously as it sought to institutionalize service-learning. Foxtrot University’s desire to make service-learning a signature experience showed the institution prioritizes the pedagogy. The Foxtrot University interviewees agreed the university’s mission statement assisted the service-learning committee as it created the institution’s official service-learning definition. The university’s commitment to community engagement was reflected in its mission’s statement, in the two strategic plans collected for this study, in the interviewees’ interview responses, and in FUFM’s comments on service-learning in the university’s fall 2015 magazine issue.

FUA and FUFM were ardent advocates for organizationally housing service-learning in student affairs and academic affairs. The administrator stated service-learning could be housed organizationally exclusively in academic affairs or student affairs at other institutions, but FUA believed service-learning’s dual-organizational placement at Foxtrot University was ideal for the institution. FUA expounded on this belief by stating the following:

This [student affairs and academic affairs] is a [organizational] structure that is going to be well received and makes us [the office where service-learning was institutionalized]
very approachable both from a community standpoint and from faculty and staff. We are a campus that you can't operate in silos. Monetary resources are limited across the board, it doesn’t matter what department or what division you're talking about. So by having that [academic affairs and student affairs] collaboration, it allows us to step outside of our silos.

FUFM had a similar response. The faculty member said the student-affairs-academic affairs organizational structure was best for Foxtrot University. FUFM acknowledged, however, service-learning could be organizationally housed in different places at other institutions. FUFM added the following:

Well, I think it [service-learning] requires both [student affairs and academic affairs]. I think, and again, this is where every campus defines it differently, but I think we have a very academic definition of service learning and I think that if there is going to be this academic definition for it, there needs to be faculty involvement in its implementation. At the same time, I think that on the staff side of it, you know they bring all of their student affairs expertise and they bring students. We look at things like alternative break and some of the volunteerism that goes on as sort of an entry point into service and one day hope that students that do those things will take a service-learning course. It is a total, total partnership between us and that goes all the way up to the dean of students and our provost down to me and my co-director. I would say that if given the chance to move this office strictly to faculty affairs or strictly to student affairs, for our campus, that would be a big mistake.

Foxtrot University’s commitment to meaningful student affairs and academic affairs collaborations was evident in the interviewees’ responses and during in the institution’s service-
learning institutionalization process. The 2014-2017 Foxtrot University strategic plan committee included student affairs educators and faculty members. The service-learning faculty senate committee also consisted of student affairs educators and faculty members. I was unable to determine if the student affairs perspective and the faculty perspective were valued equally on each committee, but the inclusion of student affairs educators on university-wide committees provided evidence the student affairs point of view was respected at the institution.

**Service-learning institutionalization assessment tools.** I used the Furco Rubric (Furco, 2006) and the Campus Compact Pyramid (Campus Compact, 2002) to assess Foxtrot University’s commitment to institutionalizing service-learning. The Rubric’s first dimension was centered on an institution’s service-learning philosophy and mission. Foxtrot University was in stage three of the definition of service-learning component, the strategic planning component, the alignment with institutional mission component, and the alignment with educational reforms component. Foxtrot University was placed in stage three of the definition of service-learning component because it had a formal, universally accepted service-learning definition used consistently to operationalize most aspects of service-learning at the institution. The university was placed in stage three of the strategic planning component because the 2014-2017 Foxtrot University strategic plan addressed the advancement of service-learning through short-range and long-range goals. Similarly, the institution was placed in stage three of the alignment with institutional mission component because service-learning was mentioned in the university’s most recent strategic plans. Foxtrot University was placed in stage two of the alignment with educational reforms component because service-learning was identified as an essential academic enrichment programs along with study abroad and honors college programs.
The Furco Rubric’s (Furco, 2006) second dimension was concerned with faculty support for and involvement in service-learning. Foxtrot University was in stage two for all four of the dimension’s components: faculty awareness, faculty involvement and support, faculty leadership, and faculty incentives and rewards. The co-directors who led the office were in the beginning stages of identifying faculty members who were teaching service-learning courses. My assessment of the faculty awareness, faculty involvement, and faculty leadership components could be different if the office where service-learning was institutionalized had more time to develop. FUA and FUFM expressed Foxtrot University had considerable faculty support for service-learning, but the administrator and the faculty member were unable to quantify the aforementioned support. The university was placed in stage two of the faculty awareness, faculty involvement, and faculty leadership components because the Foxtrot University participants in this study maintained the university had adequate faculty support for service-learning. Foxtrot University was placed in stage two of the faculty incentives and rewards component because, according to FUFM, service-learning was not always recognized in the tenure and promotion process.

The Rubric’s (Furco, 2006) fifth dimension addressed institutional support for service-learning philosophy. I positioned Foxtrot University in stage three in five of the dimension’s six categories: coordinating entity, policy-making entity, staffing, funding, and administrative support. The university was in stage two of the evaluation and assessment component. Foxtrot University was in stage three of the coordinating entity component because the university had a coordinating entity in the form of a physical office devoted to institutionalizing service-learning. The faculty senate service-learning committee and the 2014-2017 Foxtrot University strategic plan served as the service-learning policy making entities that recognized service-learning as an
essential institutional asset. Therefore, I placed the university in stage three of the policy-making entity component. The office where service-learning was institutionalized was appropriately staffed with two full-time co-directors, a full-tine AmeriCorps VISTA, and a graduate assistant so the university was placed in stage three of the staffing component. Foxtrot University’s service-learning efforts were financially supported by recurring student affairs funds and academic affairs funds, which is why the institution was placed in stage three of the funding component. FUA and FUFM explained service-learning received significant upper-administrative support from student affairs and academic affairs leaders who understood service-learning and actively cooperated to make the pedagogy visible on the campus. The high-level of upper-administrative support for service-learning was the reason the university was placed in stage three of the administrative support component. Foxtrot University was placed in stage two of the evaluation and assessment component because the process of accounting for the number and quality of service-learning activities throughout the university was just in its beginning stages.

The Campus Compact Pyramid (Campus Compact, 2002) was also used to assess Foxtrot University’s commitment to institutionalizing service-learning. I positioned Foxtrot University in the intermediate level of the Pyramid. According to the Pyramid’s creators, between 35 and 40 percent of Campus Compact institutions were in the intermediate or advanced intermediate level. Foxtrot University was in the intermediate advanced level for several reasons. Support for service-learning was reflected tangentially in the institution’s mission statement and directly through the recurring funding allocated to service-learning. Service-learning received consistent upper-administrative support from the vice president for student affairs and the provost. There
was also a visible and appropriately staffed office dedicated to supporting the campus’s service-learning efforts.

Cross-Case Analysis.

This cross-case analysis includes data collected from all six participating institutions and is framed by the three research questions presented in chapter three:

- How do student affairs educators at Campus Compact institutions where service-learning is institutionalized in student affairs define service-learning?
- What process do upper-level administrators, student affairs educators, and faculty members at Campus Compact institutions go through to institutionalize service-learning in student affairs?
- What faculty development practices are employed by student affairs educators at Campus Compact institutions where service-learning is institutionalized in student affairs to support faculty members teaching service-learning courses?

The cross-case analysis revealed a number of meaningful similarities and differences among the service-learning definitions, service-learning faculty development practices, and service-learning institutionalization processes addressed in the findings. The service-learning definition cross-case analysis examined how many participating institutions had an official service-learning definition, who created the service-learning definitions, how the service-learning definitions were created, and which service-learning core principles were included in the definitions. The service-learning institutionalization process cross-case analysis explored the similarities and differences among the service-learning institutionalization processes recognized in this study. The faculty development cross-case analysis compared and contrasted the number and type of
service-learning resources offered to instructors and faculty members at the participating institutions.

Three tables are included in this chapter. Table 2 shows where each institution was positioned in the Furco Rubric’s (2006) philosophy and mission of service-learning dimension, Table 3 shows where each institution was positioned in the Rubric’s faculty support and involvement in service-learning dimension, and Table 4 shows where each institution was positioned in the Rubric’s institutional support for service-learning dimension.

