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This study investigated the levels of involvement in service-learning programs and activities in 4-year public colleges and university that held membership in the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS). The data for the study were collected using a modified version of the American Association of Community Colleges’ 1995 *Survey on Community Service and Service Learning in Community Colleges* and 1997 *Survey on Service Learning in Community Colleges*.

The sample for the study consisted of 116 chief executive officers from 4-year public colleges and university holding membership in SACS during 1996. Frequency counts, percentage distributions, and chi square tests of significance were employed to analyze the data.

The study identified 55 (47.4%) institutions as having service-learning programs on their campuses during 1996. An institutional profile of colleges and universities that supported such programs was developed according to Carnegie Classification, enrollment size, geographic location, and mission statement. Program models and structures as well as participant characteristics; including gender, ethnicity, hours volunteered, etc.; were gathered and a profile established for each. Finally, a discussion of future prospects affecting campus-based service-learning programs was included.
Results for the survey showed service-learning program development and student/faculty participation to be on the rise among 4-year public colleges and universities. Several institutions 28 (45.9%), without a current service-learning program, responded that they are interested in developing such programs.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The importance of service to community and the concept of citizenship began with the founding of the United States and has evolved through the years as a focus for society, religion, and even higher education. The concept of combining service with education began with the founding of the first American educational institution, Harvard College in 1636. Early Harvard educators suggested that higher education should have a significant role in preparing students for citizenship and community involvement (Smith, 1994).

There was a tacit understanding of what its social purpose was and where its ultimate significance lay. Those who came, . . . assumed that Harvard was there to prepare them to be leaders of society, to serve it, to preside over its institutions. (Bok, 1982, p. 3)

As early as 1910, philosopher William James called for an intensive, far-reaching national service program. Support for such service has gained and lost public appeal over the decades. However, some institutions of higher education have accepted this role and have even included service goals in their institutional missions. The practice of intentionally combining service and learning in an effort to promote student learning and
development, however, did not take hold in America colleges and universities until the community service movement of the 1960s (Kendall, 1991).

With the renewed emphasis on service combined with learning, several new organizations have arisen to address student volunteerism, and many existing organizations have expanded their commitment to community involvement. Organizations such as the National Society for Experiential Education (NSEE), founded in 1971, Campus Outreach Opportunity League (COOL), founded in 1984, Campus Compact, formed in 1985, and AmeriCorp, implemented in 1994, were established to encourage increased student community service alongside traditional pedagogy. Student involvement in community service expanded dramatically during the 1980s with the development of new college-and-university sponsored service-learning programs.

Higher education's roles and responsibilities within present-day society have been widely discussed in the popular and scholarly literature. Many believe that colleges and universities have lost sight of their original mission and are in need of reform (Astin, 1995; Boyer, 1990, 1994; Harkavy, 1997; Hesburgh, 1993). Boyer (1990, 1994) was inspirational in fostering a national dialogue on the creation of a new genre of the American college, one that would revisit the roles of teaching, research, and service in higher education. Astin (1995) professed that American higher education has neglected its mission of fostering good citizenship. As a result of these discussions, many educators have engaged in an evaluation of the role that higher education plays within society, the relationship it has to the community, and the responsibility it shares to promote citizenship. This reexamination of institutional focus and mission has furthered the
service-learning agenda. According to Mattson and Shea (1997), "Service-learning is [was] one effort to challenge the changing nature of higher education and to revive concepts of public life and civic commitments that were quickly becoming insignificant at universities" (p. 15).

Research on service-learning and the impact it has on student learning and development is sparse in the literature. This scarcity of qualitative and quantitative research prompted the National Society for Internships and Experiential Education (NSEE) and the Johnson Foundation to sponsor the 1991 Wingspread Conference and to publish the Research Agenda for Combining Service and Learning in the 1990's. The conference's research agenda attempted to respond to educators' questions regarding the effects service-learning has on intellectual, moral, and citizenship development of participants and the effect service-learning has on the advancement of social institutions and democracy (Giles, Hommet, & Migliore, 1991). Given the recent renewed interest in citizenship and service-learning within higher education, much research remains to be done. Research is needed to determine whether learning and development occur as a result of participation in service-learning. Research is also needed to identify the benefits of service-learning programs to students, schools, and the community. In addition, information on program models, participant demographics, participant motivation, community benefits, and future outlooks is essential to continued growth and success of service-learning efforts in institutions of higher education. Data on existing service-learning programs and program models are necessary to assist colleges and universities with valuable insight into the development of new programs and activities. Thus, this
study attempted to identify service-learning programs, profiles, problems, and prospects at 4-year public colleges and universities in 11 states in the southern part of the United States. More specifically, the study addressed a set of the specific questions asked in the Research Agenda for Combining Service and Learning in the 1990's; "What are the varieties of service-learning found in American... schools and colleges?"; "Who participates in service-learning; what institutions sponsor it; how programs are structured" (Giles et al., 1991, pp. 13-14).

Statement of the Problem

The problem of this study was to investigate the levels of involvement in service-learning programs and activities in 4-year public colleges and universities that hold membership in the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS).

Purposes of the Study

The purposes of this study were: (a) to investigate which institutions have service-learning programs on their campuses; (b) to establish institutional profiles of colleges and universities that support service-learning activities; (c) to describe service-learning program models and structures; (d) to identify characteristics of participants in service-learning; and (e) to discuss future prospects affecting campus-based service-learning programs.
Research Questions

To guide the development of this study, nine major research questions were formulated:

1. Which 4-year public colleges and universities in the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools have service-learning programs on their campuses?

2. What is the nature of the institutions with service-learning programs when categorized according to the Carnegie Classifications (i.e., master’s, doctoral, research institutions)?

3. What are the institutional characteristics (i.e., size, geographic location, and mission) of 4-year public colleges and universities that are members of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools and that offer service-learning courses and programs?

4. What are the demographics of student participants in service-learning programs at 4-year public colleges and universities that are members of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools?

5. What are the key success factors in service-learning programs at 4-year public colleges and universities that are members of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools?

6. What are the program structures and administrative organizations of service-learning programs at 4-year public colleges and universities in the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools?
7. What types of community organizations are served by service-learning participants?

8. What are the major problems affecting the development of service-learning programs at 4-year public colleges and universities that are members of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools?

9. What is the likely future of service-learning at 4-year public colleges and universities in the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools?

Significance of the Study

Service-learning initiatives have been bolstered by the rising national interest in community service. Clarity regarding the role and scope of service-learning in American higher education must be sought (Westheimer & Kahne, 1994). Although it is difficult, according to Kraft (1996), to determine which schools and colleges have service-learning programs, some statistics on participants are available. For example, Abt Associates (Melchior, Jastrzab, Bailis, & Frees, 1994) presented findings to Congress in 1994 that suggest that approximately 200,000 young people and adults participate in ongoing service projects, with an average of 39 hours of direct service per participant in higher education. The American Association for Community Colleges (AACC) conducted a national study to determine the extent of involvement in service-learning among community colleges (AACC, 1995). The results of this study showed that “four out of five community colleges are interested in service learning, either by actively using the methodology or wanting to do so” (Robinson & Barnett, 1996, p.1). The American
Association of Community Colleges study provided an institutional profile, characteristics of participants, and program structure and administration for service-learning programs at community colleges. The Campus Outreach Opportunity League (COOL) maintains a list of “Campus Based Community Service Programs” on their website on the Internet (Campus Outreach Opportunity League, 1997). As of July 15, 1997, ninety-six American institutions of higher education were listed as having service-learning programs on their campuses. Only 21 of the institutions listed are located in 1 of the 11 states that are members of the SACS. Only 14 of the 21 SACS institutions are 4-year public colleges and universities (Campus Outreach Opportunity League, 1997).

Campus Compact: The Project for Public and Community Service publishes an annual report illustrating hundreds of service-learning programs and models as well as national trends and statistics for service within their coalition. The Campus Compact reported membership for 1996 at 512 colleges and universities, with Campus Compact Networks in 18 states, the Center for Community Colleges, and the Historically Black Colleges and Universities. Florida is the only state in SACS that has a Campus Compact Network (Kobrin, Mareth, & Smith, 1996). The National Service-Learning Clearinghouse supports a database of programs, organization, people, calendar of events, literature, and multimedia materials. Although this database gathers information on programs, funding, history, participation, and activities, little information is available on institutions that are members of SACS (Shumer & Belbas, 1996).
According to educators, researchers, and practitioners who participated in the 1991 Wingspread Conference and published The Research Agenda for Combining Service and Learning in the 1990’s, individual characteristics, institutional profiles, program processes, and administrative structures are important variables in research on service-learning (Giles et al., 1991). Increasingly, institutions of higher education are adopting service-learning programs and adding service requirements to their curricula. However, there is limited qualitative or quantitative research information regarding service-learning programs or the effects that service-learning have on students, institutions, or society as a whole. Therefore, an understanding of program models, participant demographics, motivations, community benefits, and future outlook is essential to the continued growth and success of service-learning.

An in-depth review of the literature found that a study on institutional and individual profiles, program structures, and administrative models for service-learning programs at 4-year public institutions has not been conducted. Thus, this study attempted to extend a study conducted by the American Association for Community Colleges Service Learning Clearinghouse in 1995 and 1997 in order to determine the extent of involvement in service-learning at 4-year public colleges and universities. This study is significant because it adds to the literature and provides valuable information on existing service-learning programs. It specifically addressed a set of research questions identified by the Wingspread Conference by focusing on who participates in service-learning, what institutions sponsor it, how programs are structures, and the varieties of service-learning found in American secondary schools and colleges (Giles et al., 1991).
Definition of Terms

**AmeriCorps** - This program is administered through state commissions on national service. It allows students to participate in volunteer service as a means of helping to pay for higher education or vocational training (Jacoby et al., 1996).

**Baccalaureate (liberal arts) Colleges I** - These institutions are highly selective and offer mostly undergraduate degrees in the arts and sciences (Evangelauf, 1994).

**Baccalaureate (liberal arts) Colleges II** - These institutions are less selective than Baccalaureate (liberal arts) Colleges I and generally have small student (i.e., fewer than 1,500) enrollment (Evangelauf, 1994).

**Campus Compact** - This national coalition of college and university presidents are committed to helping students develop lifelong skills and civic responsibility through involvement in public service (Kobrin et al., 1996).

**Carnegie Classification** - This classification system groups college and universities into categories on the basis of the levels of degrees awarded and institutional mission. The categories established for colleges and universities include Research Universities I and II; Doctoral Universities I and II; Master’s (comprehensive) Universities and Colleges I and II; Baccalaureate (liberal arts) Colleges I and II; Two-year Community, Junior, and Technical Colleges; and Specialized Institutions (Boyer, 1989; Evangelauf, 1994).

**Community Service** - This refers to unpaid work done for the purpose of improving the quality of life of those being served. The focus of community service is on serving community needs (Berson, 1994).
Doctoral Universities I - These institutions offer a full range of programs and degrees and have a commitment to graduate education. These institutions generally award at least 40 doctoral degrees annually in five or more disciplines (Evangelauf, 1994).

Doctoral Universities II - Institutions within this category are similar to Doctoral Universities I. They award at least 10 doctoral degrees annually in at least three disciplines or 20+ degrees in one or more disciplines (Evangelauf, 1994).

Master's (comprehensive) Universities and Colleges I - These institutions offer baccalaureate programs and graduate education through the master's degree (Evangelauf, 1994).

Master's (comprehensive) Universities and Colleges II - These institutions offer baccalaureate programs and graduate education through the master's degree, with a student enrollment of between 1,500 and 2,500. The difference between Master's (comprehensive) Universities and College I and II is the size of the institution and the disciplines through which degrees are awarded (Evangelauf, 1994).

Research Universities I - These institutions offer degrees ranging from baccalaureate programs to doctoral degrees. In order to be classified Research I, an institution must award at least 50 doctoral degrees each year and place a high priority on research and grants (Boyer, 1989).

Research Universities II - Institutions that fit into this category are similar to Research I institutions in degrees and priorities; however, they receive less federal support for research than Research Universities I (Boyer, 1989).
Service-learning - This term refers to “a form of experiential education in which students engage in activities that address human and community needs together with structured opportunities intentionally designed to promote student learning and development” (Jacoby et al., 1996, p. 5).

Specialized Institutions - These institutions offer degrees ranging from the bachelor’s to the doctorate, with at least 50% in a specialized field. Specialized institutions include theological seminaries; Bible colleges; medical schools and centers; health profession schools; schools of engineering and technology; schools of business and management; schools of art, music, and design; schools of law; tribal colleges; and teachers colleges (Evangelauf, 1994).

Volunteerism - This is the performing of a service or good deed without the intent of being paid for that service (Kraft, 1996).

Limitations

Not all 166 institutions receiving the mailed questionnaire chose to participate in the study, for whatever reasons. Therefore, those institutions that did participate (i.e., N=116) may or may not be a sample representative of the larger universe from which they came. To the extent that the final sample of institutions is not representative of its universe, the generalizability of all findings is compromised.

The researcher has to assume that respondents answered the survey questions honestly and accurately. Therefore, data collected in the study are limited to the
information provided by the participating 4-year public colleges and universities that are members of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS).

Delimitations

The population of this study was limited to those individuals responsible for service-learning at 4-year public colleges and universities that were members of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS). There are limited research and printed materials available on service-learning programs in the southern part of the United States; therefore, SACS member schools were selected for the study. All 166 4-year public colleges and universities in 11 states (i.e., Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, and Virginia) that were members of SACS were requested to participate in the study.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Service-learning is a time-tested educational tool that traces its lineage back to John Dewey. It helps students understand the relevance of their coursework and enables them to test their classroom work against the reality of the world around them. (Kennedy, 1991, p. 772)

Although the concept of service is deeply rooted in American higher education, few educators have agreed on the appropriate terminology to describe the programs, organizations, movements, and courses that combine the concepts of service and learning in an intentional way. Kendall (1991) identified some of the existing terminology as action research, altruism, citizen involvement, citizenship, civic awareness, civic literacy, collaborative learning, community-based education, community education, community service, cooperative education, cross-cultural learning, education for social responsibility, experiential education, field experience, field studies, global awareness, intergenerational development, international experiences, internships, leadership, national service, public service, reciprocal learning, service-learning, servant leadership, social action, study-service, volunteer action, volunteerism, youth involvement, youth participation, and youth service. The diversity of language used to describe service-learning activities
reflects the various priorities and interpretations that educators have in regard to service and education.

