

Service-Learning in SUNY: Current Status and Strategies for Implementation

The State University of New York
University Faculty Senate, Undergraduate Committee
Service-Learning Subcommittee
2014-2015

*Andrea Zevenbergen, Chair	The State University of New York at Fredonia
Michael Jabot	The State University of New York at Fredonia
*Ramona Santa Maria	Buffalo State College
Sarah Titus	The State University of New York at Fredonia
*Amitra Wall	Buffalo State College
*Daniel White	SUNY Polytechnic Institute

* Members of the Undergraduate Academic Programs and Policies Committee

Introduction

In 2008, The SUNY University Faculty Senate prepared a document titled, “Service-Learning: A Toolkit” which was disseminated throughout the SUNY system and is currently available on the University Faculty Senate website (<http://system.suny.edu/facultysenate/resources/>). This document was developed by the Student Life Committee of the University Faculty Senate. The toolkit defines service-learning, provides recommendations for students who are considering participation in service-learning, and details possible reflection activities for students involved in service-learning. The toolkit also includes some example forms which may be used by students such as service-learning time logs, applications, and agreements. Additionally, many examples of service-learning activities, organized by academic discipline, are included in an appendix.

The 2014-2015 SUNY University Faculty Senate Undergraduate Academic Programs and Policies Committee discussed a plan during its Fall 2014 meeting to assess how service-learning is currently being implemented throughout the SUNY system. Goals included assessing as many campuses as possible and preparing a report by the end of the 2014-2015 academic year. Given the strong emphasis in SUNY currently on strengthening applied learning opportunities for students, the Undergraduate Academic Programs and Policies Committee endeavored to obtain and summarize information within the academic year, in order to be able to disseminate information to campuses as quickly as possible.

A subcommittee was formed in October, 2014, and data were collected from SUNY campuses from November, 2014 – March, 2015. This report summarizes the data collection approach, details the data obtained, and includes recommendations for campuses. It also includes example forms which may be used as models for other campuses.

Definition of Service-Learning

The National Commission on Service-Learning’s (Fiske, 2001) definition of service-learning was used when assessing whether the campuses currently have service-learning. The Commission defines service-learning as “a teaching and learning approach that integrates

community service with academic study to enrich learning, teach civic responsibility, and strengthen communities.” Notably, this definition was included in the SUNY Service Learning Toolkit document; thus, conceptualizing service-learning in this way was likely familiar to many of the campus representatives who participated in the 2014-2015 assessment.

Service-learning typically includes, at minimum, three components: 1) service to others, 2) ties to academic content, and 3) student reflection on the service-learning experience. Frequently service-learning is done off-campus, but it may be done on-campus as well (e.g., hosting training sessions for non-profit organizations, providing services at an on-campus clinic). As an example of service-learning, students in a business marketing class could partner with non-profit organizations in the community to develop and execute marketing plans. After participating in the service-learning experience, students could write a paper in which they apply information learned in the field to specific content about marketing strategies learned in the course.

Methods

The sample was first determined to be 60 possible SUNY campuses, from the set of 64 designated SUNY campuses. One campus was excluded from assessment because it has no undergraduate programs. One school, Cornell University, is listed on SUNY materials as four campuses, but as one of these campuses has no undergraduate programs and three of the campuses are treated identically with regard to service-learning on the campus, Cornell University was counted as one campus for this assessment. From the 60 campuses possible for inclusion in the sample, data were obtained from 54 of them; therefore, the response rate for the assessment of service-learning throughout the SUNY system was 90%. In the other 10% of cases, solicited campus representatives declined to participate.

In order to obtain information from as many campuses as possible, the subcommittee decided that data would be obtained through phone interviews, rather than through electronic or paper questionnaires. For each campus, an individual was identified who was considered likely to be able to provide information regarding service-learning on the campus. Solicitations for interview participation were sent initially by e-mail, facilitated by SUNY’s Coordinator of Community Relations. In some cases, information on a likely contact was obtained from the campus website, or phone calls were made to career services offices and academic dean’s offices. Eventual interviewees included service-learning coordinators, faculty members, academic deans, volunteer coordinators, and career services directors. For consistency in data collection, only one person per campus was interviewed. Prior to the interview, campus representatives were told that no campuses would be specifically identified in the data. Some campuses provided examples of forms which could serve as a model for other campuses; campus representative consent to include such forms in this report was then obtained.

