

Service-Learning Quality Assessment Tool (SLQAT)

Andrew Furco, Shannon O. Brooks, Isabel Lopez, Paul H. Matthews, Laurel E. Hirt,
Anthony Schultzetzenberg, and Brittany N. Anderson

About the Tool

The Service-Learning Quality Assessment Tool (SLQAT) was designed to provide a mechanism to evaluate the quality of design and implementation for credit-bearing, academic service-learning courses. The tool takes into account 28 elements that the service-learning literature supports as essential for high quality service-learning promoting positive academic and other outcomes for students, and organizes these elements into five dimensions. Each element also has an underlying numerical value or weight, representing the hypothesized importance of its contribution to quality service-learning course design and implementation.

Using the Service-Learning Quality Assessment Tool (SLQAT)

The SLQAT may be used for different purposes, such as instructor self-study, course design, faculty development, and as a research instrument providing dependent (outcome) or independent variables. Each of these purposes is valuable, but may imply different applications; for instance, use with faculty in creating a new service-learning course will likely focus on ensuring inclusion of all elements, rather than scoring per se.

For scoring uses, the SLQAT provides numerical values for each element, with a baseline value representing the hypothesized importance of that element's contribution to service-learning course quality and implementation. (For instance, while both are important, *Element #2, Reflection*, carries a higher base value than *Element #8, Risk Management*.) If an element is absent, that component receives a score of zero. If present, depending on how well developed and implemented the element is, each element can be scored with a different possible implementation level:

- a base (middle) score if there is evidence of adequate or baseline implementation;
- a greater value for exemplary implementation;
- a lesser value for partial or inadequate implementation.

Because every element is considered important for service-learning quality, a score of zero (absent) for any element will substantially reduce the overall final summed quality score.

Scoring is based on the overall evidence provided about the course (e.g., course syllabus, course assignments, descriptions of service-learning opportunities, interview or discussion with course instructor or campus service-learning staff, observations, evaluations, etc.). Instructions for how these scores are applied, and more information about data sources, are presented below.

Assumptions

- While other stakeholder outcomes are also important for service-learning, this tool is focused on elements that influence *student* outcomes.
- Some sort of service-learning activity is assumed to be a *required* component of the course being scored.
- Each element is assumed to be *essential* to all types of course-based service-learning (regardless of scale and scope) in that it contributes to the overall quality of service-learning. However, not all elements are assumed to contribute equally to service-learning quality, represented in the base score values that indicate each element's level of contribution.
- Other factors likely influence the quality of service-learning courses and implementation (e.g., faculty teaching experience, size of the course, length of term, students' prior experience with service-learning, access to transportation, community and institutional characteristics, etc.). These factors typically cannot be adjusted at the course level, or are out of the instructor's control, and are not included in the SLQAT.
- The information contained in the data sources analyzed (such as the syllabus) is assumed to represent actual practice in the delivery of the course, and they are assumed to be valid sources for determining the presence or absence of each element.
- The course is assumed to have been taught prior to scoring. (For course development purposes, focus-

ing on the elements, rather than attempting to ascertain a score, is appropriate.)

- Higher scores on the SLQAT are assumed to represent a higher quality of service-learning course implementation, which in turn is assumed to produce more positive outcomes for students.

Data Sources

The SLQAT scoring is based on a review of both *foundational data sources* and of *supplemental data sources*.

1. The *foundational sources* for scoring the SLQAT are the **course syllabus** and **all course-specific materials** that are provided to students (e.g., assignment guidelines not incorporated into the syllabus; student contracts for service-learning; information about community partners, placements, or projects; pertinent service-learning handouts from the institution's service-learning office, etc.).
2. *Supplemental data sources* for the SLQAT rating include **at least one of the following**: interviews with/state-ments from the instructor; information from the campus service-learning office, the community partner, and/or students who took the course; deliverables from the service-learning activity; student reflections; etc. If needed and available, *more than one* of these supplemental data sources should be secured and reviewed to help enhance the accuracy and confidence of ratings.