In addition to a wide variety of terms used in the literature, there is also an array of definitions of service-learning in books, articles, laws, and monographs. Howard Berry, of Partnerships of Service Learning, defined the concept as "the union of public and community service with structured and intentional learning" (Berry, 1988, p.3). Stanton (1987) stated the following:

Service-learning appears to be an approach to experiential learning, an expression of values--service to others, community development, reciprocal learning--which determines the purpose, nature and process of social and educational exchange between learners and the people they serve, and between experiential education programs and the community organizations with which they work. (p. 4)

Dollar and Rust (1983) described service-learning as "an integrative process that includes participation in society, critical reflection on the participation, and the relation of experiences to theoretical knowledge" (p. 26). Berson (1993) concluded that "service learning expands on previous internship programs by combining the traditional educational goals of intellectual and personal growth with the social values of community service" (p.32). Neil Merrell, Director of the Center for Public Policy and Service at Mesa Community College noted that "service learning is a blending of academic study and community service" (as cited in Berson, 1993, p. 16). Wade (1995) indicated that "community service learning is the integration of meaningful service to one's school or
community with academic learning and structured reflection on the service experience” (p. 122). In a keynote address at the New England Conference on Community Service Learning, Kohlmoos (1995) observed that “service learning is by design an ongoing effort to break down the barriers and build bridges- to create a lasting connection between the constantly changing needs of the community and the educational effort to address them” (p. 43). According to Couto (1988), service-learning is “the exchange between community abilities and student needs and between community needs and student abilities” (p.4). Robert Sigmon (1979), an early leader in the service-learning movement, has stressed that service-learning plays an important role in higher education through intimate involvement and distanced reflection. He believes that the combination of involvement and reflection best promotes student understanding of the world outside. The American Association for Community Colleges adopted the following definition:

Service learning involves students in organized community service that addresses local needs, while developing their academic skills in the classroom, their sense of civic responsibility, and their commitment to the community. Service learning is related to but does not include cooperative education, practicum, or internship programs. (As cited in Robinson & Barnett, 1996, p. 1)

Although there are many definitions of service-learning, most recent definitions are based on the statement included in the preamble of the Principles of Good Practice for Combining Service and Learning, which stated: “Service, combined with learning, adds value to each and transforms both” (Giles et al., 1991, p.24). The most comprehensive
definition found in the literature is provided by the Commission on National and Community Service. The National and Community Service Act of 1990 described service-learning with a set of criteria:

[Service-learning is a method] (1) under which students learn and develop through active participation in thoughtfully organized service experiences that meet actual community needs and that are coordinated in collaboration with schools and community;

(2) that is integrated into the students’ academic curriculum or provides structured time for a student to think, talk or write about what the student did and saw during the actual service activity;

(3) that provides students with opportunities to use newly acquired skills and knowledge in real life situations in their own communities; and

(4) that enhances what is taught in school by extending student learning beyond the classroom and into the community and helps to foster the development of a sense of caring for others. (Commission on National and Community Service, 1993, p. 15; Cohen & Kinsey, 1994, p. 6; Kraft, 1996, p. 136)

Service-learning and community service are often used interchangeably, although they are not synonymous. Community service is the root of service-learning, and it fills a need in society through student volunteerism. Community service is often a powerful experience for participants. However, definitions of service-learning suggest something more than mere charity offered to the community. Service-learning suggests a reciprocal
relationship between the server (i.e., the student) and those served (i.e., the community).

Students not only give something to the community, they also derive something for themselves. Through service-learning, students are able to gain greater understanding, an appreciation of diversity, and the opportunity for internal reflection on their own values and beliefs. Service-learning provides students the opportunity to supplement their academic endeavors through involvement with the community, followed by reflection on those experiences. According to the Alliance for Service Learning in Educational Reform (1993), “Reflection is the action taken, both good and bad, determining what has been gained, lost or achieved, and connecting these conclusions to future actions and larger societal contexts” (pp. 71-72). The opportunity for critical reflection is what distinguishes service-learning from internships, cooperative education, practicums, and internships. Reflection can be orchestrated through journals, group discussion, and individual and/or group presentations or projects. Cooper (1997b) contended that community service alone is often meaningless unless it is combined with writing, speaking, and listening about the service rendered. He stated, “Learning happens through a mix of theory and practice, thought and action, observation and interaction. It allows students to learn from themselves” (p. 1). Thus, “a good service learning program helps participants see their questions in the larger context of issues of social justice and social policy -- rather than in the context of charity” (Kendall, 1990, p. 20).
Historical Overview

A review of history reveals that the term community can be traced back to the landing of the pilgrims in the New World (Cole, 1940). John Winthrop, one of the first Puritans to arrive in America, preached a sermon to the early settlers that challenged them to work and live “together as a community” (Bellah, Madsen, Sullivan, Swidler & Tipton, 1985, p. 28). The emphasis on community and helping others (i.e., service) is prevalent in history and can also be traced back to 1776 in the founding of the United States. However, the concept of combining service with education began with Harvard College in 1636. In 1830 Alexis De Tocqueville pursued the concepts of service and community when he examined the issues of society and character (Jordan, 1995). He wrote that “an enlightened self-love continually leads Americans to help one another and disposes them freely to give part of their time and wealth for the good of the state” (Kennedy, 1991, p. 771). Thus, the ideas of community and service are not new concepts, but rather old ones that are well established in the lore of the American people.

Historically, a number of agencies and systems were established to promote the development of community and service to mankind. During the Civil War, the Red Cross was created to bring nurses onto the battlefields to give aid to the wounded (Kennedy, 1991). Later, settlement houses were established to provide social services to the community. During the Great Depression, the Civilian Conservation Corps was established by President Franklin D. Roosevelt. The purpose of the Civilian Conservation Corps was to help unemployed youth find jobs (Kennedy, 1991; Kraft, 1996).
By 1862 institutions of higher education became involved in the concept of service. During that same year, Congress passed the Morrill Act, Land-Grant Colleges Act, which established new universities designed to educate the population in subjects of agriculture and industry for the purpose of serving and aiding society (Boyer, 1994). As the years passed, community service continued to gain standing and presence within institutions of higher education. As evidence of the importance placed on community service within higher education, in 1896 Woodrow Wilson declared, “It is not learning but the spirit of service that will give college a place in the public annals of the nation” (Boyer, 1994, p. 48). It was during the early 1900s that the concept of service combined with learning emerged in the Progressive Education Movement (Lankard, 1995). Educational reformers and curriculum theorists such as John Dewey and William Kilpatrick promoted a service component to academia that was designed to help students recognize the benefits of combining service and learning (Westheimer & Kahne, 1994). Thus, community service has a long history in America and in American institutions of higher education.

In his famous 1961 inaugural address, President John F. Kennedy challenged Americans to stop looking for how they would benefit from programs and services, but rather to seek what they might be able to do for their nation and mankind. This theme inspired Americans to become more involved in community service. During the Kennedy administration, the Peace Corps, VISTA, and numerous local agencies emerged to respond to the interest in community service within society (Kennedy, 1991).
In 1967 the term service-learning first appeared in the works of Sigmon and William Ramsey at the Southern Regional Education Board (Giles & Eyler, 1994). At this time, educators began contemplating the importance of combining components of experiential learning, values education, and community service. During that year, the Southern Regional Education Board (SREB) developed the first actual service-learning program that placed students in community service internships designed to promote learning and social responsibility (Martin, 1977). In 1969 the National Center for Service-Learning was established by the U.S. Office of Economic Opportunity. The early function of the center was to provide technical assistance to secondary and postsecondary institutions that were developing service-learning programs (Lewis, 1988). In 1970 Boston College established PULSE, one of the first higher education learning-work programs in the nation (Gwynne, 1989). In 1971 the National Society for Experiential Education (NSEE) was founded to support higher education’s involvement with community service (Rauner, 1995). The Domestic Service Act of 1973 gave legislative authority to volunteer programs through ACTION, the primary federal agency established to administer volunteer service programs. In 1982 the Partnership for Service-Learning was developed as an international/intercultural program designed to unite academic study and community service. The Partnership incorporated students and agencies in the Czech Republic, Ecuador, England, France, India, Israel, Jamaica, Mexico, the Philippines, Scotland, and South Dakota (Partnership for Service Learning, 1997). The Campus Outreach Opportunity League (COOL) was started in 1984 by a graduate student hiking across the northwestern United States learning about community service programs. It was
founded as a national nonprofit group to help college students start, strengthen, and/or expand their community service programs (Campus Outreach Opportunity League, 1997). In 1985 the Campus Compact was initiated by college and university presidents committed to making student involvement in community service an integral part of the academic experience (Gwynne, 1989). The National and Community Service Act of 1990 was enacted by the 101st Congress as a measure to enable students to serve their communities.

The 1990s brought an explosion of interest in service-learning and thus a vast amount of literature. Kendall (1990), in conjunction with the National Society for Internships and Experiential Education, published a three-volume set, *Combining Service and Learning*. This project was a compilation of resources that address the historical, theoretical, and practical aspects of service-learning. Material in each volume helps educators start or strengthen courses and/or programs on service-learning. Also in 1990, Delve, Mintz, and Stewart edited, *Community Service as Values Education*, a volume on service-learning that offers invaluable insight into combining service and higher education. In 1991 the NSEE sponsored a Wingspread Conference and published the *Research Agenda for Combining Service and Learning in the 1990's* (Rauner, 1995). The research agenda generated specific research questions falling within two broad thematic questions: “What is the effect of service-learning on intellectual, moral and citizenship development of participants? and What is the effect of service-learning on the advancement of social institutions and democracy?” (Giles et al., 1991, p. 9). Each of the research questions was identified by the 40 educators, researchers, service-learning
practitioners, foundation representatives, and students at the Wingspread Conference.

Five categories of questions were identified at the conference, addressing participant characteristics, educational institution profiles, community, theoretical bases, and program models. Each of these categories includes several additional and more specific questions for researcher investigation.

1. What are the general effects of the service learning experience on the individual student?

2. What is the effect of service learning on the improvement of the educational system and on specific types of educational institutions?

3. What is the effect of service learning on community improvement?

4. How can service learning research contribute to the development of theories that can further undergird and illuminate service learning?

5. What are the components and outcomes of various models of service learning? (Giles et al., 1991, p. 9).

With support from the Kellogg Foundation, the University of Michigan published **Praxis I: A Faculty Casebook on Community Service** (Howard, 1993), **Praxis II: Service Learning Resources for University Students, Staff and Faculty** (Galura & Meiland, 1994), and **Praxis III: Voices in Dialogue** (Galura & Howard, 1995). These materials have provided valuable resource information for faculty members and administrators in developing service-learning courses and programs. **The Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning (MICSL)** was established in 1994 as an outlet for publishing research on service-learning generated as a result of increased national
interest in service (Howard, 1996). The MJCSL, a national peer-reviewed journal, is published annually in the fall. In addition to the numerous new books, journals, and articles, several new organizations were formed and conferences were held which focused on service-learning issues.

Community service and service-learning programs continued to gain strength and attention as increased legislation was passed and programs were established. In a speech presented at the University of New Orleans on his 100th day in office, President William Clinton shared his vision of service-learning with the nation. He later signed the National and Community Service Trust Act of 1993, which extended and expanded American volunteer programs such as Volunteer in Service to America (VISTA), Retired Senior Volunteer Program (RSVP), Foster Grandparent Program, and the Senior Companion Program (Alt & Medrich, 1994). Additionally, President Clinton promised the nation that national service would “strengthen the cords that bind us together as a people” (Berson, 1994, p.14).

The Corporation for National Service was created by the National and Community Service Trust Act of 1993 as a funding source for community service endeavors. Learn and Serve America: Higher Education Division of the corporation was developed to focus on making service an integral part of a college student’s education and life experiences (Exley, 1996). Also in 1993, the National Service Learning Cooperative/Clearinghouse was established under the National Youth Leadership Council (NYLC). The National Service Learning Cooperative/Clearinghouse was a collaborative
effort between the University of Minnesota and the NYLC with the goal of providing a
clearinghouse of information on service-learning (Duckenfield & Wright, 1995).

Cyberspace has contributed numerous websites that provide information and links
to other national, regional, and local service-learning information pages (i.e., Service
Learning at http://www.csf.colorado.edu/sl/; National Society for Experiential Education
; National Service Learning (K-12) Clearinghouse at http://www.nicsl.coled.umn.edu/
; Campus Outreach Opportunity League at http://www.cool2serve.org/; Giraffe Project at
1996, a virtual refereed journal, *Journal of Service Learning* (JSL), was inaugurated on
the Internet. The journal was developed by the University of Colorado at Boulder to offer
ongoing access to high-quality articles on service-learning (Crews, 1997). Other service-
learning initiatives include the SERVICE-LEARNING Listserve (i.e., discussion group),
hosted by the Communications for a Sustainable Future (CSF) at the University of
Colorado at Boulder; the *Journal of Public Service and Outreach*, which is an
interdisciplinary journal dedicated to the field of service; and the *Generator*, which is
published by the National Youth Leadership Council.

During his campaign for the presidency, President Clinton called for the creation
of AmeriCorps, which actually began in 1994 as a method of funding higher education
for college students participating in community service activities. In its first year, the
program offered over 20,000 people $7,425 in annual wages, health, and childcare
benefits, and $4,725 in educational benefits in exchange for a year of community service
work (Berson, 1994). Through AmeriCorps, volunteers conduct a variety of service activities, ranging from literacy, cleaning the environment, and serving the hungry. Since the program's creation, over 70,000 students have served their communities and earned college tuition through their service endeavors (Clinton, 1997a).

Throughout his tenure, President Clinton has continued to be a catalyst for service. On September 8, 1994, he wrote a letter to the presidents of all American colleges and universities. His letter asked for help in “inspiring an ethic of service across our nation” (Jacoby et al., 1996, p. 17). On April 5, 1997, President Clinton gave a radio address on service. During that address, he declared April 13-19, 1997, as National Service Week in America, whereby over a million people would participate in service programs around the nation. Additionally, he hosted a Presidents' Summit on Service on April 27-29, 1997, at Independence Hall in Philadelphia. This historic event brought every living former president, or his representative, as well as other prominent Americans together to promote service (Clinton, 1997b). On July 28, 1997, President Clinton again addressed the nation via radio to tout his National Service Scholars Program. The new program recognizes high school students for their involvement in helping others. The National Service Scholars Program provides $1,000 college scholarships to one student per high school with an outstanding record of service. The president also stated in his address,

I have called on every state to make service a part of the curriculum in high school or even middle school. There are many creative ways to do this including giving students credit for service, incorporating service into
coursework, putting service on a student’s transcript or even requiring service as a condition for graduation, as Maryland does. (Clinton, 1997a).

Implementing Service-Learning in Higher Education

Ernest Boyer (1994), in “Creating a New American College”, accused higher education institutions of abandoning their mission of service. He concluded that institutions were no longer educating students for a life as responsible citizens; rather, they were educating students for a career or a job. The Reverend Theodore Hesburgh (1993) stated that higher education should be about “developing the minds and hearts of young people so that they might become contributors to the general well-being of our society; to make it more equitable for all; to make it a caring society for those on the fringes” (p. 26). Nelson and Berube (1995) in Higher Education Under Fire stated, Teachers don’t teach; scholars fritter away their time and your tax dollars on studies of music videos; campus regulations thwart free speech; academic standards of all kinds are in tatters; undergraduates lack both reading skills and moral foundations and in the midst of all this, to add financial insult to intellectual injury, college tuitions are skyrocketing.

(p.1)

Boyer (1994) suggested that institutions of higher education must reconsider their mission and refocus on service. According to Boyer, “The mission statement of almost every college and university in the country includes not just teaching and research, but service too” (p. 48). Colleges and universities are well suited for community service,
service-learning, and experiential education experiences. "Universities have valuable resources (for example students, faculty, staff, classrooms, libraries, technology, research expertise) that becomes accessible to the community when partnerships address community needs" (Bringle & Hatcher, 1996, p. 221). Thus, combining service and learning in an intentional manner to promote education seems not only fitting but essential within higher education.

**Service-Learning Modalities**

Service-learning encompasses a wide spectrum of community service programs and educational models. Colleges and universities can support service initiatives through cocurricular and/or curricular perspectives (Bringle & Hatcher, 1996; Campus Compact, 1995). At one end of the spectrum, large numbers of students can participate in cocurricular or extracurricular endeavors as a means of introduction to volunteerism and service. At the other end of the spectrum, students participate in service through required courses or components within their curriculum.