Table 2

*Furco Rubric’s Philosophy and Mission of Service-Learning Dimension*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participating Institution</th>
<th>Definition of Service-Learning</th>
<th>Strategic Planning</th>
<th>Alignment with Institutional Mission</th>
<th>Alignment with Educational Reform Efforts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alpha College</td>
<td>Stage 1</td>
<td>Stage 3</td>
<td>Stage 3</td>
<td>Stage 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bravo College</td>
<td>Stage 3</td>
<td>Stage 2</td>
<td>Stage 2</td>
<td>Stage 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlie University</td>
<td>Stage 3</td>
<td>Stage 3</td>
<td>Stage 3</td>
<td>Stage 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delta University</td>
<td>Stage 3</td>
<td>Stage 3</td>
<td>Stage 3</td>
<td>Stage 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Echo University</td>
<td>Stage 3</td>
<td>Stage 3</td>
<td>Stage 3</td>
<td>Stage 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foxtrot University</td>
<td>Stage 3</td>
<td>Stage 3</td>
<td>Stage 3</td>
<td>Stage 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3

*Furco Rubric’s Faculty Support for and Involvement in Service-Learning Dimension*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participating Institution</th>
<th>Faculty Awareness</th>
<th>Faculty Involvement and Support</th>
<th>Faculty Leadership</th>
<th>Faculty Incentives and Rewards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alpha College</td>
<td>Stage 2</td>
<td>Stage 2</td>
<td>Stage 2</td>
<td>Stage 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bravo College</td>
<td>Stage 2</td>
<td>Stage 2</td>
<td>Stage 2</td>
<td>Stage 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlie University</td>
<td>Stage 3</td>
<td>Stage 3</td>
<td>Stage 3</td>
<td>Stage 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delta University</td>
<td>Stage 3</td>
<td>Stage 3</td>
<td>Stage 3</td>
<td>Stage 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Echo University</td>
<td>Stage 3</td>
<td>Stage 3</td>
<td>Stage 2</td>
<td>Stage 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foxtrot University</td>
<td>Stage 2</td>
<td>Stage 2</td>
<td>Stage 2</td>
<td>Stage 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4

*Furco Rubric’s Institutional Support for Service-Learning Dimension*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participating Institution</th>
<th>Coordinating Entity</th>
<th>Policy-Making Entity</th>
<th>Staffing</th>
<th>Funding</th>
<th>Administrative Support</th>
<th>Evaluation and Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alpha College</td>
<td>Stage 3</td>
<td>Stage 3</td>
<td>Stage 3</td>
<td>Stage 3</td>
<td>Stage 3</td>
<td>Stage 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bravo College</td>
<td>Stage 3</td>
<td>Stage 3</td>
<td>Stage 3</td>
<td>Stage 3</td>
<td>Stage 3</td>
<td>Stage 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlie University</td>
<td>Stage 3</td>
<td>Stage 3</td>
<td>Stage 3</td>
<td>Stage 3</td>
<td>Stage 3</td>
<td>Stage 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delta University</td>
<td>Stage 3</td>
<td>Stage 3</td>
<td>Stage 3</td>
<td>Stage 3</td>
<td>Stage 3</td>
<td>Stage 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Echo University</td>
<td>Stage 3</td>
<td>Stage 3</td>
<td>Stage 3</td>
<td>Stage 3</td>
<td>Stage 3</td>
<td>Stage 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foxtrot University</td>
<td>Stage 3</td>
<td>Stage 3</td>
<td>Stage 3</td>
<td>Stage 3</td>
<td>Stage 3</td>
<td>Stage 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Service-Learning Definitions**

Five of the six participating institutions had at least one official service-learning definition. I was unable to identify Alpha College’s official service-learning definition during my interviews or in any Alpha College documents. Student affairs educators in the office where service-learning was institutionalized at Bravo College, Charlie University, Delta University, and Echo University developed service-learning definitions for their respective institutions. Student affairs educators at Foxtrot University worked with faculty senate members to create the university’s service-learning definition. Charlie University was the only institution in this study that had two official service-learning definitions. The Charlie University faculty senate developed an official service-learning definition and student affairs educators selected a service-learning definition from the service-learning literature. The definition adopted by the service-
learning office and the faculty senate service-learning committee’s definition coexisted because both definitions highlighted the importance of reflection and reciprocity.

The service-learning literature was used by student affairs educators at three participating institutions to inform or select their respective service-learning definitions. Two institutions used service-learning literature to inform their service-learning definitions: Bravo College and Echo University. The Bravo College service-learning definition was informed by the Campus Compact Service-Learning Pyramid (Campus Compact, 2002) and a National and Community Service Trust Act (1993) service-learning definition. Echo University’s definition was informed by Youth Service California’s (2006) seven elements of high quality service-learning. Charlie University’s student affairs educators were the only participants in this study to adopt a service-learning definition from service-learning literature. The university’s student affairs educators adopted Barbara Jacoby’s (1996) service-learning definition as one of the institution’s official definitions. I was unable to determine the process Delta University’s educators went through to develop the institution’s service-learning definition or what informed the definition.

The Foxtrot University service-learning definition was not informed by service-learning literature. Instead, the student affairs educators in the office where service-learning was institutionalized and the university’s faculty senate used the institution’s 2014-2017 strategic plan, the institution’s mission statement, and the institution’s campus culture to develop an official service-learning definition. Service-learning is often considered a course-based practice. Bravo College, Delta University, Foxtrot University, and Echo University had service-learning definitions that described service-learning as a course-based practice. Echo University was the only participating institution where course-based service-learning was called academic service-learning. Defining service-learning as a course-based practice is consistent with Bringle and
Hatcher’s (1995) ubiquitous service-learning definition, which defined service-learning as a course-based educational experience. Charlie University was the lone participating institution where service-learning was defined as a form of experiential learning. Experiential learning can be course-based, but it typically occurs outside of the classroom.

My service-learning literature review yielded three service-learning core principles: reflection, reciprocity, and student learning. These core principles were addressed to varying degrees in the official service-learning definitions identified in this study. Bravo College, Charlie University, Echo University, and Foxtrot University had service-learning definitions that underscored the significance of reflection. Delta University’s service-learning definition did not mention reflection, but the institution’s 2013 Academic Service-Learning Faculty Handbook included an explanation of why reflection was important in service-learning and some service-learning reflection activities. Charlie University, Delta University, Echo University, and Foxtrot University created service-learning definitions that highlighted reciprocity’s importance. Although Bravo College’s service-learning definition did not reference reciprocity, its definition was informed by the National and Community Service Trust Act (1993) service-learning definition which cited reciprocity’s significance. Furthermore, Bravo College’s 2015-2016 Faculty Handbook and its 2015-2016 Community Partner Handbook empathized the importance of reciprocity in service-learning. The six official service-learning definitions identified in this study all featured the importance of student learning. The emphasis on student learning in every identified service-learning definition in this study was not surprising given the preeminence of academic mission statements at institutions of higher education and the increasing importance of fostering student learning in student affairs practice (ACPA, 1996b; ACPA et al, 2006; NASPA & ACPA, 2004).
An institution of higher education’s official service-learning definition plays an integral role in its service-learning institutionalization process. The two service-learning institutionalization assessment tools used in this study, Furco’s Rubric (2006) and Campus Compact’s Pyramid (2002), emphasize the importance developing an official service-learning definition when institutionalizing service-learning. An official definition is often used by student affairs educators and faculty members to operationalize a college’s service-learning initiatives. Student affairs educators constructed or co-constructed their respective institution’s official service-learning definition at five of the six participating institutions. At four of the six participating institutions, student affairs educators developed service-learning definitions without faculty involvement. The three service-learning core principles were evident in the service-learning definitions. Charlie University, Echo University, and Foxtrot University had service-learning definitions that encompassed service-learning’s core principles. Although Bravo College and Delta University’s service-learning definitions did not include each core principle, I identified a document at each institution where all the core principles were addressed. These findings collectively provide evidence the student affairs educators in this study had a comprehensive understanding the usefulness of having an institutionally accepted service-learning definition.