Interviews were scheduled at each interviewee’s convenience and lasted 10-30 minutes, depending on the breadth of information provided. Each campus representative was first asked to establish whether the campus had service-learning opportunities for students. In some cases, this was evident from the campus website (e.g., listed name of service-learning coordinator, included manual for service-learning, policies presented on website), and the campus representative was asked first to confirm that the campus did indeed have service-learning. If the campus representative indicated that there was service-learning on the campus, he/she was asked

a set of 14 questions. These questions are included in Table 1. In some cases, additional information was volunteered by the interviewee.

Table 1: Interview Questions for Campus Representatives Who Indicated There Are Service-Learning Opportunities on Their Campus

1. Is service-learning required or optional?
2. Are there certain programs of study that require service-learning?
3. Is there a minimum number of hours that needs to be completed if a student is enrolled in service-learning?
4. Are service-learning courses assessed?
5. How are service-learning courses assessed?
6. How well known to the campus is service-learning (i.e., very well, somewhat well, not very well)?
7. How are students and faculty informed about service-learning?
8. Do students receive credit for service-learning?
9. If so, is the credit granted separately from credit given for a typical course?
10. Are there non-teaching professionals (e.g., individuals in Student Affairs) involved in providing credits, or are all the instructors faculty members?
11. What established policies do you have for service-learning on your campus?
12. Are faculty members or professionals compensated for participating in service-learning?
13. Are there any financial resources available for service-learning through the campus?
14. What do you see as barriers to more service-learning occurring on the campus?

If the campus representative indicated that the campus did not have service-learning, the representative was asked to discuss perceived barriers to offering service-learning opportunities for students on the campus.

Each campus's website was also investigated in order to obtain information regarding written policies related to service-learning, examples of forms used on the campus, and examples of service-learning activities.

Results

Information obtained from the interviews was analyzed quantitatively and qualitatively. Data were summarized across all 54 campuses which provided information, and also were in some cases analyzed separately, based on type of campus (i.e., university centers, university colleges, colleges of technology, community colleges, and specialized doctoral degree granting institutions). Sector membership was determined by reference to the SUNY Admissions Information Summary – 2014 (http://www.suny.edu/media/suny/content-assets/documents/summary-sheets/Admissions_qf_stateop.pdf).

It is important to note that in a few cases, information was not provided by an interviewee, because he/she was unsure of an answer. Thus, for the results of the quantitative analyses, the number of respondents is provided for each question analyzed.

Prevalence of Service Learning in SUNY

Of the 54 campuses which participated in this investigation, **74%** of them do provide service-learning opportunities. Twenty-two percent of the campus representatives indicated that they do not have service-learning on their campus, and in 4% of the cases, the campus representative said that he/she was unsure whether the campus offered service-learning opportunities. In the two cases where the interviewee was unsure if service-learning opportunities were offered, one campus representative categorized service-learning as generally part of experiential learning and the other campus representative knew of a few faculty members who were offering service-learning in their classes, but he/she did not view service-learning as campus-wide. One of the campus representatives that indicated that he/she was unsure if the campus offered service-learning answered the set of questions posed as if the campus did have service-learning; the other campus representative only answered the one additional question, regarding perceived barriers to service-learning on the campus.

Analyzing the data by sectors ($N = 54$), it was found that 100% of the university centers have service-learning, as well as 92% of the university colleges, 80% of the specialized institutions, 67% of the colleges of technology, and 63% of the community colleges.

Of those campuses which have service-learning ($n = 41$), service-learning is required on only three of the campuses (7%); it is optional on the remaining campuses. It is required at one of the university colleges, one of the community colleges, and one of the specialized institutions. On two of these campuses, the requirement is incorporated in a first-year student experience program.

For 51% of the campuses which have service-learning ($n = 41$), there is at least one program of study which requires service-learning. Twenty-five percent of the university centers have majors which require service-learning, and of the other campuses which offer service-learning opportunities, 61% of the community colleges, 55% of the university colleges, 50% of the colleges of technology, and 25% of the specialized institutions have at least one program of study requiring service-learning. Across the campuses, examples of majors requiring service-learning are architecture, social work, public health, hospitality administration, nursing, physical education, recreational studies, honors, communications, environmental studies, and human services.