For “low-stakes” purposes (e.g., self-study, faculty development, etc.), the SLQAT may be used with only the foundational sources. However, these foundational materials alone will likely not provide sufficient evidence to determine the presence/inclusion of particular service-learning elements. (In this case, the ratings should be used primarily for discussion around areas of strength and of potential improvement, etc.; while the element weight scores could be summed for an approximate total score, this should not be considered reliable or valid.)

Rating

When using the instrument for research and evaluation purposes:

- **Foundational sources plus at least one supplemental data source (#2, above) must be included** in the review and rating, and should be consulted to confirm the accuracy of the scoring of the course materials.
- **At least two raters** should use this instrument to **independently rate** a given course. This enhances objectivity within the evaluation as it provides a means to reduce potential rater bias or error while strengthening the reliability of the scoring process.

Depending on the intended use of the SLQAT, two rounds of scoring are recommended:

- First, each rater carefully reviews the initial course syllabus and course-specific materials (#1 *foundational sources* above), at minimum. Each rater independently scores each element in the SLQAT, noting evidence supporting each rating. For elements where the data provided do not allow the rater to decide if the element is truly “absent”, a preliminary indication of “insufficient evidence to rate” may be noted, with no score assigned (i.e., leave blank).
- Next, the raters' individual assessments should be compared, and then through discussion between the raters and consultation of all course materials and supplemental data sources available, an agreed-upon **final rating** for each element should be determined. For this final scoring, *no rating of “insufficient evidence to rate” should be included*; instead, *a score of zero (0) should be assigned* for any element which is determined to be absent, or which is still not evident from the thorough review and discussion of the full set of available data sources.

Establishing a Quality Score

To establish a total Service-Learning Quality Score for a course, the weighted scores for each of the 28 individual elements are summed.

The same or similar overall SLQAT Quality Scores for two given courses are hypothesized to indicate a similar quality of service-learning implementation and design. However, similar scores may be achieved through different pathways; that is, a particular summed score may reflect absence of different elements, and/or different implementation quality of certain elements, across two given courses with the same score.

Scoring one or more elements as entirely absent will result in lower Quality Scores, reflecting the essential nature of every element:

- A course with all 28 elements present but all rated as “below baseline” would garner a score of **159.5**.
- One in which all elements are present and all are scored at the “baseline” level would receive a summed total Quality Score of **212.5**.
- The maximum possible score of **266.1** is theoretically possible for a course in which all elements are

present and all are scored as “above baseline.”

- A definitive cutoff point for “high quality” service–learning based on total scores has not yet been codified, but Quality Scores **at or above 212** would seem to be indicative of courses incorporating best practices.

SLQAT Scoring Guidance

To use the SLQAT to rate a service–learning (SL) course, begin by considering the descriptor and question to decide if there is evidence of each element’s presence in the course.

- Upon first review, if no evidence is available or provided, leave the rating blank.
- If the evidence provided is sufficient to determine presence/absence, but the element is **not** present, assign a score of zero [“0”] for this element.
- If evidence is provided that the element is present in the course, review each of the guiding statements to decide the quality of implementation or presence of the element. Select the statement that is best aligned with the quality/level of the element’s presence and implementation, given the information and data reviewed about the course. (These scores represent baseline, above baseline, or below baseline.)
- Where possible, for each element, enter comments regarding the particular evidence that was used to justify the score assigned.
- The raters’ individual assessments should be compared, and then through a conversation between the raters and review of all evidence, a final agreed upon rating for each element should be determined.



Acknowledgments

Research teams from the University of Minnesota and the University of Georgia developed this instrument in part under grant #P116140033 from Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education, First in the World program, the U.S. Department of Education. However, the contents do not necessarily represent the policy of the U.S. Department of Education, and endorsement by the Federal Government should not be assumed.

Note

For additional information on the development of the Service–Learning Quality Assessment Tool, see the following article:

Matthews, P. H., Lopez, I., Hirt, L. E., Brooks, S. O., & Furco, A. (2023). Developing the SLQAT (Service–Learning Quality Assessment Tool), a quantitative instrument to evaluate elements impacting student outcomes in academic service–learning courses. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement*, 27(2), 161–180.