Service-Learning Institutionalization

Throughout the 1990s and 2000s, service-learning became the most tangible and widespread expression of higher education’s civic mission (Bringle, Hatcher, Hamilton, & Young, 2001; Pollack, 2013). In response to service-learning’s increased use and acceptance at colleges and universities, institutions have developed physical and organizational structures for service-learning to raise the pedagogy’s visibility and establish its academic credibility (Beatty,
Administrators and faculty members at five of the six participating institutions in this study helped institutionalized service-learning during the 1990s and 2000s. Foxtrot University, the only outlier, institutionalized service-learning in the 2010s. The founding of North Carolina Campus Compact in 2002 and South Carolina Campus Compact in 2008 coincided with the rise of institutionalized service-learning at colleges and universities. The nationwide rise in institutional support for service-learning helped establish the pedagogy as a staple in higher education.

The prevailing narrative in the service-learning literature is that service-learning should be institutionalized in academic affairs. This belief has existed in the service-learning field partly because the case for institutionalizing service-learning in student affairs is almost non-existent in the literature. This study’s findings provide evidence service-learning can be successfully institutionalized completely or partially in student affairs. Four institutions in this study institutionalized service-learning completely in student affairs: Alpha College, Bravo College, Charlie University, and Delta University. The student affairs educators and faculty members in this study praised service-learning’s organizational placement on their respective campus and their respective university’s service-learning efforts. The participants’ universal support for institutionalizing service-learning completely or partially in student affairs indicates service-learning can be institutionalized in student affairs. More specifically, the aforementioned support helps affirm the belief there are student affairs educators who have the ability to help institutionalize and further service-learning.

The service-learning institutionalization processes in this study had a number of similarities and differences. Although service-learning assessment tools like the Furco Rubric (Furco, 2006) and the Campus Compact Pyramid (Campus Compact, 2002) differ in their
descriptions of what is needed for institutionalization, these tools provide evidence service-learning institutionalization occurs at institutions where five intrinsically tied entities are present: an institutional mission statement that emphasizes the importance of community and civic engagement, upper-level administrative support, faculty involvement and backing, institutional funding, and a centralized on-campus office. The aforementioned entities are utilized in this cross-case analysis to highlight the parallels and variances among the service-learning institutionalization processes identified in this study.

**Institutional mission statement.** There is evidence in the service-learning literature the that explicit articulation of service in an institution’s mission statement is critical to institutionalization (Casey & Springer, 2006; Nicotera, Cutforth, Fretz, & Summers, 2011). A clear and compelling mission statement clarifies an institution’s priorities. Community and civic engagement typically resonates at institutions where practitioners, faculty members, and administrators can clearly express their respective institutional mission and address competing institutional visions (Holland, 2005). Each of the seven student affairs educators in this study confirmed his or her institution’s mission statement included language that promoted community engagement, civic engagement and/or public service. I came to the same conclusion when I did a document analysis of each institution’s mission statement. Additionally, all the student affairs educators stated that their respective campus’s institutional mission statement informed their campus’s service-learning institutionalization process and service-learning initiatives. Institutional mission statements had a slightly smaller impact on how the faculty members in this study approached their service-learning work. Four of the six faculty members in this study confirmed their respective institutional mission statements informed the way they taught their service-learning courses. The Bravo College faculty member and the Delta University faculty
member stated their institutional mission statement did not influence the way they taught service-
learning courses. The participant responses coupled with the document analysis of each
institution’s mission statement provided evidence that each institution’s mission statement
prioritized community engagement, civic engagement and/or public service. There is also
evidence each mission statement’s endorsement of community engagement, civic engagement
and/or public service helped student affairs educators, faculty members, and administrators
institutionalize service-learning.

**Upper-level administrative support.** The service-learning literature is replete with
evidence upper-level administrative support for community and civic engagement is needed to
institutionalize service-learning (Bringle & Hatcher, 2000; Buchanan, 1998; Henderson, Fair,
Sather, & Dewey, 2008; Kronick, Dahlin-Brown, & Luter, 2011; Vogel, Seifer, & Gelmon,
2010; Welch, 2010). Upper-level administrators have the ability to bring legitimacy to service-
learning, to include service initiatives in institutional strategic plans, and to further
institutionalize community and civic engagement’s role in advancing research, teaching, and
service activities (Eckardt & Eisman, 2006). The student affairs educators and faculty
members in this study worked at Campus Compact institutions, which means their civic and
community engagement efforts were inherently supported by their respective college chancellor
or president. The service-learning institutionalization processes at each participating institution
also received support from at least one more upper-level administrator. Alpha College’s service-
learning institutionalization process was started by a student affairs educator and an academic
dean. These two officials collaboratively secured the grant funding needed to introduce service-
learning to the campus. The academic dean further assisted with the institutionalization efforts
by advocating for service-learning’s inclusion in the college’s strategic planning documents.
Bravo College’s service-learning institutionalization process was the only process in this study initiated exclusively in student affairs. The college’s vice president for student affairs procured institutional funds with the college president’s approval to bring service-learning to the institution and the college’s dean of students used the funding to establish a centralized service-learning office.

The service-learning institutionalization process at Charlie University was started by a faculty member working independently in a service-learning enclave. The faculty member received upper-administrative support for service-learning work once the university’s chancellor realized the positive impact service-learning had on the campus community. The university’s chancellor supported service-learning by providing financial, structural, and organizational support for the office where service-learning was institutionalized. Similarly, Echo University’s service-learning institutionalization process was started by the university’s faculty senate and student affairs educators. The institution’s senior vice chancellor for academic affairs worked with student affairs educators and faculty members on the faculty senate service-learning committee that was charged with creating a plan to institutionalize service-learning. The university’s vice chancellor for student affairs and its provost fully supported the faculty senate service-learning committee by allocating financial, structural, and organizational resources to the service-learning institutionalization efforts.

Delta University’s service-learning institutionalization process was initiated by its vice president for student affairs and provost in response to recommendations given to the administrators by SACS reaffirmation members. The administrators decided to use human and financial resources from student affairs and academic affairs to commence and further the university’s service-learning institutionalization process. Foxtrot University had comparable
upper administrative support for service-learning. The service-learning institutionalization process began when the university’s provost charged two faculty members with exploring faculty, staff, and student interest in institutionalizing service-learning at the institution. The provost also worked with the university vice president for student affairs to establish an institutionalized service-learning office and further the university’s service-learning institutionalization process. Upper-level administrative support played an essential role in the service-learning processes at each participating institution.

**Faculty involvement and backing.** Service-learning’s success at institutions of higher education is largely dependent on how well it is institutionalized and how faculty members adopt and implement it (Fitzgerald, Bruns, Sonka, Furco, & Swanson, 2012; Forbes, Wasburn, Crispo, & Vandeveer, 2008; Verducci & Pope, 2001). Many faculty members perceive service-learning as a time-intensive and unquantifiable pedagogy with little academic value. These perceptions are regularly reinforced by promotion and tenure committees, professional peers, and journal editors who view faculty involvement in service as nonessential (Checkoway, 2013). As funding for colleges and universities has decreased and the roles student affairs educators play in the student learning process have increased, many student affairs educators have initiated collaborations to optimize limited resources and expand the learning environment at their institutions.