Of those campuses which offer service-learning opportunities ($n = 41$), no minimum number of required student hours has been established on 66% of the campuses. On one campus, a minimum number of hours is “sometimes” required for students who participate in service-learning. Across the set of campuses which do not have a minimum number of required hours, several interviewees discussed that if the service-learning component of a class requires the completion of a specific project, the faculty member may be reluctant to assign a specific number of hours of service-learning (i.e., it may not be possible to establish ahead of time how long the project will take; some students will take longer to finish the project than others). Since only 13 of the campuses require a set number of service-learning hours to be completed by students, these data were not analyzed as a function of type of campus. Across all the campuses, the number of required service-learning hours in individual courses which have a service-learning component varies widely (range = 10 - 156; average = 52.5). Approximately one-half of the

campuses which have a designated number of hours for students who participate in service-learning require no more than 20 hours. The association between number of hours of service-learning required and number of course credit hours was not assessed.

Given the wide range of disciplines of study in the SUNY system, it is not possible to provide a comprehensive list of examples of service-learning activities or community partners. However, some examples of service-learning activities in SUNY are as follows: planning and executing engineering and design projects for community organizations, instructing homeschooled students in content associated with an academic discipline, mentoring youth in after-school programs, mentoring young adults with developmental disabilities who are enrolled in an adapted college program, developing and delivering content for public radio stations, implementing adaptive physical fitness programs for youth and adults with disabilities, conducting interviews with community members to obtain information for non-profit service organizations, meeting with state New York State Senators to advocate for increased funding for youth programs, planning and implementing a day of respite for parents of children with special needs, and conducting research for local historical society archives. Some examples of community partners are the United Way (which helps the campus identify service-learning opportunities for students), YWCA, K-12 public schools, parochial schools, local Chambers of Commerce, public health clinics, the Boys and Girls Club, shelters for homeless individuals, museums, historical societies, the American Red Cross, Boy Scouts of America, Planned Parenthood, the Urban League, and nursing homes. Some campuses have international service-learning opportunities for students (e.g., for architecture and design projects and nursing).

Assessment of Service-Learning

Campuses which have service-learning ($n = 41$) tend to assess service-learning in at least some way. Eighty percent of the campuses which have service-learning reported that they assess it. An additional 15% reported “sometimes” assessing service-learning. The three campuses which require service-learning for all students each assess it. Across the various types of campuses which offer service-learning opportunities, 100% of the university centers assess service-learning at least sometimes, as well as 100% of the colleges of technology, 100% of the specialized institutions, 94% of the community colleges, and 91% of the university colleges.

Across the campuses, service-learning courses are assessed through a variety of methods but instructor-based/supervisor-based assessment is the most common. Many interviewees noted that assessment is dependent on and varies by the instructor. Some programs use surveys and questionnaires to test specific rubrics but other service-learning opportunities are assessed like a regular course (e.g., examining written or oral work completed by students). Examples of assessment tools, which may be adapted for use at other campuses, are included in the appendix to this report.

The interviewees associated with the university centers all indicated that an instructor or site supervisor normally assesses service-learning experiences. These assessments may include student self-reflection in the form of journals, peer feedback, and community partner feedback. The relationship between the student and the community partner also factors into student and experience assessment in many cases. At two of the university centers, specialized organizations

such a Center for Teaching within the institution have some assessment responsibility and provide support for instructors with regard to assessment.

Interviewees associated with the university colleges tended to note that service-learning assessment is dependent on and varies by instructor. In general, there is no specific service-learning assessment tool required. One of the university colleges has a service-learning minor that requires feedback from the service partner and culminating projects by students. Community partners are invited to attend the final project presentations.

Regarding the colleges of technology, it was reported that service-learning assessment occurs mainly through the instructor. Students are assessed through their writing and based on skills that they acquire through the service-learning experience.

The community colleges mainly use instructor-based assessment methods. Instructors use rubrics, grade student projects, and review journals to assess students. If service-learning coordinators are on staff, these coordinators provide survey instruments and an additional level of program assessment. In two cases, interviewees noted that community partners provide feedback for assessment purposes. Some interviewees noted that service-learning assessment falls into the regular course assessment cycle at the institution.

The specialized institutions have diverse approaches to assessment of service-learning. One campus representative reported typical instructor-based assessment, another noted a departmental-level assessment, and yet another discussed assessment completed through Student Affairs. Student projects and journals are used to measure learning outcomes. One interviewee noted that the community partners are sometimes asked to evaluate the campus's full service-learning program.