One-time or short-term cocurricular service-learning experiences are generally student-driven and are easily organized on college campuses (Watson, Church, Darville, & Darville, 1997). Students often participate in these one-time or short-term experiences through student organizations, religious groups, and/or fraternities and sororities. These programs generally involve large numbers of students, attract media attention, and offer students the opportunity to explore volunteering (Jacoby et al., 1996). Examples of one-time or short-term service opportunities include National Make a Difference Day,
National Day of Service-Into the Streets, National Youth Service Day, Greek Life philanthropic events, food and clothing drives, nursing home visits, alternative spring break trips, and others. An example of a successful service-learning program that promotes one-time or short-term service opportunities is at Eastern Michigan University. The Eastern Michigan University program hosts Volunteers Incorporating Service Into Our Neighborhoods (VISION), a student-run project matching student volunteers with community service agencies (Kobrin et al., 1996). In a recent study conducted by the Campus Compact, data showed that 60% of compact schools offer alternative break programs, 9% offer opportunities for service during the institution’s family weekend, and 45% offer service activities during the first-year orientation program (Kobrin et al., 1996). For example, Nazareth College of Rochester includes an afternoon of service as a component in their weekend orientation program. One-time or short-term community service events, combined with opportunities for reflection on the experience, are often meaningful to participants.

Ongoing cocurricular or extracurricular service activities offer students the opportunity to participate in service activities over an extended time period while interacting with friends and peers. As with the one-time or short-term experiences, project coordinators must include reflection and reciprocity in order for learning from the experience to occur. Through involvement in ongoing cocurricular service activities, students can become more aware of the community around them and engage their interest for future service activities. One example of an ongoing service-learning activity is Best Buddies, an international organization founded in 1988. This program matches college
students with developmentally disabled persons in an effort to form friendships and
provide mentoring experiences (Jacoby et al., 1996). Other ongoing service activities
include YMCA, YWCA, Circle K, and Big Brothers/Big Sisters.

Course or curriculum-based service-learning programs combine service
experiences with academic or classroom learning. Students actively participate in service
activities outside the classroom and then discuss and reflect upon those activities inside
the classroom. Haworth and Conrad (1997) have suggested that “high quality programs
are those in which students, faculty, and administrators engage in mutually supportive
teaching and learning. Students invest in teaching as well as learning, and faculty and
administrators invest in learning as well as teaching” (p. 27).

Several program models integrate service-learning into the curriculum: fourth-
credit option, stand-alone modules, introductory service-learning courses, service as a
course component, internships, summer programs, and service as a requirement for
graduation (Jacoby et al., 1996). The fourth-credit option allows students to add a service-
learning component to a regular course. The student adds an additional credit hour to the
class and agrees to complete a set number of community service hours that complement
or correspond with the course topic (Jacoby et al., 1996). A stand-alone module allows
students to earn academic credit while participating in community service. Mesa
Community College in Arizona helps students gain volunteer experience through
modules involving an independent set of assignments (i.e., journal writing, reflective
sessions, learning plans, etc.). Introductory service-learning courses provide students with
a wide range of service experiences. This type of service-learning program focuses more
on the service activity than the actual classroom learning. Supporters of introductory courses, however, indicate that the value of the course is one of introducing a student to service opportunities and motivating them for future service involvement. California State University offers Community Service 101, an introductory course in service and citizenship contributing over 25,000 hours of service to the community (Kobrin et al., 1996). A variety of methods incorporate service-learning as a course component. The service can either be required of all students or be optional for extra credit. Service can be done as a "whole class", or each individual may have his or her own experience. Some schools have even made participation in service-learning activities a requirement for graduation. Currently, however, only 10% of Campus Compact schools require service for graduation. Bellarmine College in Kentucky, Andrews University in Michigan, and the University of the Redlands in California are examples of institutions that require service involvement for graduation (Kobrin et al., 1996).

No one service-learning program or model fits all disciplines or all higher education institutional needs. Therefore, institutions should offer a variety of options and service-learning modalities to best meet the needs of the students, faculty, and community (Jacoby et al., 1996).

**Service-Learning as a Model**

Theoretical models provide a framework for practitioners to follow when developing programs and activities. Perry's (1981), Kohlberg's (1975), and Gilligan's (1982) descriptive models of moral and ethical development contribute to the
implementation of the service-learning model presented by Delve et al. (1990). These three developmental theories, along with the service-learning model, follow Lewin’s (1936) assumptions that student behavior (B) is a function (f) of the person (P) and his or her interactions with the environment (E); \( B = f\{P \times E\} \). This equation allows practitioners the opportunity to manipulate variables in order to yield learning outcomes. As a result of this concept, Delve et al. developed a model for service-learning that lays the foundation for effective community service activities and education within American colleges and universities (Macy, 1994).

The Delve et al. (1990) service-learning model was established to assist faculty and student affairs personnel with instituting a service and learning program on their own campuses. The model has implications for all academic constituents that have an interest in promoting volunteerism as an intentional learning experience. The service-learning model is comprised of five phases of development through which students progress while involved in community service activities (Macy, 1994). Four key variables were identified within the model: intervention, commitment, behavior, and balance (Delve et al., 1990). Additionally, the researchers presented five phases of the model that describe development of the persons involved in the service-learning activity. The five phases are exploration, clarification, realization, activation, and internalization. These five phases, combined with the variables listed above, outline the student development that occurs in conjunction with, and as a result of, service-learning participation.

Osthaus (1993) conducted a qualitative case study that provided an illustration of a college woman’s progression through the Delve et al. (1990) service-learning model.
This case study illustrated how one female student initially became involved with community service activities, increased her participation in service, and completed her college experience as an advocate for the fight against hunger. It showed how one student experienced the variables identified and progressed through the phases of the service-learning model.

Payne (1993) constructed an instrument to assess the existence of phases as outlined in the service-learning model developed by Delve et al. (1990). The instrument was a pencil and paper test administered to 65 students involved in service-learning programs at Colorado State University and 70 students at the University of Northern Colorado not involved in service-learning programs. Although the data collected from use of the instrument showed no significant relationship between the service-learning phases, more empirical research is needed before the model can be validated or rejected.

Cagenello (1994) conducted a longitudinal study of 10 students enrolled in the Partnership for Service-Learning’s British program, which consists of an intensive service-learning pedagogical experience. The study was designed to ascertain whether the students involved in the program would show developmental changes consistent with those outlined in the service-learning model developed by Delve et al. (1990). Results of the study supported the notion that students would progress or advance through the phases of the model.

The Delve et al. (1990) service-learning model offers a theoretical foundation from which institutions of higher education can establish service-learning programs. The model offers an introduction to programming for affective and effective community
service. Additionally, the model is applicable to various student groups and populations. If combined with adequate planning and critical reflection, the model offers students the chance to learn and grow as individuals becoming more aware of their values and beliefs (Macy, 1994). Although preliminary research supported this model (Schmidt-Posner, 1989; Cagenello, 1994; Osthaus, 1993), a need for empirical research still exists. Moore (1994) stated, “Our challenge as educators is to make community service an integral part of the educational experience” (p. 55). Establishing sound service-learning programs can contribute to that challenge.

Comprehensive Action Plan for Service Learning (CAPSL)

Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis developed the Comprehensive Action Plan for Service Learning (CAPSL) model for implementing and institutionalizing service-learning within higher education. The model suggests that service-learning program efforts should be concentrated on four constituencies: institution, faculty, student, and community. Additionally, the model outlines a sequence of tasks or outcomes that should be implemented for each of the four constituents. The tasks/outcomes identified include planning, awareness, prototype, resources, expansion, recognition, monitoring, evaluation, research, and institutionalization (Bringle & Hatcher, 1996). For example, the task of planning with the institution constituency may involve the following targets, as identified by Bringle and Hatcher (1996): “Form a planning group of key persons, survey institutional resources and climate, attend Campus Compact
Regional Institute, develop a Campus Action Plan for service-learning, form an advisory committee” (p. 226).

The CAPSL sequence of tasks represents a heuristic that can focus attention on valuable components of program development and planned change. The CAPSL model can be used as a general guide to help institutions develop service-learning programs at their institutions.

Service Learning Program Components

The National Center for Service Learning (ACTION/NCSL) provided a valuable resource guide The Service-Learning Educator: A Guide to Program Management (1979) for college and university educators who either manage service-learning programs or are interested in starting programs. The guide identifies various structures of service-learning programs: student initiated, centrally organized on-campus, faculty initiated, clearinghouse or bureau, or coordinated off-campus for several colleges and universities. The guide concedes that each college and university has its own uniqueness, and therefore there is “no one ‘right’ way” (ACTION, 1979, p. 4) to establish a service-learning program in higher education. A list of benefits that colleges and/or universities may garner from supporting a service-learning program is also provided to illustrate the importance of service-learning in higher education.

1. It [service-learning] increases the number of learning opportunities the institution can offer students and may consequently attract more students to the institution;
2. It [service-learning] provides a way for the institution to play a vital role in community affairs, thus increasing public support;

3. It [service-learning] offers the institution a way to prepare students more effectively for the world of work;

4. It [service-learning] gives the institution an opportunity to participate in building a better, more humane community, thus creating a more healthy environment for the institution itself;

5. It [service-learning] offers numerous opportunities for research and scholarship related to the nature of learning and to the relationship between the learning institution and society, consequently enhancing the intellectual life of the institution;

6. It [service-learning] enhances liberal education by providing a testing ground for classroom concepts, expanding the student’s sense of cultural awareness and encouraging the value of lifelong service to one’s community. (ACTION, 1979, p. 5)

Service-learning programs should also focus on the principles established by the Johnson Foundation in the Wingspread Special Report. The principles provide institutions with criteria for effective programs. Therefore, a model service-learning program does the following:

1. Engages people in responsible and challenging actions for the common good.

2. Provides structured opportunities for people to reflect critically on their service experience.
3. Articulates clear service and learning goals for everyone involved.

4. Allows for those with needs to define those needs.

5. Clarifies the responsibilities of each persona and organization involved.

6. Matches service providers and service needs through a process that recognizes changing circumstance.

7. Expects genuine, active, and sustained organizational commitment.

8. Includes training, supervision, monitoring, support, recognition, and evaluation to meet service and learning goals.

9. Insures that the time commitment for service and learning is flexible appropriate, and in the best interests of all involved.

10. Is committed to program participation by and with diverse populations (Honnet & Poulsen, 1989, pp. 2-3).

Articles by Berson (1993), Bringle and Kremer (1993), Craig (1990), Gwynne (1989), Kendall (1991), and White (1994) provided suggestions for developing and implementing service-learning programs. These authors provided step-by-step instructions as well as resource listings and suggestions for program success. Program illustrations were also provided for readers. Although little research was cited, these authors suggested that students will learn and develop as a result of their participation in service-learning activities. Thus, they promote the development of service-learning programs and initiatives.

The Volunteer Action Center at Florida International University, charged with providing a diverse set of service and volunteer opportunities, has worked with over
2,500 students with over 30,000 hours of service (Cooper, 1997a). The center currently offers resource information through their website (i.e., http://www.fiu.edu/-time4chg/Library). One resource document, 101 Ideas for Combining Service and Learning, listed suggestions for service-learning and community service programs throughout various academic disciplines: Anthropology, Accounting, Art, Biology, Business, Liberal Studies, Computers, Education, English, Environment, History, Philosophy, Political Science, Psychology, and Sociology (Cooper, 1997a). Program suggestions range from specific activities such as "A Day without Art", sponsored by Yale University, to more general concepts such as publicizing local businesses that violate environmental quality regulations. The list of program activities obviously does not include all successful service-learning endeavors, yet it covers a spectrum of activities and events.

Probably the two most comprehensive summaries of service-learning program development are provided by the Annual Membership Survey and Resource Guide published by Campus Compact (Bearman & Kilgore, 1993) and Service Matters: A Sourcebook for Community Service in Higher Education (Kobrin et al., 1996). These guides provide a wealth of information for institutions in the process of developing service-learning programs and initiatives. They contain listings of community service opportunities and descriptions, service-learning programs, academic and cocurricular models, and courses at higher education institutions in the United States. Service Matters: A Sourcebook for Community Service in Higher Education provides
information on national trends, service program types, and issues addressed by participants in service-learning.

Challenges for Higher Education

A number of challenges face higher education's effective implementation of service-learning as a core component within institutional curriculums. Some of those challenges were initially experienced during the community service movement of the 1960s and 1970s. Others issues are more contemporary. These issues, both old and new, must be addressed in order for service-learning to continue to gain strength and substance in the next century.

Community Service Movement of the 1960s and 1970s

Renewed interest in volunteerism, community outreach, and service-learning excite many authors, yet leave others leery of their chances for success. Even with all its enthusiasm and support, the community service movement of the 1960s and 1970s did not survive over time. In order to avoid repeating history, Kendall (1991) observed that we must learn from the pitfalls and challenges experienced a few decades ago. Past experiences can serve as lessons to help the current movement learn and grow. Three major lessons or challenges must be learned from the past:

(1) Programs must be integrated into the central mission and goals of the institution;

(2) There must be a reciprocal exchange between equals and;
(3) reflection on service-learning experiences is essential for learning to occur (Kendall, 1991).

These issues were echoed by several other authors as well (Cohen & Kinsey, 1994; Delve et al., 1990; Stanton, 1991; Wutzdorff, 1993).

In 1968 the American Council on Education supported the belief that programs must be integrated into the central mission and goals of the institution and stated the need for “institutional support for the service curriculum” (American Council on Education, 1968, p. 2). Unfortunately, this was not the case at many institutions in the 1960s and 1970s. Kendall (1991) described the service-learning environment in the 1960s and 1970s: “Faculty members participated out of their hip pockets and their hearts, but this participation was not taken into account in their course loads and certainly not in their tenure decisions” (p.10). Kendall (1991) also cited a political science professor as saying, “The university was very supportive of my teaching students about public service and public issues as long as I did not ask for money, secretarial assistance, tenure, a blurb in the catalog or time at faculty meetings” (p. 10). This last quotation suggests that many community service-learning opportunities did not have the support of their institutions from the top down in terms of administrative support, budgetary assistance, and/or faculty release time. Keith (1995) echoed these concerns and suggested that an examination of college and university missions and goals was in order to ascertain how service-learning could be supported by the institutional vision. In order to avoid the problems experienced in the 1960s and 1970s, current service-learning programs must
carefully garner the necessary support from the faculty and administration and also find ways to work within the institutional mission and goals.

The second lesson Kendall (1991) identified suggests that there must be a reciprocal exchange between equals in order for service-learning programs to be successful. She quoted Debbie Cotton, a volunteer at Volunteer Clearinghouse of the District of Columbia, as saying, “It’s easy for the ‘service’ to become patronizing charity” (p. 12). In other words, if the focus of the service is only on doing for others or helping others, it loses its reciprocity of learning between server and served. It then causes an inequity between participants and reflects a one-way relationship. Without clear expectations, open communication, continual negotiation, and respect for both parties’ goals and needs, service-learning programs lose the support necessary for continuation. Without community interest, support, and involvement in the process, well-intentioned students and faculty members have a difficult if not impossible time gaining the experiences needed for service-learning to occur.

The community service movement of the 1960s and 1970s also learned that service alone was not enough to promote learning or growth. It was discovered that critical reflection on what was experienced and learned was essential. Kendall (1991) quoted Jim Keith, Guilford College in Greensboro, North Carolina, as saying, “There’s a real difference between just putting young people out into the community, which is relatively easy to do and establish thoughtful programs that foster real learning by young people and by those served, which is hard to do” (p. 12). Keith’s (1995) beliefs were supported by the National Student Volunteer Program, which in 1979 changed its name
to the National Center for Service-Learning. This national association realized that service and volunteerism alone were not enough, but were quite beneficial when intricately interwoven with learning.

Kendall (1991) presented three issues as her interpretation of what contributed to the demise of the community service movement of the 1960s and 1970s: (a) lack of integration into the central mission and goals of the institution, (b) lack of a reciprocal exchange between equals, and (c) lack of critical reflection on service-learning experiences. She suggested that current institutions and administrations must learn from these problems in order to avoid despair. Although contemporary institutions are aware of these issues due to experience and documentation in the literature, they have yet to find an adequate resolution to the problem.