The seven student affairs educators in this study had documented and established relationships with faculty members who taught service-learning courses. The depth of the aforementioned relationships varied by institution. The interaction between the Alpha College student affairs educator and the faculty members at the college who taught service-learning courses was primarily limited to the joint identification of community partners. Alpha College’s
faculty members seemingly taught service-learning courses independently with occasional support from ACA. Foxtrot University’s service-learning program was less than six months old when I collected data at the institution. Nevertheless, the university’s faculty senate members initiated the service-learning institutionalization process and worked with student affairs educators to acquire the resources needed to institutionalize service-learning on their campus. The other student affairs educators in this study developed and sustained relationships with faculty members by creating resources to help faculty members lessen the preparation time needed to teach service-learning courses. The student affairs educators were not able to influence the way service-learning was considered during tenure and promotion reviews, but they were able to help cultivate educational environments where faculty members teaching service-learning courses felt their work was supported and appreciated.

**Institutional funding.** The commitment of permanent financial resources to service-learning provides evidence an institution views service-learning as a core component of its academic work (Leiderman, Furco, Zapf, & Goss, 2002; Welch & Saltmarsh, 2013). Colleges and universities that allocate institutional funds to service-learning show greater institutionalization than institutions that support service-learning through non-institutional funds (Bringle & Hatcher, 2000). At many institutions, upper-level administrators provide faculty members and service-learning practitioners with soft or temporary funding in the form of grants, gifts, or contracts provided by external agencies to introduce service-learning into a curriculum (Buchanon, 1998; Rubin 1996; Young, Shinnar, Ackerman, Carruthers, & Young, 2007). Alpha College was the only institution where upper-level administrators used grant funding exclusively to start the service-learning institutionalization process. Bravo College’s upper-level administrators temporarily utilized grant funding to supplement the state funding earmarked for
introducing service-learning at the college. Upper-level administrators at the other four institutions allocated two or more recurring revenue streams to commence the service-learning institutionalization process and further service-learning on their respective campuses.

Alpha College was the only college where service-learning was backed exclusively by recurring student affairs funds. It should be noted Alpha College’s service-learning efforts were initially funded by a grant. Bravo College and Charlie University funded service-learning using recurring state funds and student activity fees. Similarly, Echo University supported service-learning through recurring state funds, student activity fees, auxiliary funds. Academic affairs funding for service-learning was not rare among the participating institutions. Delta University and Foxtrot University were the institutions where recurring academic affairs funds were allocated to service-learning. Auxiliary funding and endowment funding were even rarer. Echo University combined recurring auxiliary funds with three other recurring revenue streams to fund service-learning while Delta University used endowment funds in conjunction with recurring student affairs, academic affairs, and grant funding to support service-learning. Although the student affairs educators and faculty members in this study expressed a desire for additional funding for service-learning, they all acknowledged their current funding was enough to sustain their service-learning efforts.

Centralized office. The presence of an institutionally-funded centralized service-learning office shows an institutional commitment to institutionalizing service-learning and promoting its academic credibility (Beatty, 2010; Bringle & Hatcher, 2000; Eckardt & Eisman, 2006; Sandmann & Plater, 2009; Stater & Fotheringham, 2009). When service-learning is institutionalized, centralized offices have enough qualified staff members to handle the scope and scale of their respective service-learning efforts (Leiderman, Furco, Zapf, & Goss, 2002).
Each participating institution had an on-campus office that served as the physical home for service-learning. Alpha College, Delta University, and Foxtrot University had a centralized office in their respective student unions. Bravo College, Charlie University, and Echo University had a centralized office located near the student union on their respective campuses.

Although the level of staffing varied among the institutions in this study, five of the six institutions had enough qualified staff members to handle the scope and scale of their respective service-learning efforts. Alpha College was the exception. The Alpha College student affairs educator was hired to serve in a role unrelated to service-learning, but assumed responsibility for service-learning, volunteer programs and alternative spring break programs when the student affairs educator responsible for the aforementioned service programs vacated the position. The Alpha College student affairs educator did not have a background in service-learning or community engagement and was unable to provide a detailed explanation of the service-learning resources offered to faculty members. The other six student affairs educators in this were qualified to handle the scope and scale of their respective service-learning efforts. Bravo College and Delta University each had a student affairs educator who did such an exemplary job leading service-learning and civic engagement efforts that they each received a Campus Compact state-affiliate civic engagement professional of the year award.

**Faculty Development Practices**

Service-learning’s success at institutions of higher education is largely dependent on how well the pedagogy is institutionalized and how faculty members adopt and implement it (Fitzgerald, Bruns, Sonka, Furco, & Swanson, 2012; Forbes, Wasburn, Crispo, & Vandeveer, 2008; Verducci & Pope, 2001). Nationally, service-learning practitioners have focused on persuading faculty to teach service-learning courses by providing them with the pedagogical and
logistical support needed to add a service-learning component to a course (Banerjee & Hausafus, 2007). The student affairs educators in this study shared the national focus and developed a collection of service-learning resources for faculty members at their respective institutions. The two most popular service-learning resources in this study were introduction to service-learning pedagogy workshops and service-learning course development consultations. Student affairs educators at five of the six participating institutions offered the aforementioned resources. Foxtrot University was the only institution where workshops and consultations were not offered. It should be noted, however, the Foxtrot University student affairs educators who participated in this study planned to offer service-learning workshops and service-learning course consultations in the future. The six faculty members who participated in this study had extensive experience teaching service-learning courses and did not attend their respective institution’s introduction to service-learning pedagogy workshops or service-learning course development consultations. Nevertheless, the faculty members universally praised the utility of the service-learning workshops and course consultations to those new to the pedagogy.

Student affairs educators in this study also offered a number of other service-learning resources. Charlie University and Delta University’s student affairs educators annually provided formal introduction to service-learning presentations at university-wide new faculty orientations. University-wide service-learning presentations at new faculty orientations provide student affairs educators with opportunities to converse in-person with faculty members and potentially introduce them to service-learning pedagogy. In addition, student affairs educators at both institutions help coordinate service-learning faculty fellows programs. The service-learning faculty fellows programs helped further institutionalize service-learning at Charlie University and Delta University by increasing faculty support for the pedagogy. Delta University and Echo
University’s student affairs educators administered listservs designed to share service-learning resources with faculty members interested in service-learning. Charlie University and Echo University’s student affairs educators visited service-learning classrooms each semester to provide students with introductory service-learning workshops. Additionally, Bravo College and Delta University’s student affairs educators curated a service-learning resource library created to help faculty members stay abreast of service-learning best practices. The diverse array of service-learning resources developed by student affairs educators in this study provides evidence student affairs educators are equipped to provide faculty members with the pedagogical and logistical support needed to teach service-learning courses.

Many faculty members lack the training and expertise needed to establish and sustain relationships with community members or to work with students outside of a traditional classroom setting (Beere, Votruba, & Wells, 2011; Cushman, 2002). This study’s findings provide evidence student affairs educators working in institutionalized service-learning offices are able to help faculty members build and sustain service-learning connections with community agency representatives. The Delta University and Echo University student affairs educators in this study helped build service-learning collaborations among faculty members and community agency representatives by hosting annual on-campus community-focused networking events. Student affairs educators at both institutions utilized the networking events as forums to connect faculty members and community agency representatives with similar community-engaged interests. Acting as community liaisons, the student affairs educators at Alpha College, Bravo College, Delta University, and Echo University used their relationships with community agency representatives to establish mutually beneficial service-learning partnerships. Serving as
intermediaries between faculty members and community agency representatives helped student affairs educators at these four institutions establish and sustain faculty-community relationships.