The Service-Learning Quality Assessment Tool (SLQAT) Rating Cover Page

Name of Rater	
Date Rating Completed	
Course Name & Number (and Semester/Year, if relevant)	
Course Instructor	
Institution	

Data sources used for rating

Foundational	
Supplemental	
Follow-up	
Scores	
Dimension I: Course Design	_____ out of 92.7 maximum; all elements present at baseline levels = 74
Dimension II: Learning	_____ out of 69.4 maximum; all elements present at baseline levels = 55.5
Dimension III: Student	_____ out of 26.4 maximum; all elements present at baseline levels = 21
Dimension IV: Instructor	_____ out of 28.8 maximum; all elements present at baseline levels = 23
Dimension V: Community Partner	_____ out of 48.8 out of 48.8 maximum; all elements present at baseline levels = 39
Total Quality Score	_____ out of 266.1 maximum; all elements present at baseline levels = 212.5

Dimension I: Course Design Dimension (10 Elements)

Element #1: Articulation of Service-Learning in Syllabus <i>Service-learning is articulated and integrated in the course design and syllabus</i>				
Is there evidence in the syllabus of a service-learning experience within the course design and/or the course expectations?	Element is absent based on existing evidence.	While the SYLLABUS or ancillary documents mention a service-learning experience, this is underdeveloped, unclear, not relevant, or not integrated into the rest of the course.	The SYLLABUS articulates and describes a relevant service-learning experience as part of the course.	The SYLLABUS clearly explains the scope, relevance and purpose of the service-learning experience, and how it is integrated into the course, with appropriate details.
IMPLEMENTATION LEVEL:	Absent	Below Baseline	Baseline	Above Baseline
WEIGHTED SCORE:	0	5.6	7.5	9.4
Element #2: Reflection <i>The course includes relevant critical reflection activities intended to foster connections between course content and service activities</i>				
Is there evidence of activities that engage students in reflection on the service-learning experience?	Element is absent based on existing evidence.	While at least one REFLECTION activity is present, reflection is minimal, superficial, or does not connect the service activity with course content or learning goals/objectives.	The course provides more than one substantive REFLECTION activity (whether through writing, arts-based, electronic, oral, or other modalities) that links the service activity with at least one course goal/learning objective.	The course provides ongoing, challenging, critical REFLECTION activities throughout the course that foster connections between the service activity and one or more course learning goal/objective.
IMPLEMENTATION LEVEL:	Absent	Below Baseline	Baseline	Above Baseline
WEIGHTED SCORE:	0	6.8	9.0	11.3

EVIDENCE/NOTES:

Element #3: Diverse Perspectives
The course provides opportunities to explore diverse perspectives on issues connected to goals/objectives and service activities

Is there evidence that the course incorporates learning about diverse perspectives on issues related to the service-learning experience?	Element is absent based on existing evidence.	While diverse PERSPECTIVES about the service-learning activity or community seem likely to emerge through course discussions, activities, or readings, this is not intentionally or explicitly designed into the course; or, elements addressing diversity may be superficial/insufficient for the activity and context.	At least one course design element (e.g., lecture, reading, discussion, or activity) intentionally engages students to explore diverse PERSPECTIVES on issues directly related to their service activity, community partner, or beliefs/opinions; the level of discussion of diversity is appropriate for the overall service-learning experience and context.	Multiple relevant and rigorous course elements (e.g.,lectures, readings, discussions, or activities) intentionally challenge students and deepen PERSPECTIVES on issues directly related to their service-learning experience, community partner, and/or beliefs/opinions.
IMPLEMENTATION LEVEL:	Absent	Below Baseline	Baseline	Above Baseline
WEIGHTED SCORE:	0	6.0	8.0	10.0

Element #4: Assessment of Student Performance
The course incorporates assessment of students’ performance related to service-learning experience

Is there evidence that student performance related to the service-learning experience is assessed?	Element is absent based on existing evidence.	Student performance in the service-learning experience is ASSESSED, but in ways not related to student learning (e.g., general participation points for the service activity, or credit for hours of service).	At least one dimension of student learning from the service-learning experience is adequately ASSESSED.	More than one dimension of student learning from the service-learning experience is ASSESSED and includes clear evaluative criteria (e.g., grading methods, demonstration of skills, reflection activities, rubrics).
IMPLEMENTATION LEVEL:	Absent	Below Baseline	Baseline	Above Baseline
WEIGHTED SCORE:	0	5.3	7.0	8.8