Getting Students and Faculty Involved in Service-Learning

Interviewees were asked to indicate how well-known service-learning is on the campus. Across the set of campuses which have service-learning opportunities for students ($n = 39$), 38% of the campus representatives said that service-learning is "very well-known", 51% reported that it was "somewhat well-known" and approximately 11% said it was "not very well-known." Among the university centers, 50% of the campus representatives said that service-learning was "very well-known" and the other 50% said it was "somewhat well-known." The most common response for the university colleges (55%), colleges of technology (75%), and community colleges (44%) was "somewhat well-known." For the specialized institutions, the most common response was "very well-known."

Across SUNY, opportunities to participate in service-learning experiences are communicated to students and faculty in a wide range of ways. Faculty members are typically informed of service-learning teaching opportunities through faculty meetings, workshops, and professional development exercises. On campuses with service-learning coordinators, coordinators reach out to faculty who incorporate service-learning into their classes, and the faculty members then provide information to students. Campuses with service-learning opportunities also advertise through the institution web sites, through campus governance bodies, through email/newsletters, and through social media.

Among the university centers, two interviewees mentioned “word of mouth” as a way that students learn about service-learning opportunities. Community service and service-learning offices, as well as student success offices, contact faculty to inform them of the opportunity to incorporate service into their courses and then the faculty members relay that information to their students. In addition to faculty members, there are fairs and newsletters that get the message out to students.

Several of the university colleges have dedicated engaged-learning offices, institutes, and centers to share information about service-learning opportunities. Students also learn about service-learning at new student orientations, at volunteer or career fairs, from the career services center, and from campus websites. On one campus, administrators talk about service-learning with faculty at workshops and then students learn about the opportunities through faculty. Social media such as Facebook and more traditional listserv e-mails are also used to disseminate information.

The colleges of technology follow the general trend that service-learning options are brought to faculty to incorporate into courses and then students learn about service-learning through their instructors. One college of technology is hoping to incorporate service-learning into the campus’s strategic plan. At this campus, faculty members are learning about service-learning opportunities through regular professional development activities each year. On campuses that have them, some service-learning coordinators team up with faculty to provide guidance and information on best practices at faculty workshops. One institutional representative mentioned that Banner has an indicator to designate service-learning courses. Other traditional e-mail and paper postings are also part of the outreach efforts of the colleges of technology.

At the community colleges, service-learning coordinators often work with faculty members during professional development opportunities to teach them more about service-learning. On some community college campuses, deans and academic vice presidents are involved and on others, service-learning is coordinated mostly through Student Affairs. Faculty and student governance groups are also occasionally engaged, depending on the campus. Some service-learning coordinators at the community colleges will go to classrooms to talk about service-learning with students.

The specialized institutions have a variety of strategies to inform faculty and students about service-learning. Some share information about service-learning experiences through Banner during course registration. At one institution, the athletics department has a big campaign for service. The residence hall staff was also mentioned by a specialized institution as a means to share information about service-learning with students. At one of the specialized institutions, it was noted that service-learning is incorporated into most first-year classes. Thus, first-year students learn about service-learning as soon as they begin coursework on the campus.

Granting Academic Credit for Service-Learning

In response to the question of whether students receive academic credit for service-learning, of those campuses which have service-learning opportunities ($n = 41$), 88% of the campus representatives indicated “yes”, 7% indicated “no”, and 5% indicated “sometimes.” As only

three campuses indicated that they do not give academic credit for service-learning, the data on the granting of academic credit were not analyzed with regard to type of campus. In one case in which academic credit is not given, the service-learning is an extracurricular experience related to the academic program, and project outcomes are assessed. In another case, the service-learning opportunities are coordinated by faculty members but credit is not given for the service-learning hours. In the third instance in which no credit is given for service-learning work, service-learning work is considered part of the general category of experiential learning and students volunteer their time with community organizations.

On most of the campuses (i.e., 83%) that offer service-learning ($n = 41$), students do not receive separate academic credit for participating in service-learning. That is, the service-learning experiences are fully integrated into a typical academic course. Interviewees indicated that sometimes service-learning is required of every student in a particular class, and other times, students may elect to complete service-learning hours or instead do another type of class assignment. For 10% of the campuses, campus representatives indicated that students receive separate academic credits for service-learning; for 7% of the campuses, students sometimes receive separate academic credits for service-learning.