Collaborative relationships between student affairs educators and faculty members are cited in the service-learning literature as beneficial to service-learning institutionalization efforts, but student affairs educators are often expected to take subordinate roles in the aforementioned collaborations (Bringle & Hatcher, 2000; Henderson, Fair, Sather, & Dewey, 2008; Myers & Goodwin, 2011). The student affairs educators in this study, however, did not play a lesser role when collaborating with faculty members. Student affairs educators at five of the six participating institutions offered the aforementioned resources. More specifically, Bravo College, Charlie University, Delta University, Echo University, and Foxtrot University’s student affairs educators formed equitable partnerships with faculty members. At Bravo College, student affairs educators trained faculty members to present service-learning course assessment workshops and service-learning reflection workshops on the service-learning office’s behalf. Charlie University and Foxtrot University’s student affairs educators served on their respective institution’s faculty senate as faculty senate service-learning committee members. As service-learning committee members, student affairs educators at both institutions were invited to serve on the committee and to bring a student affairs perspective to the committee’s work. Similarly, an Echo University student affairs educator provided the student affairs perspective on the institution’s service-learning committee and worked closely with the university’s service-learning faculty fellows to further institutionalize service-learning. The equitable and amicable collaborations between student affairs educators and faculty members at each institution in this study were cited by the participants as one of the primary reasons service-learning institutionalization efforts were successful.
Conclusion

The six institutions described in this study represented various levels of service-learning institutionalization. However, the service-learning definitions, service-learning institutionalization processes, and faculty development practices identified at these institutions were consistent with the service-learning standards found in the service-learning literature. Each institution allocated the human, financial, and organizational resources needed to institutionalize service-learning. The student affairs educators and the faculty members universally approved of service-learning’s organizational placement at their respective institutions. The findings provide evidence service-learning can be successfully institutionalized in student affairs and that student affairs educators are qualified to provide leadership of an institution’s service-learning efforts with their academic affairs counterparts.
CHAPTER 5

IMPLICATIONS

This study was designed to explore the ways student affairs educators define service-learning, the processes upper-level administrators, student affairs educators, and faculty members go through to institutionalize service-learning in student affairs, and the faculty development practices employed by student affairs educators to support faculty members teaching service-learning courses. Upper-level administrators, student affairs educators, and faculty members at the Campus Compact institutions represented in this study invested the financial, structural, and human resources needed to effectively institutionalize service-learning. Through semi-structured interviews and institutional document analyses at each institution, I found evidence service-learning can be successfully institutionalized in student affairs. The student affairs educators I interviewed had worked to develop or select service-learning definitions befitting their missions and institutions, make meaningful contributions to their institution’s service-learning institutionalization process, and produce a variety of resources designed to assist faculty members teaching service-learning courses. The faculty members participating in this study universally commended the student affairs educators on their respective campuses for their work with faculty members. This chapter includes the significance of the findings, implications for student affairs practice, limitations of this study, and recommendations for future research.

Significance of Findings

The qualitative multi-case study methodology used in this study yielded in-depth and
meaningful findings. The student affairs educators in this study were passionate about service-learning and repeatedly expressed to me they were happy someone was researching service-learning in student affairs. Their passion for service-learning and the student affairs profession probably contributed to the depth and breadth of the answers they provided during the interviews. The qualitative multi-case study methodology allowed me to garner at least two perspectives on service-learning and service-learning institutionalization from six different institutional contexts. The within-case and cross-case analyses helped me highlight the implications for student affairs practice and answer this study’s research questions. In my experience as a student affairs educator in a service-learning office, I have noticed institutions prefer to explore service-learning matters using quantitative measures. There is often a focus on the number of service-learning courses offered each academic year, the number of faculty members teaching service-learning courses, and the economic impact service-learning courses have on the local community. Quantitative data is valuable, but I do not believe it fully captures all the information needed to institutionalize and advance service-learning. The methodology used in this study allowed me to gain first-hand perspectives on significant service-learning processes and practices that are often overlooked. The interviewees provided me with a wealth of information that was not publically available and would have been challenging to acquire through quantitative methodologies.

The vast majority of the student affairs educators represented in this study demonstrated service-learning expertise and developed faculty development practices that aligned with the service-learning literature. My service-learning literature review yielded three service-learning core principles: reflection, reciprocity, and student learning (Clayton et al., 2010; Cushman, 2002; Gelmon et al., 2001). The official service-learning definitions presented in this study
reflected the aforementioned principles to varying degrees. Furthermore, the service-learning resources and events developed by the student affairs educators in this study highlighted the importance of the service-learning core principles. For example, there were student affairs educators who created faculty handbooks with reflection activities, facilitated faculty-community agency representative meetings where community needs were identified, and presented service-learning workshops designed to help faculty members create learning outcomes for their service-learning courses. The term “service-learning” was written a variety of different ways in the service-learning literature. Many colleges and universities hyphenate the term “service-learning” to join service-learning’s two central concepts: community action, the "service," and efforts to learn from community action, the "learning" (Beatty, 2010; Jacoby, 1996; Stanton, Giles, & Cruz, 1999). Student affairs educators at four of the six participating institutions hyphenated service-learning to directly signify the connection between service and learning. The student affairs educators’ knowledge of service-learning’s core principles, the resources needed to assist faculty teaching service-learning courses, and the purported importance of the hyphen in service-learning provide evidence the student affairs educators in this study had a solid understanding of service-learning. These findings are significant because they provide evidence there are student affairs educators working in offices where service-learning is institutionalized that have the service-learning expertise required to contribute to academically rigorous initiatives.

Several contributors to the service-learning literature asserted service-learning became the most tangible and widespread expression of higher education’s civic mission throughout the 1990s and 2000s (Bringle, Hatcher, Hamilton, & Young, 2001; Pollack, 2013). In response to service-learning’s increased use and acceptance at colleges and universities, institutions developed physical and organizational structures for service-learning to raise the pedagogy’s
visibility and establish its academic credibility (Beatty, 2010). The Furco Self-Assessment Rubric for the Institutionalization of Service-Learning in Higher Education (Furco, 2006) and the Campus Compact Service-Learning Pyramid (Campus Compact, 2002) state the presence of a physical center dedicated to service-learning is key to service-learning institutionalization. The majority of the colleges in this study developed physical and organizational structures for service-learning throughout the 1990s and 2000s. Five of the six institutions institutionalized service-learning during this time period. Foxtrot University, the one outlier, institutionalized service-learning in 2015. The physical and organizational structures to support service-learning efforts at each institution were also significant because their existence was consistent with service-learning institutionalization best practices found in the Furco Rubric and the Campus Compact Pyramid.

In a national study that surveyed 147 institutionalized community engagement office directors, researchers found 77.6 percent of the community engagement offices reported to academic affairs and most of the offices were directed by an educator professionally aligned with academic affairs (Welch & Saltmarsh, 2013). These researchers also discovered only a third of the directors had a student affairs background (Welch & Saltmarsh, 2013). These national figures were consistent with my study’s findings. Most North Carolina Campus Compact (NCCC) and South Carolina Campus Compact (SCCC) member institutions organizationally house service-learning in academic affairs. There are 36 NCCC member institutions and 17 SCCC member institutions. Thirteen colleges or approximately 25 percent of NCCC and SCCC member institutions organizationally housed service-learning partially or exclusively in student affairs. The student affairs educators in this study were aware service-learning was typically housed in academic affairs, but they were still proponents of institutionalizing service-learning
Service-learning institutionalization in student affairs exclusively or partially in student affairs. Service-learning institutionalization in student affairs is not the norm, but this study’s findings provide additional evidence service-learning can be successfully institutionalized in student affairs.

Service-learning is completely institutionalized when it becomes an essential aspect of a college’s institutional mission and vision, a permanent aspect of the curriculum, influences faculty roles and rewards, and earns the widespread support, acceptance and involvement of students, faculty, administrators, and the community (Bringle & Hatcher, 2000; Bringle, Hatcher, Hamilton, & Young, 2001; Holland, 2009; Young, Shinnar, Ackerman, Carruthers, & Young, 2007). The participating institutions did not completely institutionalize service-learning because service-learning was not a permanent aspect of each college’s curriculum and it did not universally influence faculty roles and rewards. This finding is inconsequential because the definition of complete service-learning institutionalization identified in the literature is more aspirational than realistic. Incorporating service-learning into a course can be a time consuming exercise. My anecdotal observations as a student affairs educator working in the service-learning functional area coupled with my knowledge of the service-learning literature inform my conclusion that service-learning is too time-intensive and community-focused to permanently become an aspect of a college’s curriculum or universally influence faculty roles and rewards. I do not think faculty members should teach service-learning courses if they are not willing to build mutually beneficial relationships with community agency representatives or develop meaningful reflection opportunities for their students. Service-learning may always be a well-respected, but sparingly used pedagogy at institutions of higher education and I do not think there is anything wrong with that.