Current Challenges, Concerns, and/or Issues

In addition to the unresolved problems of the community service movement of the 1960s and 1970s, several current issues are reflected in the literature. Those issues include liability issues, program expenses/funding, faculty reward systems, administrative placement of the program, student motivation for participation, and program limitations (AACC, 1996; Kendall, 1991). In order for service-learning programs to be effective on college campuses, the institution must not only learn the three lessons presented by Kendall, but also address the latest issues listed above.

Legal issues. Modern America has become an increasingly litigious society, and service-learning is not exempt from legal challenges. Recently, one law suit attempted to
force an institution to abandon its emphasis on service. The complaint claimed that the school district’s public service requirement forced students into involuntary servitude. Although the courts found no violation of constitutional rights, the case against a New York district illustrates a potential future concern (Splitt, 1996).

Additionally, institutions of higher education must be aware of concerns regarding the safety of their students and faculty. Many schools have become so overwhelmed with liability issues that they have steered away from community service activities during the class period (Wade, 1995). By pushing community service activities to after-class, these activities become add-ons rather than integrated service-learning components in the curriculum. Rather than avoid actual service-learning programs, Strauss and Stephens (1994) suggested that institutions need to be aware of the relationships they are forming with community agencies and actively seek legal and safe options for student participation. They observed that many agencies have insurance that covers volunteers and that some states even cover volunteers under worker’s compensation laws. The authors admitted that there is no way to eliminate liability completely because accidents can happen in many situations, from transporting students to and from community service activities to incidents at the activity/agency itself. However, they suggested that thoughtful planning and inclusion of the university attorney/General Counsel in service-learning program planning and development can reduce potential risks.

**Program expense/funding.** Service-learning programs cost institutions time and money. When offering a service-learning program, someone has to teach the new courses, coordinate the service activity with the community, and facilitate follow-up activities.
This coordination effort takes faculty and administrative time and energy. Battistoni (1995) has suggested that service-learning involves extensive coordination efforts and classroom preparation for the faculty member. Gwynne (1989) stated that the lack of textbooks and resource materials make the job of teaching a service-learning course more demanding than a nonservice learning course for the faculty. Faculty time spent on coordinating these efforts equates to reduced time spent teaching and/or conducting research activities. In order to justify time spent on service-learning efforts, institutions must refocus on their mission of teaching, research, and service (Boyer, 1990).

The results of the AACC Survey on Community Service and Service-Learning indicate that insufficient funding is the most significant challenge or impediment that community colleges face in developing and maintaining service-learning programs. Insufficient release time for faculty involved in teaching courses with service-learning components was ranked second in terms of program challenges. Service-learning programs, like any institutional program, require budgetary support in order to be effective. A variety of resources can assist institutions with this budgetary burden. Financial assistance is often available through government sources, community organizations, and foundations. Service-Learning and Community Colleges: Where We are? (Robinson & Barnett, 1996) cited 12 funding sources for service-learning programs and activities: tuition and fees, home institutions, American Association of Community Colleges, Campus Outreach Opportunity League, Campus Compact, foundations, local business, community organizations, local government, state government, federal government, and the Corporation for National Service. Start-up grants are available...
through resources such as the Corporation on National and Community Service, the U.S. Department of Education’s Fund for the Improvement of Post-Secondary Education (FIPSE), and state agencies (Berson, 1994). According to data provided by the Campus Compact, 87% of the compact schools in 1996 allocated funds from their operating budgets. Additionally, 22% of Campus Compact schools received funding from the Corporation for National Service; 64% of the compact schools offered work-study placement for community service; and 29% offered scholarships and/or fellowships for service involvement (Kobrin et al., 1996). The U.S. Department of Labor and Education offers grants for school-to-work projects as well. Additionally, college work study money may be used to support service-learning program organization and administration efforts through a new project called “America Reads.” Results, however, from the 1995 AACC Survey on Community Service and Service-Learning suggest that, for community colleges, the college itself is the most frequent source of financial support for service-learning (Robinson & Barnett, 1996).

Faculty reward systems. Faculty members are a key to the success of the service-learning program (Wills, 1992). Without attachment to an academic course, service-learning programs have the probability of becoming merely community service or charity activities. This is not to suggest that students cannot learn outside of the classroom; quite the contrary is true. However, service-learning, combined with classroom work, can provide thoughtful reflection on issues common to the experience at the service location and in the classroom discussion.
Given the importance of faculty support and involvement in the service-learning process, the problem of faculty reward and incentives becomes apparent. Sowell (1996) suggested that decisions regarding promotion and tenure are made primarily on the grants incurred and the quantity of research published. He, like many, feels that teaching and service should be more heavily weighted in promotion and tenure decisions. Survey results from the AACC (Robinson & Barnett, 1996) indicate that community service is not a requirement for tenure or promotion at 81% of the community colleges that are members of their association. Therefore, interest in service-learning by faculty is often limited as a result of the lack of recognition of their efforts in the merit system, tenure, and promotion evaluation (Campus Compact, 1995; Watson et al., 1997; Zlotkowski, 1996). According to data obtained through the 1995 AACC Survey on Community Service and Service-Learning (Robinson & Barnett, 1996), most community college faculty are motivated to participate in service-learning through praise, recognition, and peer influence. Furthermore, only 30% of schools with membership in the Campus Compact considered service in faculty tenure evaluation during 1996 (Kobrin et al., 1996). Thus, this issue of faculty reward and recognition must be addressed and incentives provided in order to encourage faculty to become actively involved in the service-learning movement.

In 1995 the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) sought funding through the Corporation for National Service to create a unique new program called SabbatiCorps (Adler, 1995; Seidel & Smith, 1997). The idea was that the new program would enlist college and university faculty across the nation to support
community service programs while they were on sabbatical from their institutions. The faculty would use their expertise to assist with community service program development and assessment. In exchange, the faculty would receive release time from teaching and/or research and possibly mini-grants and awards. Advocates for the proposed program identified the benefits of the program to include institutional change, faculty development, community improvement, expansion of community service expertise and experience, enhancement of teaching, and development of new knowledge (Adler, 1995). Unfortunately, the Corporation of National Service decided against funding SabbatiCorps as a national initiative. However, in early 1996, the Maryland Governor’s Commission on Service (MGCOS) launched SabbatiCorps without national support as a pilot program in Maryland. Initial reports on the program indicated positive and promising feedback about the new program, which may in fact develop as a real incentive for faculty to engage in service.

Administrative placement of the service-learning program. Another difficult issue facing higher education involves the decision concerning where administratively to locate the service-learning program. Craig (1990) suggested that service-learning and student activities are a perfect fit. He believes that student activities departments can best provide the staff and budgetary commitments necessary for program success. Others, however, believe that separate offices, such as the Office of Community Service, should be established to coordinate the program efforts (Wills, 1992). Yet others strongly believe that service-learning programs should be rooted in the academic arena (Boyer, 1990; Gwynne, 1989; Sowell, 1996). Gwynne (1989) suggested that service-learning
responsibilities already fall within the role of faculty and, therefore, must remain their
duty. Results from the 1995 AACC Survey on Community Service and Service-Learning
indicate that individual faculty members in different disciplines and student services
administrators are predominately the people responsible for organizing service-learning at
community colleges (Robinson & Barnett, 1996). The American Association of
Community Colleges found that only 32% of community colleges with service-learning
programs have a separate office or center for service-learning programs and activities.
The Campus Compact research on its membership during 1996 found that 29% of 4-year
public institutions, 59% of 4-year private institutions, 10% of community colleges, and
2% of the Historically Black Colleges and Universities have centralized service offices to
support their institution's service-learning initiatives (Kobrin et al., 1996). Whichever
approach is taken by the institution—centralized, decentralized, administratively placed in
academic affairs or student affairs—there must be a clearly defined organizational
structure, as well as properly outlined duties and responsibilities. "Failure to identify
program content and lines of responsibility may lead community service into a 'lot of
activity' marginal to the central mission of the college" (Gwynne, 1989, p. 68).

Student motivation for participation. Yet another challenge facing service-
learning programs is that of student motivation for participation. Although thousands of
students already participate in community service activities (Brown, 1993), students must
be motivated to continue their involvement. Caines and Kielsmeier (1991) developed a
list of types of projects in which students participate through service-learning endeavors:
Bicycle shop, Big Buddies, blood drive, board membership, building projects, clothes collection, community education classes, community history, cooking meals, crisis centers, day care, emergency services, environmental research, environmental cleanup, fund-raising for charities, gardens, helping the homebound, home chores, hot lines, Meals on Wheels, overseas volunteers, paint-a-thons, peer helpers and tutors, performing arts, planting trees, public awareness, public media, reading for the blind, recreation programs, recycling, research, special equipment, Special Olympics, tax preparation, tutoring, victim aid, visiting institutionalized people, visual arts, voter education, youth agencies, youth leadership and youth sports. (as cited in Kraft, 1996, pp. 140-141).

According to Postsecondary Education Opportunity ("Getting Ready . . . Why Freshmen Enroll in College . . . For Life," 1995), 77.3% of freshmen students claim that their most prevalent reason for attending college is to get a better job. Only 36.5% of the new students identified "developing as a cultured person" as significant for their college experience. One student explained, "Their hectic lives keep them from taking a deeper interest in what they're learning" (Wilson, 1995, p. 23A). Astin's 1988 survey of 1st-year American college and university students indicates that only 22% of students believe that participation in community service activities is very important (Astin, 1989). However, the Higher Education Research Institute (HERI) at UCLA conducted a survey of freshmen in 1996 which showed that 71.8% did participate in volunteer work within the year prior to starting college (Sax, Astin, Korn, & Mahoney, 1996). Survey data from the
Campus Compact in 1996 indicate that over 543,000 students at compact schools participated in service activities in 1995-96 as compared to 321,880 students in 1994-95 (Kobrin et al., 1996).

Since 1987... interest in developing a meaningful philosophy of life has been increasingly gradual while wanting to be very well-off financially has become slightly less popular. It may be that this recent reversal coupled with the sharply declining interest in business careers and majors, are early signals of a shift away from a materialistic philosophy. Interest in participating in community service programs has increased recently as well, rebounding to a level roughly equal to that registered in 1970 when it was first recorded. (Dey, Astin, & Korn, 1991, p. 31)

Busy schedules, financial pressures, and job training present students with less time and more priorities than ever before. Institutions of higher education are challenged to convince students of the academic and intellectual benefits of involvement in service and learning.

Program limitations. Unorganized and ill-planned service-learning programs may actually produce a negative impact on the agency, person(s) being served, and/or the student involved in the service (Osborne, Penticuff, & Norman, 1997). Preplanning, communication of expectations, student volunteer orientation, and clearly defined project goals help to avoid potential problems. Additionally, service-learning coordinators must work diligently to ensure that students do not develop unwarranted or racist attitudes and behaviors from their experiences (Hondagneu-Sotelo & Raskoff, 1994; Jarosz &
Johnson-Bogart, 1996). Service-learning experiences that lack proper reflection and discussion may promote one of the very issues they purport to teach against—social injustice. As students work in situations with people from different ethnic, racial, and economic backgrounds, they must be challenged to seek understanding rather than inequality. Critical reflection is paramount if students are to confront past prejudices and to link community experiences with their classroom academic materials (Hondagneu-Sotelo & Raskoff, 1994).

Research on the Benefits of Service-Learning

Numerous descriptive articles can be found in the literature on service-learning; however, there is a lack of solid evidence that service-learning programs are present on college campuses, as well as a lack of data on the effects of service-learning on student learning and development (Kraft, 1996). Current articles tended to endorse the service-learning concept by suggesting that students learn and develop as a result of their participation in community service activities. Some articles described contemporary service-learning programs, resources for developing programs, and models linking community service to higher education. However, few quantitative research studies can be found to support the notion that students actually learn and develop through involvement in community service activities. Studies on peer tutoring (Hedin, 1987) found increases in mathematics and reading achievement as a result of service involvement. However, the increases in learning were modest and were possibly a result of learning and growth in general (Kraft, 1996). Delve et al. (1990) proposed a service-
learning model to assist faculty and administrators in identifying student development through volunteer participation. Although based on existing theoretical models, little empirical research exists to support the claim of Delve et al. More recently, an experimental study on political science students provided some of the first real evidence of the positive academic effects of service-learning (Markus, Howard, & King, 1993). Conrad and Hedin (1991) argued that qualitative studies focusing on critical thinking and problem solving are more productive and reliable for the study of service-learning than are quantitative studies. However, with the rising interest in service-learning, there is a great need for more outcome-based research that addresses the service-learning experience in relation to higher education.

Research findings on social and psychological outcomes with students who participate in service-learning activities are generally positive. Early research showed the effects of service-learning participation on individuals' self-esteem, self-concept and attitudes. Sager (1973) showed increases in self-esteem and self-confidence in students who volunteered at a state hospital for the summer. A study involving two helping experiences indicated an increase in self-concept while significantly helping the community (Kazunga, 1978). Smith (1966) studied Peace Corps volunteers stationed in Ghana. Participants in the study showed increased levels of realism, autonomy, independence, and self-worth as a result of their service. Bourgeois (1978) found that community involvement promoted civic competence and increased acceptance of democratic values. Conrad and Hedin (1982) found that students who participated in service-learning activities developed more favorable attitudes toward adults. Luchs
(1981) reported that service-learning students gained more positive attitudes towards others and showed higher levels of self-esteem. According to Rifkin (1996), anecdotal evidence suggests that participation in service-learning reduces the incidence of depression, drug and alcohol abuse, suicide, and violent crimes. Although most of these studies measured involvement in community service rather than true service-learning involvement, the groundwork has been laid for future research on the outcomes of social and psychological development of students as a result of service-learning.

Much has been written on the role, responsibility, and impact that postsecondary education has concerning the community (Berson, 1994; Hondagneu-Sotelo & Raskoff, 1994; Kennedy, 1991; McDaniel, 1994; Shoup, 1978; Stanton, 1987; Wade, 1995; Wills, 1992). This role dates back to the founders of the first colleges. As stated by Thomas Jefferson, founder of the University of Virginia, a student should “understand his duties to his neighbors and country and to discharge with competence the functions confided to him by either” (Farland & Henry, 1992, p. 35). John Henry Newman also considered service and duty to society to be important to the mission of higher education (Pelikan, 1992). Most modern-day institutional mission statements maintain this vision and goal for service to the community (Boyer, 1994; Rubin, 1990). Descriptive literature illustrates the vested interest in service to the community that community colleges share (AACC, 1995; Community College of Rhode Island Annual Report, 1995; Exley, Young, Johnson, & Johnson, 1995). Community college students have deep roots in society and can work as partners with community-based organizations to identify needs and plans for service opportunities (Berson, 1994). Harkavy and Wievel (1995) described American
colleges and universities as "civic institutions devoted to solving the pressing problems of society" (p. 7). This emphasis on higher education's mission as one of service coupled with learning is documented throughout the literature.

Also found in the literature are a number of recent doctoral dissertations on the topic of service-learning (Bergkamp, 1997; Blackwell, 1997; Brown, 1996; Chebator, 1996; Gibson-Carter, 1996; Greene, 1997; Hall, 1997; Jordan, 1995; Rauner, 1995; Ridgell, 1996; Savoie, 1996; Thompson, 1996; Weis, 1996). These studies examine the impact of service-learning on education through surveys and case studies. This surge in research interest will no doubt help to provide necessary data on community service and service-learning as it has an impact on student growth, learning, and development.