EVIDENCE/NOTES:

Element #5: Flexibility in Course Design/Implementation <i>The course shows flexibility to evolve and adapt to community and student circumstances</i>				
Is there evidence of flexibility in the course if circumstances require changes to the service-learning experience or course expectations?	Element is absent based on existing evidence.	The course provides minimal FLEXIBILITY in the structure of the service-learning experience (e.g., a general statement indicating that plans may change).	The course shows evidence of FLEXIBILITY in one aspect of the service-learning experience (e.g., deadlines, placements, accommodations).	The course shows evidence of FLEXIBILITY in more than one aspect of the service-learning experience (e.g., deadlines, placements, accommodations).
IMPLEMENTATION LEVEL:	Absent	Below Baseline	Baseline	Above Baseline
WEIGHTED SCORE:	0	5.6	7.5	9.4
Element #6: Mutual Benefit <i>The service-learning experience is designed to benefit all stakeholders involved</i>				
Is there evidence that the service-learning experience is designed to provide benefit to stakeholders?	Element is absent based on existing evidence.	Possible BENEFITS for students, partners, or other stakeholders of the service-learning experience may be inferred or understood, but are not explicit or articulated.	Outcomes or BENEFITS for students and for at least one other stakeholder (e.g., community members, partner organization) anticipated from the service-learning experience are clearly evident in foundational or supplemental data about the course.	The intended BENEFITS for students, partners, and other stakeholders are clearly articulated and explained (e.g., evident in the course design), and are linked to course objective/goals and service-learning project expectations and deliverables.
IMPLEMENTATION LEVEL:	Absent	Below Baseline	Baseline	Above Baseline
WEIGHTED SCORE:	0	6.0	8.0	10.0

EVIDENCE/NOTES:

Element #7: Feedback <i>Stakeholders are given opportunities to provide feedback on the strengths and weaknesses of service-learning activities, design, and practices</i>				
Is there evidence that feedback on the service-learning experience is sought or included in the course?	Element is absent based on existing evidence.	FEEDBACK about the service-learning experience by participating stakeholders is informal or implied.	At least one formal opportunity or method for FEEDBACK by students, community partners, or beneficiaries directly related to the service-learning experience is evident in the course activities or materials.	More than one formal opportunity or method of FEEDBACK by multiple stakeholders is clearly apparent.
IMPLEMENTATION LEVEL:	Absent	Below Baseline	Baseline	Above Baseline
WEIGHTED SCORE:	0	5.3	7.0	8.8
Element #8: Risk Management <i>Consideration of risk management is relevant and appropriate for the course and service activities</i>				
Is there evidence that potential risks involved in the service-learning experience have been considered and addressed?	Element is absent based on existing evidence.	Some RISKS or risk management considerations related to the service-learning experience are mentioned, but not in adequate detail in relation to apparent level of risk.	Information about relevant potential RISKS and/or relevant risk management guidelines is communicated to stakeholders in advance of the service-learning experience.	Any potential RISKS of the service-learning experience (to all appropriate stakeholders) have clearly been identified, and appropriate risk management requirements have been developed and are clearly documented and presented in the course materials (e.g., background checks, transportation considerations, or volunteer orientations).
IMPLEMENTATION LEVEL:	Absent	Below Baseline	Baseline	Above Baseline
WEIGHTED SCORE:	0	4.9	6.5	8.1

EVIDENCE/NOTES:

Element #9: Use of Resources and Support for Service-Learning
The course makes use of available institutional or external supports for service-learning

Is there evidence that available institutional or external resources and support have been applied?	Element is absent based on existing evidence.	The course materials, design, or components suggest that an institutional or external RESOURCE or support (e.g., professional development, consultation, funding, award, resource, or accommodation support) may have been applied to enhance or develop the service-learning experience, but this is not explicit or clear.	At least one relevant institutional or external RESOURCE (e.g., professional development, consultation, funding, award, resource, or accommodation support) has clearly been applied to enhance the instructor's, community partners', and/or students' service-learning experience.	A variety of institutional or external RESOURCES (e.g., professional development, consultation, funding, award, resource, or accommodation support) has clearly been applied to enhance the service-learning experience.
IMPLEMENTATION LEVEL:	Absent	Below Baseline	Baseline	Above Baseline
WEIGHTED SCORE:	0	4.5	6.0	7.5