I used the Furco Rubric (Furco, 2006) and the Campus Compact Pyramid (Campus
Compact, 2002) to identify each participating institution’s commitment to institutionalized service-learning. There was a dramatic difference between the two assessment tools in terms of specificity. The dimensions of the Furco Rubric I used to analyze the data accounted for almost all the service-learning institutionalization components addressed by the student affairs educators in this study. This study’s findings validated the Furco Rubric and the Furco Rubric added validity to this study’s findings. The Campus Compact Pyramid was more challenging to use as a service-learning institutionalization assessment tool because it was far less detailed than the Furco Rubric. I spoke to a representative at the Campus Compact national office about the two assessment tools I used in this study and the Campus Compact representative told me the Furco Rubric was the best service-learning institutionalization assessment tool available. The representative also said the Campus Compact Pyramid has value, but is rarely promoted by Campus Compact representatives since the Furco Rubric is very detailed (M. Grove, personal communication, December 23, 2015).

The Furco Rubric’s (2006) author acknowledged the Rubric may not include key components to a campus' service-learning institutionalization efforts. I found this acknowledgement to be true in this study. The politics associated with institutionalizing service-learning, which are not mentioned in the Furco Rubric, were addressed consistently by this study’s participants. At one institution in the study, a former chancellor allegedly moved service-learning from academic affairs to student affairs because the chancellor allegedly believed the provost at the time was mismanaging funds and lowering the academic credibility of the institution. At another institution in the study, there was allegedly an upper-level administrator in academic affairs who wanted to move service-learning from student affairs to academic affairs. I was told the upper-level administrator was publically telling faculty members
and student affairs educators that service-learning was being moved into academic affairs even though that message was denied by the provost and the vice president for student affairs at the institution. Although several participants talked about the politics of service-learning institutionalization without prompting, I did not ask any follow-up questions about the political nature of service-learning institutionalization because during the data collection period I thought the politics of service-learning institutionalization were beyond the scope of my study. After analyzing the data and reflecting on my experiences as a student affairs educator working in service-learning, I realized the politics of service-learning institutionalization warranted additional attention because institutional politics can have a direct impact on service-learning institutionalization processes.

Implications for Student Affairs Practice

This study’s findings yielded four implications for student affairs practice. First, student affairs educators should actively seek opportunities to advance student learning through student affairs-academic affairs collaborations. Service-learning’s importance to student affairs-academic affairs collaborations is referenced in several of the student affairs profession’s seminal documents. Service-learning was identified in *Learning Reconsidered* as an ideal opportunity for student affairs educators and faculty members to collaborate and promote complex educational outcomes and learning (NASPA & ACPA, 2004). Service-learning was also mentioned in *Powerful Partnerships* as a practice and pedagogy student affairs educators and faculty members can collaboratively employ to increase the likelihood of informal and incidental learning situations (ACPA & NASPA, 1998). Long-held, often erroneous or outdated beliefs about student affairs work and faculty culture have helped perpetuate educational environments where student affairs educators and faculty members reside in silos (ACPA, 1996; Hartley,
Harkavy, & Benson, 2005; Singleton, Burack, & Hirsch, 1997). This study’s findings provide evidence service-learning is a compelling vehicle for student affairs-academic affairs collaborations. By having service-learning expertise, tangible resources, and other incentives, the student affairs educators were able to obtain faculty buy-in and enter collaborations with faculty members where there was no discernable power differential.

At many institutions of higher education, a student affairs division is viewed by many as an essential, yet notably tangential support division to the core academic mission actualized by faculty members (Shepardson, 2016). Student affairs educators, however, should not be limited to providing tangential support to an institution’s core academic mission. In order to help eliminate the belief student affairs educators do not have a role in fostering student learning, student affairs educators must acquire the skills needed to advance student learning and actively pursue outlets to put these skills into practice. The student affairs educators in this study contributed to advancing student learning by serving as a resource to faculty members teaching service-learning courses and, in some cases, teaching service-learning courses. The student affairs educators also shared their service-learning resources and expertise through several outlets, including, but not limited to, service-learning courses, service-learning workshops, one-on-one service-learning course consultations, and service-learning centered networking events. Furthermore, Bravo College and Delta University had a student affairs educator in this study who received a Campus Compact state-affiliate civic engagement professional of the year award. Although student affairs work varies widely at institutions of higher education, this study’s findings provide evidence student affairs educators should identify ways within their institutional context to collaborate with faculty members in order to highlight the ability of student affairs educators to further student learning.
Second, service-learning educators should prioritize securing recurring institutional funding for their programs initiatives. The Furco Rubric (Furco, 2006) and the Campus Compact Pyramid (Campus Compact, 2002) underscore the significant role funding plays in the service-learning institutionalization process. The Furco Rubric highlights that recurring institutional funding can be used to finance service-learning mini-grants, service-learning conference expenditures for faculty members, full-time staff positions, and student-centered service-learning activities. The Campus Compact Pyramid emphasizes the importance of financial support, but does not indicate a preference for one-time or recurring funding. Student affairs educators at each institution worked with upper-level administrators to obtain recurring institutionalization for service-learning. As federal and state funding for colleges and universities has declined, student affairs educators have had to identify more ways to financially support their programs and initiatives. The reorientation of student affairs practice towards the financial interests of colleges and universities has been called student affairs capitalism (Lee & Helm, 2013). The emergence of student affairs capitalism has caused dissonance among some student affairs educators because the concept is in opposition to the student affairs profession’s core values (Lee & Helm, 2013; Miser & Mathis, 1993).

Most of the student affairs educators in this study were fortunate to have the recurring institutional funding needed to pay for their programs and initiatives. The Alpha College student affairs educator revealed Alpha College officials reduced the recurring institutional funding allocated to service-learning for a few years due to the economic downturn. This reduction in funding resulted in a reduction of full-time staff and service-learning support for faculty members. The student affairs educators in this study appreciated their recurring institutional funds and acknowledged their jobs would be challenging with one-time funding or if they were
reliant on funding from outside sources. There are times when student affairs educators are so focused on their students that they neglect funding matters in their office and division. Although meeting and exceeding the needs of students is a central part of student affairs practice, it is also critically important for student affairs educators to view their work from an institutional or macro-level and determine what they need to do to sustain or increase the funding allocated to their programs and initiatives.

Third, student affairs educators bring a student-centered approach to service-learning that can be absent from faculty-led service-learning efforts. Although students typically spend more time with faculty members than they do with student affairs educators, students often view student affairs educators as more approachable than faculty members. The student-centered approach student affairs educators employ affords them the opportunity to get an understanding of student needs and trends that faculty members may not be able to acquire in a traditional classroom setting. Student affairs educators can support faculty members teaching service-learning courses by developing reflection activities, service-learning workshops, and service-learning briefs informed by student development theories and the knowledge student affairs educators have of the contemporary student experience. Student affairs educators working in service-learning also have more time to initiate and sustain mutually beneficial university-community partnerships than their faculty counterparts. Many faculty members have teaching and/or research responsibilities that make it very challenging to form reciprocal collaborations with community agency representatives. Student affairs educators can help increase the quality and quantity of service-learning courses linking faculty members and community agencies with shared interests. Service-learning is a fairly new student affairs functional area and student affairs educators are definitely underrepresented in the service-learning field. Student affairs
educators working in service-learning and graduate student affairs preparation program faculty members should encourage students with an interest in community engagement and student learning to pursue a career in service-learning. An increase in the number of student affairs educators in service-learning offices could also lead to a rise in research on service-learning in student affairs, a boost in service-learning presentations at student affairs conferences, and an expansion of service-learning offices organizationally housed in student affairs.