Summary

Although emphasis on community and service has existed throughout American history, the combined term, service-learning, is a relatively new concept. The long-term impact of participating in service-learning on student learning and development is still too early to predict. Information on service-learning programs, profiles, problems, and prospects is needed in order to help institutions determine the value of such programs to their institution, students, and the community. Service-learning program characteristics will prove to be beneficial to future research efforts. More research is needed to determine the effects that service has on learning and development, as well as how institutions can develop programs to best promote those expected and desired outcomes.
CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

To fulfill the purposes of this study, descriptive data were collected from chief executive officers or institutional representatives employed at 4-year public colleges and universities that are members of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS). This chapter contains sections on (a) procedures for collecting the data, (b) the survey instrument, (c) the population, (d) procedures for the analysis of data, and (e) the reporting of the data.

Procedure for Collection of Data

In order to conduct this study, an institutional membership list was obtained from the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools-Colleges Division. The agency was contacted by telephone and a membership list with institution-contact information was received by mail. Four-year public colleges and universities, along with institutional contact names, titles, and addresses, were listed on the membership list of SACS and were extracted and identified as potential participants in the study. Appendix A is a listing of all 4-year public colleges and universities that hold membership in SACS. College and university contacts (i.e., institution president or chancellor) listed on the SACS Membership List were mailed a cover letter and a questionnaire.
A survey packet (Appendix B) on service-learning, including a self-addressed and postage-paid envelope for return reply, was mailed to all 166 colleges and universities identified for participation in the study. Institutions that did not complete and return the survey within 10 working days were mailed a reminder letter. Institutions that still did not complete and return the survey within 10 more working days were mailed another survey for their completion. Every effort to obtain completed surveys from all institutions within the population was made. A 65% return rate (or 108 responses) was necessary to constitute a usable availability sample. A 69.8% return rate was obtained (N=116).

Survey Instrument

The instrument chosen to conduct this study was an amended version of the 1995 AACC Survey on Community Service and Service Learning in Community Colleges and the 1997 AACC Survey on Service Learning in Community Colleges developed by the American Association for Community Colleges (AACC) Service-Learning Clearinghouse. The AACC developed the survey instruments to collect information on community college programs and resources for service-learning. Both the 1995 and the 1997 AACC surveys contained sections titled Institutional Profile, Volunteer Community Service Activities, Service Learning Opportunities, Student Participation, Faculty/Staff Participation, Program Administration, Outside Organizations, and Other Information. The AACC survey questionnaires contained 62 questions. The 1995 and 1997 AACC survey instruments were modified to garner information from 4-year public colleges and universities that are members of SACS. Section titles (i.e., Institutional Profile,
Volunteer Community Service Activities, Service Learning Opportunities, Program Administration, Outside Organizations, and Other Information) were maintained in the adapted questionnaire; however, some questions were omitted or revised. The adapted survey questionnaire was titled \textit{Survey on Service-Learning} and posed 43 questions for participant consideration. Appendix B is a copy of the adapted questionnaire sent to the 4-year colleges and universities selected to participate in the study.

The Coordinator of the Service-Learning Clearinghouse of AACC, Gail Robinson, was contacted by Internet to obtain permission to use and adapt the \textit{AACC Survey on Community Service and Service Learning Programs in Community Colleges} (1995) and the \textit{AACC Survey on Service Learning in Community Colleges} (1997) in this research. Appendix C is a copy of the letter received from Gail Robinson, Director of the American Association of Community Colleges, granting permission to use and adapt the survey instruments for the purposes of this study.

Population of the Study

The population of this study included all 4-year public colleges and universities that were members of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS) (\(N=166\)). The institutions identified for participation in the study were obtained from the SACS Commission on Colleges 1997 Membership List.

Procedures for Analysis of Data

One-hundred and sixteen completed surveys were received by return mail.

Completed survey instruments from each of the 116 participating colleges and
universities were entered into a computer for analysis. A statistical program was written on SPSS to analyze the data. Response frequencies, percentages, and chi square tests of significance were run on the data. Appendix D is a list of the 116 participating institutions.

Reporting the Data

Responses to questionnaire items are reported in terms of frequency counts and percentage distributions. Data are presented in pie charts, histograms, and tables. Although the research was guided by research questions instead of hypotheses, chi square tests of significance were performed for the purpose of determining the significance of differences between and among selected discrete variables. A copy of the final report of the study has been made available to SACS and all institutions that requested a copy of the findings.
CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION OF DATA

This chapter contains the responses of the survey participants to the nine major research questions gathered through a mailed questionnaire. The chapter is organized into nine parts: (a) identification of institutions with service-learning programs; (b) description of the nature of institutional respondents according to the Carnegie Classifications; (c) delineation of institutional characteristics; (d) delineation of student characteristics; (e) identification of key success factors; (f) descriptions of program structures and administrative organization; (g) identification of community organizations; (h) definition of problems affecting service-learning programs; and (i) descriptions of the future of service-learning.

Institutions With Service-Learning Programs

The survey was sent to all 166 4-year public colleges and universities that hold membership in the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS). A response rate of 116 (69.8%) was achieved after three mailings to institutions in the sample.

The first research question asked which 4-year public colleges and universities in SACS had service-learning programs on their campus. Table 1 contains a list of respondents to the survey along with an indication of whether they had a service-learning
Table 1

Four-Year Public Colleges and Universities That Were Members of SACS and Had Service-Learning Programs on Their Campus During 1996

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responding institutions</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Alabama:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athens State College</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alabama State University</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auburn University at Montgomery</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacksonville State University</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Troy State University</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Troy State University at Dothan</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Troy State University at Montgomery</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of North Alabama</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of West Alabama</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Alabama</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Alabama at Huntsville</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Alabama at Birmingham</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Florida:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of North Florida</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Central Florida</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida International University</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida State University</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Florida</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of South Florida</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Georgia:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clayton College and State University</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armstrong Atlantic State University</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kennesaw State University</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Georgia College and State University</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albany State University</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Augusta State University</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(table continues)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responding institutions</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Columbus State University</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Valley State University</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia College and State University</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia Southwestern State University</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State University of West Georgia</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valdosta State University</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia Southern University</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical College of Georgia</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia Institute of Technology</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia State University</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Georgia</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky State University</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morehead State University</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murray State University</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Kentucky University</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Kentucky</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Louisville</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern University at New Orleans</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana State University at Shreveport</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicholls State University</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana Tech University</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwestern State University</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana State University</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeast Louisiana University</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of New Orleans</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Southwestern Louisiana</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcorn State University</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi University for Women</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delta State University</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responding institutions</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Mississippi</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Southern Mississippi</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>North Carolina:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth City State University</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fayetteville State University</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of North Carolina at Asheville</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of North Carolina at Pembroke</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of North Carolina at Wilmington</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Carolina University</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Carolina University</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina Agricultural and Technical State University</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina Central University</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of North Carolina at Charlotte</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>South Carolina:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coastal Carolina University</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francis Marion University</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of South Carolina-Aiken</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Citadel</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winthrop University</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical University of South Carolina</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clemson University</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tennessee:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Tennessee at Chattanooga</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austin Peay State University</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Tennessee State University</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee State University</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Tennessee, Memphis</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Tennessee State University</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Memphis</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Tennessee, Knoxville</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(table continues)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responding institutions</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Texas:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Houston-Downtown</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angelo State University</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midwestern State University</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prairie View A &amp; M University</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sul Ross State University</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tarleton State University</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas A &amp; M University-Texarkana</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Houston-Clear Lake</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Houston-Victoria</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Texas at Brownsville</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Texas of the Permian Basin</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lamar University</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sam Houston State University</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas A &amp; M University-Commerce</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas A &amp; M University-Kingsville</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNT Health Science Center at Ft. Worth</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UT Health Science Center at San Antonio</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Texas at San Antonio</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas A &amp; M University</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas Tech University</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas Woman’s University</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Houston</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Texas at Austin</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Texas at Dallas</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Virginia:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinch Valley College of the University of Virginia</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia Military Institute</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christopher Newport University</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Washington College</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia State University</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radford University</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Madison University</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Mason University</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Virginia</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(table continues)*
Figure 1. Service-learning programs during 1996 on four-year public colleges and universities that are members of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools.

program on their campus during 1996. Figure 1 further illustrates institutional support for service-learning. Of the 116 respondents to the survey, 55 (47.4%) had service-learning programs on their campuses during 1996. The remaining 61 (52.6%) responding institutions indicated that they did not have service-learning programs on their campuses during 1996.
Nature of Institutional Respondents

The second research question asked what the nature of institutions with service-learning programs was when categorized according to the Carnegie classifications. Therefore, institutions that responded to the mailed survey are categorized in Table 2 according to the Carnegie classification for higher education. Of the 116 respondents, 14 (12%) were from Research Universities I; 5 (4%) were from Research Universities II; 9 (7.7%) were from Doctoral Universities I; 8 (6.8%) were from Doctoral Universities II; 59 (50.8%) were from Master's (comprehensive) Universities and Colleges I; 5 (4%) were from Master's (comprehensive) Universities and Colleges II; 1 (1%) was from Baccalaureate (liberal arts) Colleges I; 9 (7.7%) were from Baccalaureate (liberal arts) Colleges II; and 6 (5%) were from Specialized Institutions. Of the 55 respondents that indicated they had a service-learning program on their campus during 1996, 11 (20%) were Research Universities I; 3 (5.5%) Research Universities II; 6 (11%) Doctoral Universities I; 4 (7.2%) Doctoral Universities II; 20 (36.3%) Master's (comprehensive) Universities and Colleges I; 3 (5.4%) Master's (comprehensive) Universities II; 1 (1.9%) Baccalaureate (liberal arts) Colleges I; 4 (7.2%) Baccalaureate (liberal arts) Colleges II; and 3 (5.5%) Specialized Institutions. Of the 61 respondents indicating that they did not have a service-learning program on their campus during 1996, 3 (4.9%) were Research Universities I; 2 (3.2%) Research Universities II; 3 (4.9%) Doctoral Universities I; 5 (8.1%) Doctoral Universities II; 39 (64%) Master's (comprehensive) Universities and Colleges I; 1 (1.6%) Master's (comprehensive) Universities II; 0 Baccalaureate (liberal
arts) Colleges I; 5 (8.1%) Baccalaureate (liberal arts) Colleges II; and 3 (4.9%) Specialized Institutions.

Table 2

Nature of Institutional Respondents at 4-Year Public Colleges and Universities That Were Members of SACS in 1996

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Descriptive variables</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Responding institutions with service-learning programs (N=55)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Universities I</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Universities II</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral Universities I</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral Universities II</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s Universities &amp; Colleges I</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>36.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s Universities &amp; Colleges II</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baccalaureate Colleges I</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baccalaureate Colleges II</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialized Institutions</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ x^2 = 10.817; \text{NS @ } p=0.05 \]

Responding Institutions w/out Service Learning Programs in 1996 (N=61)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Descriptive variables</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Research Universities I</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Universities II</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral Universities I</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral Universities II</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s Universities &amp; Colleges I</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>64.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s Universities &amp; Colleges II</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baccalaureate Colleges I</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baccalaureate Colleges II</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialized Institutions</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ x^2 = 195.67* @ p=0.05 \]

Total responding institutions 116 100.0
Institutional Characteristics

The third research question asked what the institutional characteristics of 4-year public colleges and universities were that held membership in SACS. Table 3 contains a list of responding institutions categorized according to size, geographic location, and whether service was specifically mentioned in their institutional mission statements. Of the 55 responding colleges and universities with service-learning programs, 5 (9.3%) had fewer than 2,500 students enrolled at their institution, 8 (14.8%) had 2,501-5,000 students, 6 (11.1%) had 5,001-7,500 students, 6 (11.1%) had 7,501-10,000 students, 2 (3.7%) had 10,001-12,500 students, 3 (5.6%) had 12,501-15,000 students, 5 (9.3%) had 15,001-17,500 students, 3 (5.5%) had 17,501-20,000 students, 16 (29.6%) had over 20,001 students, and 1 (1.8%) institution did not report this information. Of the 61 responding colleges and universities that did not have service-learning programs in 1996, 9 (14.8%) had fewer than 2,500 students enrolled at their institution, 14 (23%) had 2,501-5,000 students, 14 (23%) had 5,001-7,500 students, 11 (18%) had 7,501-10,000 students, 3 (4.9%) had 10,001-12,500 students, 4 (6.6%) had 12,501-15,000 students, 1 (1.6%) had 15,001-17,500 students, 2 (3.3%) had 17,501-20,000 students, 3 (4.9%) had over 20,001 students, and 1 was not recorded according to size. Of the 55 responding institutions with service-learning programs, 2 (3.6%) were in Alabama, 6 (11%) were in Florida, 8 (14.5%) were in Georgia, 2 (3.6%) were in Louisiana, 5 (9%) were in Kentucky, 4 (7.3%) were in Mississippi, 6 (11%) were in North Carolina, 3 (5.5%) were in South Carolina, 2 (3.6%) were in Tennessee, 9 (16.4%) were in Texas, and 8 (14.5%) were in Virginia. Of the 61 responding institutions that did not have service-learning programs on their
Table 3

Institutional Characteristics of Respondents at 4-Year Public Colleges and Universities That Were Members of SACS and Had Service-Learning Programs on Their Campuses During 1996 (N=55)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Descriptive variables</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment Size:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 2,500 students</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,501-5,000</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,001-7,500</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7,501-10,000</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,001-12,500</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12,501-15,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15,001-17,500</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17,501-20,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 20,001</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>29.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing Data</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ x^2 = 23.33^* \text{ @ } p = 0.05 \]

Geographic Location:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ x^2 = 13.24; \text{ NS @ } p = 0.05 \]
Descriptive variables

Service in the Institutional Mission Statement:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>89.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ x^2 = 33.61 \* @ p=0.05 \]

campuses in 1996, 10 (16.4%) were in Alabama, 0 (0%) were in Florida, 9 (14.8%) were in Georgia, 1 (1.6%) was in Kentucky, 7 (11.5%) were in Louisiana, 1 (1.6%) was in Mississippi, 5 (8.2%) were in North Carolina, 4 (6.6%) were in South Carolina, 6 (9.8%) were in Tennessee, 15 (24.6%) were in Texas, and 3 (4.9%) were in Virginia. According to whether the responding institutions had service specifically mentioned in their institutional mission statement, 49 (89.1%) did mention service, and 6 (10.9%) did not mention service. Of the 61 responding institutions that did not have service-learning programs on their campuses in 1996, 48 (78.7%) did mention service in their institutional mission statements, 12 (19.7%) did not mention service, and 1 (1.6%) institution did not provide this information.