The interviews elucidated more information regarding possible formats for how academic credit may be granted for service-learning, outside of a typical class. These approaches include the following: service-learning as a separate 1-credit class, projects which include service-learning components may receive independent study credit, students may elect to take a 1-credit service-learning class as an add-on to a typical academic course, and students can earn 1 credit of service-learning by writing a paper after participating in an Alternative Spring Break service project. As mentioned earlier, one campus had developed a service-learning minor.

At 54% of the campuses which have service-learning ($n = 39$), only teaching faculty assign grades in credit-bearing classes for service-learning work completed by students. On the remaining campuses, professional staff members (e.g., staff members in the Student Affairs division) at least sometimes are the instructor of record for courses which include service-learning experiences. There is considerable variation across the types of campuses. At 100% of the university centers, professional staff members at times are the instructor of record for courses which include service-learning. The proportions of campuses which have professional staff members serve sometimes as the instructor of record for such courses are as follows: 64% of the university colleges, 25% of the colleges of technology, 33% of the community colleges, and none of the specialized institutions. Regarding the specialized institutions, it is important to note that only three of the specialized institutions provided information regarding this variable; thus, it may be that this practice does occur at the other specialized institutions. With regard to the differences found across the types of campuses, it may be that campuses with more professional staff members related to experiential learning (e.g., including in some cases a part-time or full-time designated coordinator of service-learning) are more likely to give these professional staff members roles which include teaching students in service-learning experiences. For example, a course in leadership may include a service-learning component and be taught by an individual from the Student Affairs division.

Policies Related to Service-Learning

When asked about campus policies related to service-learning, the campus representatives provided information about established policies, recommendations for best practices on the campus, and examples of forms which are used on the campus. Thus, it is difficult to compile the information quantitatively (i.e., some interviewees mentioned “policies” which were only campus recommendations). Across the campuses which have service-learning ($n = 41$), the most common policy relates to criteria which courses must meet to be designated as service-learning opportunities. Other policies relate to use of a specific service-learning contract, signing of liability waivers, student use of forms to track service-learning hours completed, designated learning outcomes for service-learning, and required assessment forms. One campus has a specific policy related to reducing safety risks when in the community. One of the colleges of technology illustrates well the extent to which supportive documents can be provided for faculty and staff. At this campus, there is a brochure for prospective community partners, liability form, service-learning agreement form, assessment instruments for students and community partners, application for service-learning course designation, and a student service hour tracking form. Some SUNY campuses have developed full service-learning manuals which include information for faculty, students, and community partners.

Some campus representatives indicated that there are no set policies or forms used on the campus because policies and materials are developed individually by faculty members, departments, or schools on the campus. Thus, the establishment of campus-wide policies for service-learning is not universal at SUNY institutions in part due to issues related to academic freedom and faculty purview over the curriculum. With consideration that some campuses may wish to develop a stronger infrastructure for service-learning, the appendix to this report includes several examples of forms used on SUNY campuses which can be modified for use on other campuses.

Compensation and Financial Resources for Service-Learning

Among the SUNY campuses which have service-learning ($n = 41$), faculty and professionals receive extra compensation for including service-learning experiences in their courses on 12% of the campuses. Seven percent of the campus representatives replied in the affirmative to this question about additional compensation for teaching which includes service-learning and 5% indicated that there is sometimes compensation given. Of the five campuses in which this additional compensation is given at least on some occasions, three are community colleges, one campus is a university center, and one is a university college.

Many of the campus representatives indicated that courses which include service-learning experiences were part of the faculty member’s regular teaching load. On other campuses, faculty members choose to include service-learning in a class or not, but there is no additional compensation to the faculty member for including it. One interviewee, from a campus in which faculty and professionals are not compensated for including service-learning in their courses, indicated that the faculty have been working with campus administrators to have service-learning added to the annual report, so that their time in service-learning is acknowledged if not compensated. On another campus, faculty and professionals may receive recognition for their service-learning work through awards from the campus President. Some campus representatives indicated that faculty may receive some compensation to add service-learning to an existing

course or to develop a new course including service-learning, but once the course has been offered once, there is no further compensation.