Fourth, student affairs educators should acquire upper-level administrative support for their programs and initiatives. The student affairs educators and faculty members in this study received a significant amount of upper-administrative support for their service-learning efforts. The presidents, chancellors, chief student affairs officers, provosts, and deans mentioned in this study demonstrated support for service-learning through campus-wide speeches, strategic planning documents, committee membership, funding allocations. These administrators were able to use their positional and political influence to help acquire the resources needed to start, maintain, or grow service-learning on their campuses. The student affairs educators in this study consistently stated the service-learning institutionalization process was buttressed by upper-level administrative support and the recurring funding that accompanied the aforementioned support. Recurring institutional funding and upper-administrative support are linked in this study because upper-level administrators played an indispensable role in securing recurring funding for service-learning. The findings underscore how imperative it is for student affairs educators to have at least one upper-level administrator in student affairs or academic affairs who regularly supports their work.
Limitations

This exploratory study had several limitations that were all considered when the study was being conceptualized. First, I only interviewed student affairs educators and faculty members at Campus Compact institutions. Presidents and chancellors at colleges and universities join Campus Compact because they represent institutions that value all forms of community and civic engagement. Therefore, student affairs educators and faculty members at these institutions selected to participate in this study were more likely to be more informed and invested in service-learning than educators at institutions that are not Campus Compact members. Second, I only interviewed one faculty member and no more than two student affairs educators at each institution. The Furco Rubric’s (Furco, 2006) author suggested those employing the Rubric to randomly select five or more faculty members on the campus being assessed to determine how well they can articulate the definition of service-learning and how it differs from other forms of community engagement. My faculty awareness component analysis was incomplete because I did not interview five or more faculty members at each institution in this study. Nevertheless, the sample size and methodologies I selected were appropriate since this was an exploratory study. Third, I was able to gather useful data from student affairs educators and faculty members, but I did not interview students, community agency representatives, or upper-level administrators. The Furco Rubric (Furco, 2006) underscores the importance of involving students, community agency representatives, and upper-level administrators in the service-learning institutionalization process. Interviewing at least one person from the aforementioned constituencies at each of the participating institutions could have provided me with a more in-depth perspective on each college’s service-learning institutionalization level.
Recommendations for Future Research

Using this study’s findings as a guide, I identified a number of recommendations for future research. My primary recommendation is the need for more empirical research on service-learning institutionalization in student affairs. Most of the service-learning literature focuses on service-learning organizationally housed in academic affairs. An increase in the amount of research on service-learning institutionalization in student affairs could help dispel the narrative that service-learning should be institutionalized exclusively in academic affairs. Additional research on service-learning institutionalization in student affairs could also inform the work of student affairs educators working in offices where service-learning is institutionalized in student affairs. More specifically, studies focused on how student affairs educators build relationships with faculty members teaching service-learning courses and help institutionalize service-learning in student affairs would assist student affairs educators aspiring to increase the depth of their service-learning knowledge.

Future research could also be conducted at institutions of higher education that are not members of Campus Compact. This research could help student affairs educators and others interested in service-learning gain an understanding of how service-learning is institutionalized in student affairs at colleges where there may be less of a focus on community and civic engagement. Similarly, researchers could compare and contrast how service-learning is institutionalized in student affairs at different institutional types. For example, there is a possibility the service-learning institutionalization processes at flagship public institutions differ from the service-learning institutionalization processes at small private minority serving institutions. The current study could also be expanded to include perspectives from multiple student affairs educators, faculty members, students, community agency representatives, and
upper-level administrators at each institution. The methodology may need change to accommodate the larger sample size, but a rise in participants would increase the generalizability of the findings. Research on the role *Learning Reconsidered* (NASPA & ACPA, 2004), *Powerful Partnerships* (ACPA & NASPA, 1998), and other student affairs seminal documents play in service-learning institutionalization may be beneficial to the student affairs profession. The student affairs educators and faculty members in this study may have used student affairs seminal documents to inform their service-learning efforts, but they did not reference any of the seminal documents when discussing service-learning institutionalization or service-learning as a whole. Representatives from student affairs organizations invest a great deal of effort into creating documents designed to inform student affairs practice. It would be interesting to see how much of an impact those documents have on service-learning efforts in student affairs.

**Conclusion**

Student affairs educators and faculty members regularly collaborate to develop educational environments where every office, program, and initiative presents students with opportunities to learn (NASPA & ACPA, 2004; ACPA et al., 2006). Service-learning has been identified as an ideal practice and pedagogy to use during these collaborations (ACPA, 1996a; NASPA & ACPA, 2004; ACPA et al., 2006). This study’s findings provide evidence there are service-learning educators with the expertise needed to assist with service-learning institutionalization efforts and support faculty members teaching service-learning courses. It is imperative for student affairs educators in all functional areas to view themselves as scholar practitioners with the expertise to lead traditional academic endeavors without sacrificing academic rigor.
References


APPENDIX A

STUDENT AFFAIRS EDUCATOR QUESTIONNAIRE

1. Does your institution have an official service-learning definition?
   a. If so, what is the definition?
   b. Please explain the process that was used to create your institution’s service-
      learning definition.
   c. Is your institution’s service-learning definition informed by the service-learning
      literature?
      i. If so, please explain how the literature informed your institution’s service-
         learning definition.
   d. Did any institution-specific factors (i.e., mission statements, vision statements,
      strategic plans) influence your institution’s service-learning definition?
      i. If so, please explain how institution-specific factors informed your
         institution’s service-learning definition.
   e. If not, why have you chosen to not define service-learning?

2. Please explain the process your institution went through to institutionalize service-
   learning in student affairs.
   a. Was it a top-down process (administratively driven) or a bottom-up (faculty
      driven initiative?
   b. How has service-learning been funded throughout the process of institutionalizing
      service-learning in student affairs?
c. When was the physical space for your office established?
   i. How was the location for the office chosen?

d. Please describe the support given to your service-learning by upper-level
   administrators on your campus.

e. What are the advantages of institutionalizing service-learning in student affairs?

f. Does the organizational placement of service-learning at your institution matter?
   i. If so, why; If not, why not?

3. Please explain some notable practices employed by student affairs educators and service-
   learning stakeholders at your institution to develop the faculty’s capacity to teach service-
   learning courses?
   
a. How many faculty members are currently teaching service-learning courses on
      your campus?

   b. How do academic departments view service-learning during the tenure and
      promotion process?
APPENDIX B

FACULTY MEMBER QUESTIONNAIRE

1. Does the organizational placement of service-learning at your institution matter?
   
i. If so, why; If not, why not?
   
b. Please describe the support given to you by upper-level administrators on your campus for engaging in service-learning.
   
c. Why do you believe the service-learning is housed organizationally in the student affairs division?