Student Characteristics

The fourth research question asked about the demographics of student participants in service-learning programs at 4-year public colleges and universities that are members of SACS. Survey respondents that had service-learning programs on their campuses classified their student participants according to gender, ethnicity, number of hours of
service per week, whether they received a stipend for their service, and whether service participation was listed on their institutional transcript. Table 4 delineates student participant characteristics according to these variables. Of the 55 responding colleges and universities that had service-learning programs on their campuses, 27 (49.1%) indicated that more women than men were involved in service-learning, 4 (7.3%) reported more men than women involved in service-learning, 12 (21.8%) reported equal gender distribution among participants, and 12 (21.8%) responded as data unknown. Of the 55

Table 4

Student Participant Information From Institutional Respondents at 4-Year Public Colleges and Universities That Were Members of SACS and Had Service-Learning Programs on Their Campuses During 1996 (N=55)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Descriptive variables</th>
<th></th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More Women than Men</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>49.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More Men than Women</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal Women and Men</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>21.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing Data</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>21.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\chi^2 = 19.02^* \at \ p=0.05$

Ethnicity:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th></th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African-American</td>
<td></td>
<td>24.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td></td>
<td>62.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td></td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(table continues)
### Descriptive variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hours of Service per Month:</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1- 4 hours</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>25.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-10 hours</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>30.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15 hours</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16+ hours</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing Data</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ x^2=4.83; \text{NS @ p}=0.05 \]

### Stipends for Service:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stipends for Service:</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes for All Service Participation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes for Some Service Participation</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>21.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No, Stipends not provided</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>69.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing Data</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ x^2=42.46* @ p=0.05 \]

### Service Listed on Student Transcripts:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Listed on Student Transcripts:</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>83.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing Data</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ x^2=32.96* @ p=0.05 \]

- Data not available

Responding colleges and universities that had service-learning programs, 31 (56.4%) provided data on the ethnic diversity of their student participants. Twenty-four (43.6%) institutions did not respond to survey questions on ethnic diversity but did indicate that their institutions did not gather such data. Of the 31 institutions that did provide data on ethnicity, the average participation of African-Americans was 24%, Caucasians 62.5%,
Hispanics 10.7%, and 2.8% of the participants were reported as falling within other ethnic groups. With regard to the number of hours per week that students participated in service activities, on average, 25.5% of the student participants worked 1-4 hours per week, 30.9% worked 5-10 hours per week, 18.2% worked 11-16 hours per week, 12.7% worked more than 16 hours per week, and 12.7% indicated that this information was unknown.

Only 1 institution (1.8%) responded that it provided stipends to all of its students who participated in service-learning activities; 12 (21.8%) provided some stipends to students for their service; 38 (69.1%) did not provide stipends; and 4 (7.3%) failed to respond to this specific survey question. Service-learning information was included on student transcripts at 5 (9.1%) of the responding institutions and was not provided for students at 46 (83.6%) of the institutions. Four (7.3%) of the responding institutions did not provide information on whether they listed service participation on students transcripts.

Key Success Factors

The fifth research question asked what the key success factors were for service-learning programs at 4-year public colleges and universities that were members of SACS. Table 5 identifies key success factors in the development of institutional service-learning programs that were identified by survey respondents. Of the 55 institutions that had service-learning programs, the first key success factor listed by schools was administrative support at 23 (41.8%) of the schools. The second key factor listed by schools was faculty support at 15 (27.3%) of the institutions. The third key success factor
recorded by colleges and universities was tied between community support and student organization at 10 (18.2%) each.

Table 5

**Key Success Factors in the Development of Service-Learning Programs at 4-Year Public Colleges and Universities That Were Members of SACS (N=55)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Descriptive variables</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Key Success Factor:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEO Support</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>21.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Support</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>41.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Support</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Support</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing Data</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2nd Key Success Factor:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEO Support</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Support</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Support</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>27.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Support</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource Materials</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Start-up Funding</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Commitment</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing Data</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3rd Key Success Factor:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Support</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Support</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource Materials</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Start-up Funding</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Assistance</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Commitment</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Organization</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing Data</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>29.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Program Structures and Administrative Organizations

The sixth research question asked what the program structure and administrative organization of service-learning programs was at 4-year public colleges and universities that were members of SACS. Survey respondents that had service-learning programs on their campuses during 1996 provided information on the organizational structure of their service-learning programs, whether their institution had a separate service-learning center or office, types of reflection components, methods of student evaluation, number of faculty teaching courses with service-learning components, faculty motivation, faculty development programs, whether participation in service was a factor in tenure and promotion, staff participation, and areas in which service-learning was involved in the curriculum. Data were also gathered on whether each institution offered stand-alone courses on service-learning, whether service was tied specifically to a general education requirement, whether the institution’s course catalog or class schedule identified courses that offered service-learning, and the number of different courses that provided service-learning opportunities for students. Table 6 describes program structures and administrative organizational make-up.

Of the 55 responding institutions, 16 (29.1%) indicated they had a service-learning officer or coordinator, 3 (5.5%) had one faculty member for all disciplines, 24 (43.6%) had different faculty members in different disciplines, 8 (14.5%) had student volunteer coordinators, 8 (14.5%) had student coordinators or student organizations, 2 (3.6%) had service-learning teams, and 4 (7.3%) had AmeriCorps members coordinate...
their service-learning efforts. About half of the institutions (45.5%) had a separate
service-learning center or office. The types of reflective components used in service-
learning courses included 43 (78.2%) class discussion, 41 (74.5%) student written
journals, 35 (63.6%) group projects, 22 (40%) research papers, 37 (67.3%) oral
presentations, 34 (61.8%) reflection papers, 24 (43.6%) student-led activities, 19 (34.5%)
creative writing, 20 (36.4%) special assignments, and 19 (34.5%) creative projects (e.g.,
art, music, video). Of the 55 responding institutions, students are evaluated in the
following methods: 8 (14.5%) examinations (short answer/essay), 3 (5.5%) examinations
(multiple choice/true-false) 31 (56.4%) evaluation forms (completed by agency), 28
(50.9%) evaluation forms (completed by students), 17 (30.9%) questionnaires (completed
by student), 18 (32.7%) progress reports (completed by students), 33 (60%) log of
accomplishments/activities (completed by student), 22 (40%) log of
accomplishments/activities (completed by agency), 27 (49.1%) research/reflection papers,
31 (56.4%) oral reflection/presentations, and 30 (54.5%) onsite observations. The
institutions reported that the number of faculty who taught courses with service-learning
components was on average 1-5 faculty at 9 (16.4%) of the institutions, 6-10 faculty at 17
(30.9%) of the institutions, 11-20 faculty at 12 (21.8%) of the institutions, 21-30 faculty
at 5 (9.1%) of the institutions, 31-40 faculty at 5 (9.1%) of the institutions, 41-50 faculty
at 4 (7.3%) of the institutions, and 51+ faculty at 3 (5.5%) of the institutions. Faculty
were motivated to participate in service-learning through mini-grants at 13 (23.6%),
stipends at 4 (7.3%), release time at 7 (12.7%), peer influence at 20 (36.4%), outside
leaders at 6 (10.9%), praise/recognition at 22 (40%), mandatory involvement at 5 (9.1%),
personal commitment at 41 (74.5%), and no encouragement at 7 (12.7%) of the institutions. Of the 55 responding institutions, 24 (43.6%) offered faculty development programs for service-learning. Community service was a requirement for faculty tenure at 25 (45.5%) of the institutions. The respondents reported that administrators/staff were involved in service-learning at their institutions through personal service, advisory boards, board members, and institutional leadership roles, among others. The number of administrators was reported to be 1-5 at 17 (30.9%), 6-10 at 9 (16.4%), 11-20 at 5 (9.1%), 21-30 at 6 (10.9%), 31-40 at 5 (9.1%), 41-50 at 2 (3.6%), and 51+ at 11 (20%) of the institutions. Service-learning components were reported to be included in the following curricular areas: science/math at 20 (36.4%), health at 33 (60%), English at 22 (40%), technical/vocational at 8 (14.5%), social sciences at 41 (74.5%), business at 21 (38.2%), and humanities at 29 (52.7%) of the institutions.

When asked whether each institution offered a specific stand-alone course on community service and service-learning, 13 (23.6%) reported that their institution did offer such a course. Service-learning was reported to be tied to general education requirements at 9 (16.4%) of the responding institutions. Institutions indicated that their course catalogue or class schedule clearly identified courses that offered service-learning opportunities at 14 (25.5%) of the schools. Of the respondents, 14 (25.5%) reported that 1-5 different courses on their campus provided service-learning opportunities for students, 21 (38.2%) had 5-10 courses, 4 (7.3%) had 11-20 courses, 2 (3.6%) had 21-30 courses, and 7 (12.7%) had 31+ courses.
Table 6  

Program Administration and Administrative Structure of Respondents at 4-Year Public Colleges and Universities That Were Members of SACS and Had Service-Learning Programs on Their Campuses During 1996 (N=55)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Descriptive variables</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Structure:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service-learning Officer or Coordinator</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>29.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One Faculty member for all disciplines</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Different faculty in different disciplines</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>43.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Services/St. Activities/St. Life</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteer Coordinator</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Coordinator</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service-learning team</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AmeriCorps Member(s)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Separate Service-Learning Center/Office</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>45.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>54.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$x^2 = .454; NS @ p=0.05$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Reflective Components:</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Class Discussion</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>78.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student-Written Journals</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>74.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Projects</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>63.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Papers</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral Presentations</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>67.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflection Papers</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>61.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student-led Activities</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>43.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative Writing</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>34.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Assignments</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>36.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative Projects</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>34.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(table continues)
Descriptive variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Methods of Evaluating Students:</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exams (short answer/essay)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exams (multiple choice/true-false)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation Forms (completed by agency)</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>56.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation Forms (completed by student)</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>50.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questionnaires (completed by student)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>30.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progress Reports (completed by student)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>32.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Log of Accomplishments (by student)</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Log of Accomplishments (by agency)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research/Reflection Papers</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>49.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral Reflection/Presentation</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>56.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-site Observation</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>54.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of Faculty Teaching Courses:

| 1-5 Faculty           | 9 | 16.4 |
| 6-10 Faculty          | 17| 30.9 |
| 11-20 Faculty         | 12| 21.8 |
| 21-30 Faculty         | 5 | 9.1  |
| 31-40 Faculty         | 5 | 9.1  |
| 41-50 Faculty         | 4 | 7.3  |
| 51+ Faculty           | 3 | 5.5  |

$x^2=19.978^* @ \ p=0.05$

Faculty Motivation/Encouragement:

| Mini-grants          | 13| 23.6 |
| Stipends             | 4 | 7.3  |
| Release Time         | 7 | 12.7 |
| Peer Influence       | 20| 36.4 |
| Outside Leaders      | 6 | 10.9 |
| Praise/recognition   | 22| 40.0 |
| Mandatory Involvement| 5 | 9.1  |
| Personal Commitment  | 41| 74.5 |
| No Encouragement      | 7 | 12.7 |

(table continues)
The table below summarizes various descriptive variables and their frequencies and percentages. The variables include faculty development programs, community service requirements, staff involvement in service-learning, curricular areas with service-learning components, and stand-alone courses on service-learning.

### Descriptive variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Development Programs offered for Faculty:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>43.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>56.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 = 0.890; \text{NS } @ p = 0.05 \]

| Community Service Required for Tenure: | | |
| Yes | 25 | 45.5 |
| No | 30 | 54.5 |

\[ \chi^2 = 0.454; \text{NS } @ p = 0.05 \]

| Staff Involvement in Service-Learning: | | |
| 1-5 Administrators | 17 | 30.9 |
| 6-10 Administrators | 9 | 16.4 |
| 11-20 Administrators | 5 | 9.1 |
| 21-30 Administrators | 6 | 10.9 |
| 31-40 Administrators | 5 | 9.1 |
| 41-50 Administrators | 2 | 3.6 |
| 51+ Administrators | 11 | 20.0 |

\[ \chi^2 = 18.953^* @ p = 0.05 \]

| Curricular Areas with Service-learning Components: | | |
| Science/Math | 20 | 36.4 |
| Health | 33 | 60.0 |
| English | 22 | 40.0 |
| Technical/Vocational | 8 | 14.5 |
| Social Sciences | 41 | 74.5 |
| Business | 21 | 38.2 |
| Humanities | 29 | 52.7 |

| Stand-alone Course on Service-Learning: | | |
| Yes | 13 | 23.6 |
| No | 42 | 76.4 |

\[ \chi^2 = 15.28^* @ p = 0.05 \]

*(table continues)*
Descriptive variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service-Learning tied to General Ed. Requirement:</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>83.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\chi^2 = 24.88^* @ p=0.05$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Catalog or Schedule Identify Courses:</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>25.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>74.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\chi^2 = 13.26^* @ p=0.05$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Courses providing SL Opportunities:</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-5 Courses</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>25.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 Courses</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>38.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-20 Courses</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-30 Courses</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31+ Courses</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing Data</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\chi^2 = 23.16^* @ p=0.05$

Community Organizations

The seventh research question asked what types of community organizations were served by service-learning participants at 4-year public colleges and universities that were members of SACS. Therefore, survey respondents that had service-learning programs on their campuses during 1996 provided information on the types of community agencies organizations support, the areas of community needs addressed, the methods of
community input gathered, AmeriCorps participation, and membership in a national or state Campus Compact, which is presented in Table 7.

Of the 55 institutions that had service-learning programs, students at 48 (87.3%) institutions volunteered at K-12 schools, 51 (92.7%) volunteered at social service agencies/organizations, 33 (60%) volunteered at environmental agencies/organizations, 41 (74.5%) volunteered at health agencies/organizations, and 32 (58.2%) volunteered at local governmental agencies. Areas of community need addressed by students in service-learning programs included education at 49 (89.1%) of the institutions, public safety at services, student activities or student life administrators involved in the program, and 6 (10.9%) had environment at 39 (70.9%) of the institutions. Community input into service-learning programs was obtained through community advisory boards at 35 (63.6%) of the institutions, collaborative partnerships at 38 (69.1%) of the institutions, personal contact with community members at 46 (83.6%) of the institutions, and site surveys at 22 (40%) of the institutions. All of the institutions responded that they gathered community input through one mechanism or another. AmeriCorps members participated at 20 (36.4%) of the responding institutions, and 15 (27.3%) of the institutions indicated that they were members of national or local Campus Compacts.
### Table 7

**Community Service Agency Involvement in Institutional Service-Learning Programs at 4-Year Public Colleges and Universities That Were Members of SACS (N=55)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Descriptive variables</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Types of Community Agencies</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K-12 Schools</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>87.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Service Agencies</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>92.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Agencies</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Agencies</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>74.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Governmental Agencies</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>58.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Areas of Community Need</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>89.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Safety</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>32.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Need</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>89.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>70.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community Input Garnered</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisory Boards</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>63.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative Partnerships</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>69.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Contact with Community Members</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>83.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Surveys</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Involvement</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AmeriCorps Participation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ x^2 = 4.09 \] \text{ @ } p = 0.05

(\text{table continues})
Problems Affecting Service-Learning Programs

The eighth research question asked what the major problems affecting the development of service-learning programs were at 4-year public colleges and universities that were members of SACS. Table 8 contains institutional responses from participants that had service-learning programs on their campuses during 1996 and provided data on the types of problems their service-learning programs experienced. Of the 55 institutions that had service-learning programs, the major concern listed by schools was insufficient administrative support at 9 (16.4%) of the schools. The second (10 or 18.2%) and third (14 or 25.5%) major problem listed by institutions was insufficient funding.

Future of Service-Learning

The ninth research question asked what the likely future of service-learning was at 4-year public colleges and universities that were members of SACS. Of the 116 survey respondents, 61 institutions reported that they did not have service-learning programs on their campus during 1996. Figure 2 illustrates the possible future of service-learning on campuses that did not have programs at the time of the study. Of the 61 institutions, 28
(45.9%) indicated that they were interested in starting a service-learning program on their campus in the future. What follows are verbatim comments from survey respondents regarding the possible future of service-learning on their campuses: “We are in the initial phases of developing a program now”; “We are beginning a service-learning program in fall 1997; however, no information is available yet”; “Criteria for service learning designation for courses have been developed and reviewed by the University Undergraduate Curriculum Committee.” It is anticipated that such a designation will be in place by Fall 1998; and “We are in the process of being established for 1997-98.”