At 56% of the campuses which have service-learning experiences for students ($n = 41$), there are some campus financial resources for service-learning. Examining the prevalence rates separately for each type of campus, it was found that at 72% of the community colleges, 50% of the university centers, 50% of the colleges of technology, 45% of the university colleges, and 25% of the specialized institutions, there are at least some financial resources for implementing service-learning on the campus.

Across the campuses, resources include financial compensation to faculty for developing courses with a service-learning component, money for travel to conferences, funds to support professional development seminars related to service-learning for the faculty and staff, and small grants to support supplies for specific projects, student transportation, and food. Sources of funding across the campuses include the President's Office, the Office of the Academic Vice President, Student Senate, budgets associated with academic deans, and external donors. Some campus representatives described having an annual budget for service-learning projects. On some campuses, there are general civic engagement grants available for faculty, which may include support for service-learning initiatives. Although the community colleges were more likely than the other types of campuses to have some financial support for service-learning, the types of resources did not differ across the types of campuses. It should be noted that only one of the campus representatives mentioned financial support for a service-learning coordinator, even though such coordinators of service-learning were among the campus representatives interviewed.

Reported Barriers for Implementing Service-Learning on Campuses

A final question posed to all the campus representatives related to perceived barriers for implementing service-learning on their campus. This question was asked of all the interviewees ($n = 53$). Even on campuses with extensive service-learning opportunities, there are many courses which do not have a service-learning component. Thus, interviewees were asked, "What do you see as barriers to more service-learning occurring on the campus?" if they reported having service-learning on the campus, or were asked, "What do you see as barriers to offering service-learning opportunities for students on your campus?" if they said that there was not service-learning on the campus. It is important to recall that for 22% of the campuses, the campus representative indicated that there is not service-learning on the campus.

The data regarding perceived barriers were analyzed somewhat differently than the data from the other questions. Because each respondent often indicated several barriers for implementing service-learning on the campus (e.g., as many as 13 listed barriers, for one campus), the data were analyzed using a systematic qualitative analysis process. Separate idea units were identified, and then categorized into themes. Two of the subcommittee members analyzed the data independently and then consensus regarding the themes was obtained across the two subcommittee members.

Across the data, the most commonly mentioned barrier (indicated by 43% of the campus representatives) was lack of administrative support or campus infrastructure for service-learning.

This includes the lack of designated staff for coordination of service-learning and lack of policies. Other frequently mentioned barriers were campus members not valuing or prioritizing service-learning (30%), lack of student and/or faculty time for service-learning (30%), lack of financial resources for service-learning on the campus (28%), challenges related to geography (e.g., campus is located in a rural area) or community partners (28%), workload concerns of faculty (26%), lack of campus understanding of service-learning and how to execute it (23%), lack of perceived reward to faculty, including considerations of tenure and promotion (21%), and transportation concerns (21%).

In some cases, 100% of the campus representatives in a particular sector mentioned one of the barriers listed above. For that reason, these sensitive data are not separated by type of campus. However, there are some general trends that can be noted, related to type of campus. None of the university center interviewees mentioned challenges with regard to transportation, geography/community partners, or financial resources. None of the representatives from the specialty institutions reported campus members not valuing or prioritizing service learning, or there being a lack of campus understanding of service-learning and how to execute it. Last, none of the campus representatives from the colleges of technology mentioned lack of perceived reward to faculty for engaging in service-learning.

Overall, these data are sobering and illuminate the time, initiative, and commitment of individual faculty and professional staff members who are offering service-learning opportunities for students. As mentioned above, there are three campuses which require service-learning of all students. These campuses have clearly found ways to implement service-learning, even though there are challenges. Some of these barriers are more easily surmounted than others. Informally, some of the campus representatives mentioned recommendations to overcome some of these barriers; these recommendations are summarized below.