4. Please explain some notable practices employed by student affairs educators and service-learning stakeholders at your institution to develop your capacity to teach service-learning courses?

   d. How is service-learning perceived during the tenure and promotion process in your department?

   e. What expectations do you have for the student affairs educators at your institution who are responsible for supporting faculty members who teach service-learning courses?
APPENDIX C

FURCO SELF-ASSESSMENT RUBRIC FOR SERVICE-LEARNING

INSTITUTIONALIZATION IN HIGHER EDUCATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEFINITION OF SERVICE-LEARNING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STAGE ONE Critical Mass Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no campus-wide definition for service-learning. The term &quot;service-learning&quot; is used inconsistently to describe a variety of experiential and service activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STAGE TWO Quality Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is an operationalized definition for service-learning on the campus, but there is some variance and inconsistency in the use of the term.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STAGE THREE Sustained Institutionalization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOTES</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRATEGIC PLANNING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STAGE ONE Critical Mass Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The campus does not have an official strategic plan for advancing service-learning on campus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STAGE TWO Quality Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STAGE THREE Sustained Institutionalization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The campus has developed an official strategic plan for advancing service-learning on campus, which includes viable short-range and long-range institutionalization goals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOTES</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ALIGNMENT WITH INSTITUTIONAL MISSION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STAGE ONE Critical Mass Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STAGE TWO Quality Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STAGE THREE Sustained Institutionalization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service-learning is part of the primary concern of the institution. Service-learning is included in the campus’ official mission and/or strategic planning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOTES</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ALIGNMENT WITH EDUCATIONAL REFORM EFFORTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STAGE ONE Critical Mass Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STAGE TWO Quality Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service-learning is tied loosely or adversely 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.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STAGE THREE Sustained Institutionalization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOTES</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**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 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STAGE ONE</th>
<th>STAGE TWO</th>
<th>STAGE THREE</th>
<th>NOTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>FACULTY AWARENESS</strong></td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FACULTY INVOLVEMENT &amp; SUPPORT</strong></td>
<td>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 their own professional work. Only a few key faculty members actively participate as service-learning instructors.</td>
<td>A substantial number of influential faculty members participate as instructors, supporters, and advocates of service-learning and support the infusion of service-learning into the institution's overall mission AND the faculty members' individual professional work.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FACULTY LEADERSHIP</strong></td>
<td>None of the most influential faculty members on campus serve as leaders for advancing service-learning on the campus.</td>
<td>There are only one or two influential faculty members who provide leadership to the campus' service-learning effort.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FACULTY INCENTIVES &amp; REWARDS</strong></td>
<td>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 processes.</td>
<td>Faculty who are involved in service-learning receive recognition for it during the campus' review, tenure, and promotion process.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage One: Critical Mass Building</th>
<th>Stage Two: Quality Building</th>
<th>Stage Three: Sustained Institutionalization</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student Awareness</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no campus-wide mechanism for informing students about service-learning courses, resources, and opportunities that are available to them.</td>
<td>While there are some mechanisms for informing students about service-learning courses, resources, and opportunities that are available to them, the mechanisms are specific and concentrated in only a few departments or programs (e.g., course flyers).</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student Opportunities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Few service-learning opportunities exist for students; only a handful of service-learning courses are available.</td>
<td>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.).</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student Leadership</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>Students are welcomed and encouraged to serve as advocates and ambassadors for institutionalizing service-learning in their departments or throughout the campus.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student Incitivies and Rewards</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The campus has neither formal mechanisms (e.g., cataloged list of service-learning courses, service-learning notations on student transcripts, etc.) nor informal mechanisms (e.g., 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.</td>
<td>While the campus offers some informal incentives and rewards (e.g., 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 (cataloged list of service-learning courses, service-learning notations on student transcripts, etc.) that encourage students to participate in service-learning.</td>
<td>The campus has one or more formal mechanisms in place (e.g., cataloged list of service-learning courses, service-learning notations on student transcripts, etc.) that encourage students to participate in service-learning and reward students for their participation in service-learning.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMUNITY PARTNER AWARENESS</th>
<th>STAGE ONE Critical Mass Building</th>
<th>STAGE TWO Quality Building</th>
<th>STAGE THREE Sustained Institutionalization</th>
<th>NOTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MUTUAL UNDERSTANDING</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMMUNITY PARTNER VOICE &amp; LEADERSHIP</td>
<td>Few, if any, opportunities exist for community agency representatives to take on leadership roles in advancing service-learning on campus; community agency representatives are not invited or encouraged to express their particular agency needs or recruit student and faculty participation in service-learning.</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STAGE ONE Critical Mass Building</th>
<th>STAGE TWO Quality Building</th>
<th>STAGE THREE Sustained Institutionalization</th>
<th>NOTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>COORDINATING ENTITY</strong>&lt;br&gt;There is a campus-wide coordinating entity (e.g., committee, center, or steering committee) that is devoted to assessing the various campus constituencies in the implementation, advancement, and institutionalization of service-learning.</td>
<td>There is a coordinating entity (e.g., committee, center, or steering committee) on campus, but the entity either does not coordinate service-learning activities systematically or provides services to only a certain constituency (e.g., students, faculty) or limited part of the campus (e.g., campus extension).</td>
<td>The institution maintains a coordinating entity (e.g., committee, center, or steering committee) that is devoted primarily to assessing the various campus constituencies in the implementation, advancement, and institutionalization of service-learning.</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>POLICY-MAKING ENTITY</strong>&lt;br&gt;The institution's policy-making body(ies) do not recognize service-learning as an essential educational goal for the campus.</td>
<td>The institution's policy-making body(ies) recognize service-learning as an essential educational goal for the campus, but no formal policies have been developed.</td>
<td>The institution's policy-making body(ies) recognize service-learning as an essential educational goal for the campus and formal policies have been developed or implemented.</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>STAFFING</strong>&lt;br&gt;There are no full-time faculty members on campus whose primary paid responsibility is to advance and institutionalize service-learning on the campus.</td>
<td>There is an appropriate number of staff members on campus who understand service-learning fully and who hold appropriate titles that can influence the advancement and institutionalization of service-learning throughout the campus, however appointment are temporary or paid from external grants.</td>
<td>The campus has on staff some appropriate number of permanent faculty members who understand service-learning and hold appropriate titles that can influence the advancement and institutionalization of service-learning on campus.</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FUNDING</strong>&lt;br&gt;The campus' service-learning activities are supported primarily by soft money (endowment grants) from sources outside the institution.</td>
<td>The campus' service-learning activities are supported by both soft money (endowment grants) from sources outside the institution as well as hard money from the institution.</td>
<td>The campus' service-learning activities are supported primarily by hard funding from the campus.</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT</strong>&lt;br&gt;The campus' administrative leaders have little or no understanding of service-learning, often equating it with other campus outreach efforts, such as community service or internship programs.</td>
<td>The campus' administrative leaders have a clear understanding of service-learning, but they do little to make service-learning a viable and important part of the campus' work.</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EVALUATION &amp; ASSESSMENT</strong>&lt;br&gt;There is no organized, campus-wide effort underway to assess for the number and quality of service-learning activities taking place.</td>
<td>An initiative to account for the number and quality of service-learning activities taking place throughout the campus has been proposed.</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX D

CAMPUS COMPACT SERVICE-LEARNING PYRAMID

INTRODUCTORY
- President intrigued but learning
- A few faculty interested in a few disciplines
- No faculty rewards or visible champions
- No service-learning center or liaison not well known on campus
- Courses of variable quality
- Ad hoc community involvement

INTERMEDIATE
- President supportive, reflected in mission, financial support
- Up to 24% of faculty use service-learning in a number of different disciplines
- Faculty incentives and supports for designing and teaching service-learning courses
- Chief Academic Officer and some departments supportive
- Course quality and impact is measured
- Visible community service or service-learning center supports faculty
- Community networks developed

ADVANCED INTERMEDIATE
- President very supportive
- Some departments in every major college or division use service-learning to foster civic education in that discipline
- Service-learning aligned with institutional mission and learning outcomes and is supported at all levels of administration
- Faculty development, hiring and tenure systems recognize value of service-learning
- Scholarship of engagement is beginning to increase among faculty
- Student outcomes are defined and measured
- Campus has strong community partnerships supported by the president and other

ADVANCED
- President seeking more ways to encourage civic engagement
- Service-learning is widespread and valued practice across all disciplines. All students have an opportunity for service-learning
- Service-learning and other practices of engagement are aligned with institutional mission and this is reflected in institutional, student, and faculty assessments
- Campus has strategic reciprocal community partnerships that provide opportunity for teaching, research and service to meet community's needs and mobilize a range of campus resources: intellectual, physical and economic
- Campus is experimenting with other ways to deepen the impact of civic education through initiatives on and off campus to increase student, faculty, institutional, and community capacities for "public work" in a diverse democracy