Many of the 55 institutions that had service-learning programs during 1996 indicated that they plan to maintain their programs in the future. What follows are verbatim comments from survey respondents regarding the future of their existing programs: “The . . . Executive Staff named service-learning as an institutional priority for the year”; “The University is very committed to community service and in 1994 established the Public Service Roundtable. The Roundtable encourages service to entire state and involves people from across the campus”; “Service is a core value at . . .”; “. . . has received funding from the Learn and Serve: Higher Education of the Corporation for National Service for the past two years. This year a grant in the amount of $100,000 will assist the institution with technical assistance for faculty to become more involved”; “The new president is interested in service-learning and our office is improving its self-promotion and publicity”; “We are still in the beginning stages of the development of pure service-learning at this institution. However, we do have a recently appointed Dean of Community Service, a newly established Service-Learning Center, an AmeriCorps
Program and a budding Service-Learning Council. These entities are working toward the careful establishment of a curricular-based and academically-sound set of service-learning courses, course modules, and course activities that will produce a significant service-learning environment on this campus within a few years; and "A group of faculty members and administrators are currently working on a grant proposal that would lead to the development of a more comprehensive structure for service learning and would include manuals and workshops."

Table 8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problems Affecting Service-Learning Programs at 4-Year Public Colleges and Universities That Were Members of SACS (N=55)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Descriptive variable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Major Problem w/ SL Programs:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of CEO Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insufficient Administrative Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Resistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficulty in Placing Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Record Keeping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of Centralization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insufficient Knowledge/Understanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insufficient Release Time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insufficient Funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of Time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Major Problem w/ SL Programs:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insufficient Administrative Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Resistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Record Keeping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of Centralization</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(table continues)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Descriptive variables</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Insufficient Knowledge/Understanding</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insufficient Release Time</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insufficient Funding</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Reluctance</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of Time</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing Data</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3rd Major Problem w/ SL Programs:</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate College-Community Relations</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insufficient Knowledge/Understanding</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insufficient Release Time</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insufficient Funding</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>25.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Reluctance</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of Time</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing Data</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>43.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 2. Future prospects for service-learning at 4-year public colleges and universities that are members of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools. The illustration shows twenty-eight (45.9%) institutions indicated an interest in developing a program on their campus in the near future, and the remaining 33 (54.1%) institutions were not interested in developing a service-learning program.
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, DISCUSSION OF THE FINDING, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

The purposes of this study were to investigate institutions with service-learning programs on their campuses. The study also established institutional profiles of colleges and universities that support service-learning activities and describes service-learning program models and structures. The study also identified characteristics of participants in service-learning. Finally, the study discusses future prospects affecting campus-based service-learning programs. The following findings are summarized and listed according to the research questions:

1. Which 4-year public colleges and universities in SACS had service-learning programs on their campuses? Analysis of the data provided by institutional chief executive officers at 4-year public colleges and universities that were members of SACS during 1996 indicated that service-learning was growing in institutional appeal and practice. The data showed that 55 (47.4%) of the responding institutions had service-learning programs on their campuses during 1996, and 28 (45.9%) of the remaining colleges and universities were interested in starting a program in the future.
2. What was the nature of the institutions with service-learning programs when categorized according to the Carnegie Classifications? The data illustrated that Master's (comprehensive) Colleges and Universities 1 (36.3%) were more likely than Research and Doctoral Universities to have service-learning activities on their campuses. The majority (64%) of institution without service-learning programs were Master's (comprehensive) Colleges and Universities 1. A chi square analysis indicates that the observed distribution of schools without service-learning programs on their campuses during 1996 departs significantly from the expected distribution; hence, the variable of Carnegie Classification is importantly associated with the way the respondents are categorized.

3. What were the institutional characteristics of 4-year public colleges and universities that were members of SACS that offered service-learning courses and/or programs? The model institution that supported service-learning initiatives was found to have an enrollment of over 20,000 students; be geographically located in Florida, where 100% of the responding institutions had service-learning programs; and have service mentioned in their institutional mission statement (89.1%). A chi square analysis indicates that the observed distributions of enrollment size and service listed in the institutional mission departs significantly from the expected distribution. Hence, the variables of enrollment size and service listed in institutional missions are importantly associated with the way the respondents responded to those questions.

4. What were the demographics of student participants in service-learning programs at 4-year public colleges and universities that were members of SACS? The
data indicated that more women than men (49.1%) participated in service-learning activities. Respondents also showed that participants were generally Caucasian (62.5%) and volunteered on average 5-10 hours per week at service agencies. Most institutions did not provide stipends (69.1%) to student participants, nor did they list participation on their students' transcripts (83.6%). A chi square analysis indicates that the observed distributions of gender, stipends, and service listed on student transcripts depart significantly from the expected distributions. Thus, the variables of gender, stipends, and service listed on student transcripts are importantly associated with the respondents' responses to those questions.

5. What were the key success factors in service-learning programs at 4-year public colleges and universities that were members of SACS? Respondents indicated that administrative support (41.8%) and faculty support (27.3%) were the two top factors in determining institutional success in developing a service-learning program on college and university campuses.

6. What was the program structure and administrative organization of service-learning programs at 4-year public colleges and universities that were members of SACS? Analysis of the data showed that the majority of responding institutions had different faculty in different disciplines coordinate the organizational structure of the institution's service-learning courses and activities. Additionally, the data indicated that 54.5% of the institutions did not have a separate service-learning center or office to orchestrate service-learning activities. Most institutions used class discussion (78.2%) and student written journals (74.5%) as types of reflective components for student participant learning.
Student performance was generally evaluated by a log of accomplishments kept by the student (60%) at the majority of the institutions. On average, 6-10 faculty (30.9%) at each institution taught service-learning courses and motivated themselves intrinsically (74.5%) to teach such courses through their personal commitment. The data indicated that faculty development programs (56.4%) were generally not offered for faculty participants in service activities and community service was not required for tenure at 54.5% of the institutions. Few administrators/staff (1-5) participated in service-learning activities, as indicated by a 30.9% response rate. The typical curriculum areas in which service-learning components were found were in the social sciences (74.5%) and health fields (60%). Most institutions did not have stand-alone courses on service-learning (76.4%), did not identify service-learning courses in their institution catalogue or schedule of classes (74.5%), and did not tie service to the general education requirements (83.6%).

Finally, the model institution had 6-10 courses (38.2%) that provided service-learning opportunities to students. A chi square analysis indicates that the observed distributions depart significantly from the expected distributions; hence, the variables of stand-alone courses, service-learning tied to general education requirements, course catalogue descriptions, and number of courses offered are importantly associated with the way the respondents responded to those questions.

7. What types of community organizations were served by service-learning participants? The data indicated that 92.7% of the institutions placed students in social service agencies to conduct their service activities. Education (89.1%) and human need (89.1%) were the areas of community need most often focused on by participants.
Institutions gathered community input into their programs through personal contact with community members (83.6%). Finally, most institutions did not have AmeriCorps participation (60%) or membership in a local or national Campus Compact (72.7%). A chi square analysis indicates that the observed distributions depart significantly from the expected distributions; hence, the variables of AmeriCorps participation and membership in a Campus Compact are importantly associated with the way the respondents responded to those questions.

8. What were the major problems affecting the development of service-learning programs at 4-year public colleges and universities that were members of SACS? The data reflected insufficient administrative support (16.4%) as the leading problems affecting the development of service-learning programs. Insufficient funding (18.2%) was recorded as the second major problem that institutions faced in establishing programs.

9. What was the likely future of service-learning programs at 4-year public colleges and universities in SACS? Respondents indicated that 45.9% of the institutions without service-learning programs were interested in establishing programs. Of the 55 responding institutions with service-learning programs, 49% had been established since 1990, and 54.5%, within the last 10 years, thus illustrating the recent progression of program development.

Discussion of the Findings

The study found that service-learning program development was a relatively new initiative for most institutions. With 54.5% of the reported programs being developed
within the past 10 years, several challenges were presented during the data collection phase of this project. First, the newness of the programs prevented easy comparison of longitudinal data for institutions in responding to the survey. Second, as new programs emerged, their focus, structure, and administrative management changed to meet the institutions and community’s needs. The newness of program development may contribute to institutions not offering large numbers of courses (i.e., 6-10 courses on average at 38.2% of the institutions). The newness may also contribute to institutions not having a large number of faculty teaching service-learning courses or large numbers of staff involved in program administration. New programs explain the fact that institutions do not offer faculty development programs (56.4%), do not require community service for tenure (54.5%), do not tie service-learning to general education requirements (83.6%), do not identify service in the institutions catalogue or schedule of classes (74.5%), and/or do not offer a stand-alone course on service-learning (76.4%). As institutions develop and expand their programs, they may add these features to their services. Third, new and evolving programs often lack adequate program assessment methods. As represented in the data, many institutions were unable to answer one or more questions on the survey due to insufficient data collection/assessment mechanism on their campuses. This lack of data was represented as missing in the tables provided in chapter 4. For example, exact numbers of student participants according to ethnicity were not obtained. Some institutions provided percentages of student participation according to ethnic diversity, yet 43.6% did not respond to questions regarding ethnic background.
Of the data gathered, the study found that Master's (comprehensive) Colleges and Universities had greater participation in service-learning initiatives than other classifications of colleges and universities. Since Master's Colleges and Universities place more emphasis on teaching and service than do research and doctoral institutions, service-learning appears to be a good “fit” with these institutions. Additionally, the data found that larger institutions with over 20,000 students (29.5%) tend to have service-learning programs more often than smaller schools. Larger institutions generally have more faculty and staff than do smaller schools, as well as increased opportunities for specialization and new program initiatives.

The results revealed that all colleges and universities (100%) responding to the survey from the state of Florida had service-learning program on their campuses. Florida is the only state in SACS that has a statewide Campus Compact; therefore, institutional support from the compact may lead to greater service participation from area schools (Kobrin et al., 1996).

Timing of the study was not optimal. Questionnaires were mailed to institutions in June and collected during the summer term. Because many college and university CEOs delegated the completion of the survey to faculty members and many faculty members were on hiatus during the summer term, the return rate may have been affected. A long semester, fall or spring, may have generated a greater return rate since more program coordinators and/or faculty members may have been on-campus to receive and complete the survey.
Insufficient institutional contacts was another problem with data collection. Surveys were mailed to each institution's chief executive officer for response. As expected, most college and university presidents forwarded the survey to the individual(s) responsible for service on their campus. A list of service-learning administrators would have enabled the researcher to mail the questionnaire directly to the person responsible for the service program. By directly mailing the service to the service-learning coordinator, a greater return rate and quicker response time would have been realized.

Conclusions

The problem of this study was to investigate the levels of involvement in service-learning programs and activities at 4-year public colleges and universities that hold membership in SACS. The following conclusions are based on the findings of this study.

1. Service-learning program development is on the rise among colleges and universities with new initiatives underway.
2. Large institutions with an enrollment of over 20,000 are more likely to establish service-learning programs on their campuses than are smaller institutions.
3. States in which there is an active state Campus Compact are more likely to have colleges and universities that have service-learning programs than states that do not participate in the Campus Compact network.
4. Students are interested in service activities without the need for paid stipends or academic credit on their transcript.
5. Administrative and faculty support are key components in establishing successful service-learning programs, whereas resource materials and technical assistance are not as essential to success. Insufficient administrative support was listed as a challenge or major problem in service-learning program development.

6. It appears that some faculty are willing to participate in service-learning initiatives without increased funding, release time, or recognition toward promotion and tenure. Increased funding, administrative support, release time, and credit toward tenure may increase the numbers of faculty who are interested in teaching courses with service-learning components.

7. Obstacles impacting the successful development of service-learning programs include insufficient administrative support and insufficient funding.

Recommendations

Service-learning program development is increasing, with 47.4% of responding institutions having programs during 1996 and 45.9% of institutions without programs expressing interest in program implementation. Therefore, there is a need for further research on service-learning programs and participation. The following recommendations are made for further research and program improvement:

1. Institutions that do not currently have service-learning programs on their campuses should utilize this research and others to develop programs for their students.

2. Institutions that do currently have service-learning programs should strengthen their existing programs by broadening the scope of courses with service-learning
components offered; should develop service-learning offices or centers; should garner program support of the faculty, staff, and students; should target funding mechanisms; and/or should develop incentives for faculty participation.

3. Similar research should be conducted with private colleges and universities in SACS. Service-learning program and participant profiles may prove to be different according to the institutions' locus of control.

4. Similar research should be conducted in other geographic locations within the United States to determine whether findings are similar.

5. Research should be conducted on participants (i.e., faculty, staff, and students) to garner their opinions and perceived benefits of service-learning in order to better meet their needs.

6. Research should be conducted on funding sources, technical assistance, and resource materials available for program development and implementation.

7. Further investigation into program structure and administration organization is necessary to provide valuable data to institutions in the preliminary stages of developing a program.

8. Further research is necessary to determine institutional justification for faculty and staff time spent and costs involved in program development for service-learning courses and activities.

9. Research should be conducted on community agency needs, satisfaction, and perceived benefits to clients and the agency.
10. Institutions should adopt assessment tools to garner information on participant demographics, satisfaction, perceived benefits, and perceived learning/growth.

11. Institutions with existing service-learning programs should adopt assessment methods/tools to gather information on unmet needs for service within the campus and community.

12. Institutions should share information and resources with other colleagues through faculty and staff networking, published materials, national and local associations, and conference participation.
APPENDIX A

SOUTHERN ASSOCIATION OF COLLEGES AND SCHOOLS

MEMBERSHIP LIST OF 4-YEAR PUBLIC COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES
Four-Year Public Colleges and Universities that are members of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools

**Alabama**

- Athens State College
- Alabama State University
- Auburn University at Montgomery
- Jacksonville State University
- Troy State University
- Troy State University at Dothan
- Troy State University in Montgomery
- University of Montevallo
- University of North Alabama
- The University of West Alabama
- Alabama Agricultural and Mechanical University
- The University of Alabama at Huntsville
- University of South Alabama
- Auburn University
- The University of Alabama
- The University of Alabama at Birmingham

**Florida**

- University of North Florida
- The University of West Florida
- Florida Agricultural and Mechanical University
- University of Central Florida
- Florida Atlantic University
- Florida International University
- Florida State University
- University of Florida
- University of South Florida

**Georgia**

- Clayton College and State University
- Savannah State University
- Armstrong Atlantic State University
- Kennesaw State University
- North Georgia College and State University
- Southern Polytechnic State University
Albany State University
Augusta State University
Columbus State University
Fort Valley State University
Georgia College and State University
Georgia Southwestern State University
State University of West Georgia
Valdosta State University
Georgia Southern University
Medical College of Georgia
Georgia Institute of Technology
Georgia State University
University of Georgia

**Kentucky**

Kentucky State University
Eastern Kentucky University
Morehead State University
Murray State University
Western Kentucky University
Northern Kentucky University
University of Kentucky
University of Louisville

**Louisiana**

Southern University at New Orleans
Louisiana State University at Shreveport
McNeese State University
Nicholls State University
Southeastern Louisiana University
Grambling State University
Louisiana Tech University
Northwestern State University
Southern University and A and M College
Louisiana State University
Louisiana State University Medical Center
Northeast Louisiana University
University of New Orleans
University of Southwestern Louisiana
Mississippi

Alcorn State University
Mississippi University for Women
Mississippi Valley State University
Delta State University
Jackson State University
University of Mississippi Medical Center
Mississippi State University
University of Mississippi
University of Southern Mississippi

North Carolina

Elizabeth City State University
Winston-Salem State University
Fayetteville State University
North Carolina School of the Arts
University of North Carolina at Asheville
University of North Carolina at Pembroke
University of North Carolina at Wilmington
Appalachian State University
Western Carolina University
East Carolina University
North Carolina Agricultural and Technical State University
North Carolina Central University
North Carolina State University
University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
University of North Carolina at Charlotte
University of North Carolina at Greensboro

South Carolina

Coastal Carolina University
College of Charleston
Francis Marion University
Lander University
University of South Carolina-Aiken
University of South Carolina-Spartanburg
The Citadel
Winthrop University
Medical University of South Carolina
South Carolina State University
Clemson University
University of South Carolina

Tennessee

University of Tennessee at Chattanooga
University of Tennessee at Martin
Austin Peay State University
East Tennessee State University
Tennessee State University
Tennessee Technological University
University of Tennessee, Memphis
Middle Tennessee State University
University of Memphis
University of Tennessee, Knoxville

Texas

University of Houston-Downtown
Angelo State University
Midwestern State University
Prairie View A & M University
Sul Ross State University
Tarleton State University
Texas A & M International University
Texas A & M University- Texarkana
University of Houston-Clear Lake
University of Houston- Victoria
University of Texas at Brownsville
University of Texas-Pan American
University of Texas of the Permian Basin
University of Texas at Tyler
West Texas A & M University
Lamar University
Sam Houston State University
Southwest Texas State University
Stephen F. Austin State University
Texas A & M University-Commerce
Texas A & M University- Corpus Christi
Texas A & M University - Kingsville
Texas Southern University
University of North Texas Health Science Center at Ft. Worth
University of Texas Health Science Center at San Antonio
University of Texas Medical Branch at Galveston
University of Texas at San Antonio
Texas A & M University
Texas Tech University
Texas Woman's University
University of Houston- University Park
University of North Texas
University of Texas at Arlington
University of Texas at Austin
University of Texas at Dallas
University of Texas at El Paso
University of Texas Health Science Center at Houston
University of Texas Southwestern Medical Center at Dallas

Virginia

Clinch Valley College of the University of Virginia
Virginia Military Institute
Christopher Newport University
Longwood College
Mary Washington College
Virginia State University
Radford University
James Madison University
Norfolk State University
The College of William and Mary
George Mason University
Old Dominion University
University of Virginia
Virginia Commonwealth University
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University
APPENDIX B

SURVEY PACKET
June 12, 1997

[First Name] [Last Name]
President
College or University
Street Address
City, State PostalCode

Dear TITLE LAST NAME:

The Center for Higher Education is conducting a national survey of institutions which are members of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools. The purpose of the survey is to develop a profile of service-learning courses and programs offered by these institutions.