Conclusions and Recommendations

Ninety percent of the SUNY campuses participated in this investigation. Of these campuses, approximately three-quarters of them have service-learning opportunities for students on the campus. The university centers and university colleges were more likely than the colleges of technology and community colleges to provide service-learning opportunities. On most campuses, service-learning is optional, rather than required. Approximately one-half of the campuses which offer service-learning have at least one program of study which requires service-learning. On most of the campuses which offer service-learning, there is no minimum number of hours established for students to complete. Most of the campuses which offer service-learning opportunities complete at least some assessment of service-learning, but the types and comprehensiveness of assessment strategies vary across campuses. Campuses have generated many ways to inform students and faculty about service-learning opportunities. On most campuses which have service-learning, students receive credit for participating, and the credit is integrated into a typical course. With regard to service-learning policies, the most common campus-wide policies apply to criteria under which courses may be designated as including service-learning. Many campuses have recommended forms for faculty, students, and community partners including contracts, applications, student time logs, and assessment measures. Most faculty and professionals on the SUNY campuses do not receive additional compensation for including service-learning components in their courses. In general, financial

resources for service-learning are limited. When resources do exist, they are typically used to support the development of courses which include service-learning, student transportation to service-learning sites, and training opportunities for faculty and professionals. Reported barriers to service-learning occurring on the campuses included lack of administrative support and campus infrastructure for service-learning, lack of financial resources, and lack of time for faculty and students to participate in service-learning.

It is hoped that this document will provide ideas for campuses which are interested in increasing the number of faculty and students involved in service-learning. The following recommendations are made:

- 1) Some of the campus representatives indicated that there is not good understanding of what service-learning is and how to execute it on their campus. This investigation revealed that there is not one single way to conceptualize or implement service-learning on a campus. However, individual campuses can define service-learning, and set criteria under which courses can be designated as including service-learning. Courses can receive service-learning designation in the course catalog, which also has the benefit of increasing the visibility of such courses to faculty, professional staff, and students.
- 2) This investigation yielded considerable information about ways to disseminate information related to service-learning on a campus. Faculty and students can be informed about service-learning at orientations, and faculty can gain training through campus workshops. Faculty members who are engaged in service-learning can discuss their experiences at such workshops, and provide assistance to other faculty members who are interested in adding service-learning components to their courses. Students can be reminded about service-learning opportunities through electronic media including campus websites and social media avenues.
- 3) It is important to assess the outcomes of service-learning. On the campuses, service-learning is currently being assessed mostly through evaluation of student work (e.g., papers, journals, oral presentations), and through assessment forms completed by community partners and students. Assessment of specified learning outcomes appears to be rare, as is evaluation of overall service-learning programs.
- 4) Service-learning may need to be more incentivized, to increase the number of participating faculty and students. Many of the campus representatives reported that faculty members are not currently compensated specifically for service-learning work, though it is perceived as more time-consuming than more traditional teaching approaches. Several campus representatives expressed that faculty members have concerns about spending such time in service-learning when it is not valued by the university in considerations of tenure and promotion. The interviews elucidated some possible ways to increase faculty members' perceived reward for facilitating students' service-learning work including recognizing this work on annual reports and giving university awards for this faculty work. Recognition of faculty initiatives may also be highlighted through campus websites, blogs, electronic newsletters, and e-mails. It is not likely that financial compensation for including service-learning in courses is possible on most campuses. However, having small campus grants for service-learning projects (e.g., for project materials and transportation) may make service-learning work more attractive and feasible for faculty and students. Regarding students, many campus representatives

reported that students often do not have time to participate in service-learning experiences, particularly if the student is working and has family responsibilities while attending college. Helping students to see that service-learning helps to build their career-relevant field experience, and developing service-learning projects which are time-flexible may encourage more students to participate.

Acknowledgements

The subcommittee would like to thank Elise Newkirk-Kotfina, SUNY Coordinator of Community Relations, who helped the subcommittee identify service-learning “champions” from many of the campuses, and also each of the campus representatives who provided information regarding their campus’s implementation of service-learning. These representatives’ willingness to share information regarding their campus policies, successes, and challenges with regard to service-learning is greatly appreciated. Last, the subcommittee would like to thank those campuses who gave permission for their example documents to be included in the appendix to this report.

Appendix Content

Academic Service-Learning and Community-Engaged Learning Course Designation Application – Dr. Allison Alden and Dr. Jessica Arends, Center for Civic Engagement, Binghamton University

Service-Learning Reflection Examples – Center for Service-Learning, Monroe Community College

Sample Service-Learning Reflection Assignment – John Suarez, Office of Service-Learning, SUNY Cortland

New Organization Application - Community and Public Service Program, University at Albany

Service Learning Placement Agreement – Center for Service Learning & Community Service, SUNY Oswego

Service-Learning Evaluation for Students – Onondaga Community College

Community Partner Evaluation Form – O’Connor Center for Community Engagement, SUNY Delhi