Enclosed is a questionnaire which we hope you will graciously agree to complete for us. The questionnaire will take approximately 20 minutes to complete. Without the cooperation of folks such as you, this research would not be possible.

Enclosed along with the survey is a self-addressed, postage paid envelope for your use when returning the questionnaire. If you wish to receive a copy of the results of our research when it is completed, please let us know. In the meantime, please know that we greatly appreciate your cooperation. All information concerning your institution will be treated confidentially and all information reported will be in the aggregate.

In order to begin our data analysis, we are asking you to return the questionnaire by Thursday, July 3, 1997.

Thank you,

Barry Lumsden
Associate Director

Denita S. Siscoe
Research Associate

enclosure
SURVEY ON SERVICE-LEARNING

Institutional Profile

1. Institution Name

2. What was your institution’s total credit headcount enrollment for Fall 1996?
   1. 0-2,500
   2. 2,501-5,000
   3. 5,001-7,500
   4. 7,501-10,000
   5. 10,001-12,500
   6. 12,501-15,000
   7. 15,001-17,500
   8. 17,501-20,000
   9. 20,001 +

3. Is service in general, or community service specifically, in your institutional mission?
   1. Yes
   2. No

Volunteer Community Service Activities

4. Does your school help place students in local agencies or organizations for community service?
   1. Yes (name of office providing placement)
   2. No

5. Do you have any type of campus or school community service clubs or organizations (i.e., COOL, Breakaway) that involve large numbers of students/faculty/staff participants?
   1. Yes
   2. No

6. Does your school require students to perform community service in order to graduate?
   1. Yes
   2. No

Service Learning Opportunities

Service-learning opportunities involve students in organized community service that addresses local needs, while developing their academic skills in the classroom, their sense of civic responsibility, and their commitment to the community. Service-Learning is related to but does NOT include cooperative education, practicum, or internship programs.

7. Do you have any service-learning opportunities at your school?
   1. Yes
   2. No

8. If not, does your college or university have an interest in starting service-learning?
   1. Yes
   2. No

If you DO have service-learning opportunities and activities now, PLEASE complete the remainder of this survey (estimate numbers if necessary: use academic year 1996-1997 data). If you DO NOT have service-learning opportunities or activities, PLEASE return the completed portion of this questionnaire to the address listed on the back page. THANK YOU!
9. What year was service-learning (first course or activity) established?

10. In which curricular areas do students participate in service-learning opportunities? (Circle all that apply)
   1. Science/Math
   2. Health
   3. English
   4. Technical/vocational
   5. Social Sciences
   6. Business
   7. Humanities
   8. Other (specify)

11. Does your school offer a specific, stand-alone course on community service and service-learning?
   1. Yes
   2. No

12. Is service-learning tied specifically to general education requirements at your school?
   1. Yes
   2. No

13. Does your course catalog or class schedule clearly identify courses that offer service-learning opportunities?
   1. Yes
   2. No

14. How many different courses (not sections) provide service-learning opportunities to students?
   1. 1-5
   2. 5-10
   3. 11-20
   4. 21-30
   5. 31+

Student Participation

15. How many students perform service as part of the courses in question 14?
   1. 1-10
   2. 11-25
   3. 26-50
   4. 51-75
   5. 76-100
   6. 101-200
   7. 201+

16. What is the approximate gender distribution of service-learning students?
   1. More women than men
   2. More men than women
   3. Equal # of men & women

17. What is the approximate ethnic distribution (indicate approximate percentage) of service-learning students?
   1. African American
   2. Caucasian
   3. Hispanic
   4. Other

18. Is the service component mandatory (required for students) in any of the courses in question 14?
   1. Yes, mandatory in all courses
   2. Yes, mandatory in some courses
   3. No

19. Do students who participate in service-learning receive academic credit?
   1. Yes, all students who participate
   2. Yes, some students who participate
   3. No

20. Do students receive stipends for their service?
   1. Yes, all students who participate
   2. Yes, some students who participate
   3. No

21. Does participation in service-learning appear distinctly on student transcripts?
   1. Yes
   2. No

22. On average, how many hours per month of community service does a typical service-learning student provide?
   1. 1-4
   2. 5-10
   3. 11-15
   4. 16+
23. What kinds of service activities do students participate in? (Circle all that apply.)

1. Tutoring
2. Mentoring
3. Childcare
4. Healthcare/service
5. Senior citizen companionship/care
6. Homeless services
7. Community policing
8. Violence prevention
9. Neighborhood revitalization
10. Environmental conservation
11. Other (please specify) ____________________________________________

Faculty/Staff Participation

24. How many faculty teach courses with service-learning components?

1. 1-5  2. 6-10  3. 11-20  4. 21-30
5. 31-40  6. 41-50  7. 51+

25. What is the approximate gender distribution of faculty who offer service-learning?


26. What is the approximate ethnic distribution (indicate approximate percentage) of faculty who offer service-learning?

1. African American  2. Caucasian
3. Hispanic  4. Other

27. How are faculty encouraged to become involved in service-learning (circle all that apply.)

1. Mini-grants  2. Stipends
5. Outside leaders  6. Praise/recognition
7. Mandatory involvement  8. Personal commitment
9. No encouragement  10. Other (please specify) ____________________________

28. Does your institution offer faculty development programs for service-learning (e.g., mini-grants, mentoring, workshops, financial assistance)?

1. Yes  2. No

29. Is community service (within or outside the institution) a requirement for faculty tenure or promotion?

1. Yes  2. No

30. If not, is community service (within or outside the institution) a factor in faculty tenure or promotion?

1. Yes  2. No

31. How many administrators/staff are involved (e.g. through personal service, advisory board membership, institutional leadership roles) in service-learning at your institutions?

1. 1-5  2. 6-10  3. 11-20  4. 21-30
5. 31-40  6. 41-50  7. 51+
### Program Administration

32. Who organizes service-learning opportunities on your campus? (Circle primary person responsible.)

1. Service-learning Officer or coordinator
2. One faculty member for all disciplines
3. Different faculty members in different disciplines
4. Student services/student activities/student life administrator
5. Volunteer coordinator
6. Student coordinator or student organization
7. Service-learning team (collaborative approach)
8. AmeriCorp member(s)
9. Other (please specify) ___

33. Do you have a separate service-learning center or office?

1. Yes (name of administrative office to which it reports) ___
2. No

34. What types of reflective components (i.e., critical thinking about the service performed) are used in courses that provide service-learning opportunities? (Circle all that apply.)

1. Class discussion
2. Student-written journals
3. Group projects
4. Research papers
5. Oral presentations
6. Reflection papers
7. Student-led activities
8. Creative writing
9. Special assignments
10. Creative projects (e.g., art, music, video)
11. None
12. Other (please specify) ___

35. What methods are used to evaluate students’ service-learning experience? (Circle all that apply.)

1. Exams (short answer/essay)
2. Exams (multiple choice/true-false)
3. Evaluation forms (completed by agency)
4. Evaluation forms (completed by student)
5. Questionnaires (completed by student)
6. Progress reports (completed by student)
7. Log of accomplishments/activities (completed by student)
8. Log of accomplishments/activities (completed by agency)
9. Research/reflection papers
10. Oral reflection/presentations
11. On-site observations
12. Other (please specify) ___
Outside Organizations

36. Which areas of community need do your service-learning opportunities address? (Circle all that apply.)
1. Education
2. Public Safety
3. Human needs
4. Environment
5. Other (please specify)

37. What type of community agencies or organizations does your college work with? (Circle all that apply.)
1. K-12 schools
2. Social service agencies/organizations
3. Environmental agencies/organizations
4. Health agencies/organizations
5. Local government
6. Other (please specify)

38. How do you get community input for your service opportunities? (Circle all that apply.)
1. Advisory boards
2. Collaborative partnerships
3. Personal contact w/ community members
4. Site surveys
5. No community input
6. Other (please specify)

39. Are AmeriCorps members involved in your service-learning opportunities?
1. Yes
2. No

40. Is your school a member of Campus Compact (national or state)?
1. Yes
2. No

Other Information

41. Identity what you consider to be key success factors in your service-learning activities. (Circle three most significant factors.)
1. CEO support
2. Administrative support
3. Faculty support
4. Community support
5. Resource materials
6. Start-up funding
7. Technical assistance
8. Student commitment
9. Student organization (e.g., Phi Theta Kappa, student government)
10. Other (please specify)

42. Identify major problems with the development of your service-learning program. (Circle three most significant)
1. Lack of CEO support
2. Insufficient administrative support
3. Faculty resistance
4. Difficulty in placing students
5. Recordkeeping
6. Inadequate college-community agency relations
7. Lack of centralization
8. Insufficient knowledge/understanding
9. Insufficient release time
10. Insufficient funding
11. Community reluctance
12. Student reluctance
13. Lack of time
14. Other (please specify)
Thank you!

Please return this survey questionnaire by July 3rd to
Denita S. Siscoe, PO Box 425379, Denton, TX 76204
(stamped, addressed envelope provided for your convenience)
Fax- 972-315-0189

Questions? Phone (817) 898-3616, or e-mail S_Siscoe@venus.twu.edu

THIS PROJECT HAS BEEN REVIEWED AND APPROVED BY THE UNIVERSITY OF NORTH
TEXAS COMMITTEE FOR THE PROTECTION OF HUMAN SUBJECTS (phone 940-565-3940)

Survey instrument adapted with permission from the American Association of Community Colleges
APPENDIX C

LETTER FROM THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF COMMUNITY COLLEGES
Dee Siscoe
1377 Wentworth Drive
Lewisville, TX  75067

Dear Dee:

Thank you for your inquiry about service learning survey instruments designed by the American Association of Community Colleges. AACC hereby grants you permission to adapt two surveys distributed by its Service Learning Clearinghouse, the *AACC Survey on Community Service and Service Learning Programs in Community Colleges* (1995) and the *AACC Survey on Service Learning in Community Colleges* (1997). I understand that you will send a modified version of these instruments to public four-year colleges and universities as part of your doctoral studies at the University of North Texas.

Permission is granted contingent upon (1) your giving credit to AACC for the initial instrument design and (2) sharing of your findings with AACC. AACC may publish the findings in the *Community College Times*, a bi-weekly newspaper distributed to about 8,000 individuals at community colleges nationwide.

Good luck with your research. I look forward to learning the results of the study.

Sincerely,

Gail Robinson
Coordinator
Service Learning Clearinghouse

cc:  Lynn Barnett, Community Development, AACC
     Margaret Rivera, Membership & Information Services, AACC
APPENDIX D

PARTICIPANTS IN THE STUDY
Public 4-Year Colleges and Universities that were Members of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools and Participated in the Study

Alabama:

Athens State College
Alabama State University
Auburn University at Montgomery
Jacksonville State University
Troy State University
Troy State University at Dothan
Troy State University at Montgomery
University of North Alabama
University of West Alabama
University of Alabama at Huntsville
University of Alabama
University of Alabama at Birmingham

Florida:

University of North Florida
University of Central Florida
Florida International University
Florida State University
University of Florida
University of South Florida

Georgia:

Clayton College and State University
Armstrong Atlantic State University
Kennesaw State University
North Georgia College and State University
Albany State University
Augusta State University
Columbus State University
Fort Valley State University
Georgia College and State University
Georgia Southwestern State University
State University of West Georgia
Valdosta State University
Georgia Southern University
Medical College of Georgia
Georgia Institute of Technology
Georgia State University
University of Georgia

Kentucky:
Kentucky State University
Morehead State University
Murray State University
Northern Kentucky University
University of Kentucky
University of Louisville

Louisiana:
Southern University at New Orleans
Louisiana State University at Shreveport
Nicholls State University
Louisiana Tech University
Northwestern State University
Louisiana State University
Northeast Louisiana University
University of New Orleans
University of Southwestern Louisiana

Mississippi:
Alcorn State University
Mississippi University for Women
Delta State University
University of Mississippi
University of Southern Mississippi

North Carolina:
Elizabeth City State University
Fayetteville State University
University of North Carolina at Asheville
University of North Carolina at Pembroke
University of North Carolina at Wilmington
Western Carolina University
East Carolina University
North Carolina Agricultural and Technical State University
North Carolina Central University
University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
University of North Carolina at Charlotte

South Carolina:
Coastal Carolina University
Francis Marion University
University of South Carolina-Aiken
The Citadel
Winston University
Medical University of South Carolina
Clemson University

Tennessee:
University of Tennessee at Chattanooga
Austin Peay State University
East Tennessee State University
Tennessee State University
University of Tennessee, Memphis
Middle Tennessee State University
University of Memphis
University of Tennessee, Knoxville

Texas:
University of Houston-Downtown
Angelo State University
Midwestern State University
Prairie View A & M University
Sul Ross State University
Tarleton State University
Texas A & M University- Texarkana
University of Houston-Clear Lake
University of Houston- Victoria
University of Texas at Brownsville
University of Texas of the Permian Basin
Lamar University
Sam Houston State University
Texas A & M University-Commerce
Texas A & M University - Kingsville
UNT Health Science Center at Ft. Worth
UT Health Science Center at San Antonio
University of Texas at San Antonio
Texas A & M University
Texas Tech University
Texas Woman's University
University of Houston
University of Texas at Austin
University of Texas at Dallas

Virginia:

Clinch Valley College of the University of Virginia
Virginia Military Institute
Christopher Newport University
Mary Washington College
Virginia State University
Radford University
James Madison University
George Mason University
University of Virginia
Virginia Commonwealth University
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University
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