Element #10: Planning and Articulation of Service Activity
Details and specific expectations for the service activities are planned and articulated

Is there evidence of information provided to the students on what their course service activity entails?	Element is absent based on existing evidence.	Minimal PLANNING information (e.g., deadlines or hours required) related to the service activity is provided, or the information is loosely defined, and planning and details are not clearly articulated.	Key PLANNING details are provided up front to students about the service activity, including partner(s), timing, and desired deliverables or activities.	Detailed PLANNING information is provided to students regarding most essential areas such as partner(s), timing, deliverables or activities, responsibilities, location, supervision, logistics, risk management, etc.
IMPLEMENTATION LEVEL:	Absent	Below Baseline	Baseline	Above Baseline
WEIGHTED SCORE:	0	5.6	7.5	9.4

EVIDENCE/NOTES:

Sum of Dimension I _____

Dimension II: Learning Dimension (7 Elements)**Element #11: Academic Content Learning from Service-Learning***The service-learning experience's relationship to the academic content of the course is explicit, transparent, and rigorous*

Is there evidence that the service-learning experience supports the course's academic content?	Element is absent based on existing evidence.	The relationship between the service-learning experience and the ACADEMIC CONTENT of the course is implied, but it is not clear whether participating will significantly advance students' academic content learning.	There is a clear relationship between the service-learning experience and the course's ACADEMIC CONTENT, making apparent how participating supports or enhances academic content learning.	The course's ACADEMIC CONTENT and the service-learning experience are closely and intentionally linked, such that students are likely to learn the academic content more deeply or rigorously than if they did not participate.
IMPLEMENTATION LEVEL:	Absent	Below Baseline	Baseline	Above Baseline
WEIGHTED SCORE:	0	6.0	8.0	10.0

Element #12: Societal Issues Learning from Service-Learning*The service-learning experience engages students in learning about societal issue[s] in explicit, transparent, relevant ways*

Is there evidence that the service-learning experience supports students' learning about a relevant societal issue?	Element is absent based on existing evidence.	The relationship between the service-learning experience and a SOCIETAL ISSUE(S) is implied, but it is not clear whether participating will significantly advance students' understanding of the issue.	There is a clear relationship between the service-learning experience and students' learning about a relevant SOCIETAL ISSUE(S), making apparent how participating can support or enhance students' understanding of the issue.	The service-learning experience as well as other course activities are tightly and intentionally linked with an important SOCIETAL ISSUE(S) (e.g., course has an explicit social justice perspective), such that students are likely to learn about the issue in depth and/or from multiple perspectives.
IMPLEMENTATION LEVEL:	Absent	Below Baseline	Baseline	Above Baseline
WEIGHTED SCORE:	0	6.0	8.0	10.0

EVIDENCE/NOTES:

Element #13: Personal or Professional Learning from Service-Learning

The service-learning experience engages students in developing personal learning and/or professional skills

<p>Is there evidence that the service-learning experience supports students in learning about themselves or developing professional skills?</p>	<p>Element is absent based on existing evidence.</p>	<p>Students seem likely to develop at least some PERSONAL LEARNING or PROFESSIONAL SKILLS in the course or service-learning experience, but this is not explicit or is not clearly related to the service-learning experience per se.</p>	<p>There is clear evidence of how the service-learning experience can support students in developing deeper PERSONAL LEARNING outcomes (e.g., moral reasoning, stereotype reduction, developing new interests, becoming more aware of personal strengths, etc.); or in developing PROFESSIONAL SKILLS (e.g., teamwork, communication, time management, project development, etc.).</p>	<p>There is clear evidence of how the service-learning experience and related course content supports students in developing both deeper PERSONAL LEARNING outcomes (e.g., moral reasoning, stereotype reduction, developing new interests, becoming more aware of personal strengths, etc.), and in developing PROFESSIONAL SKILLS (e.g., teamwork, communication, time management, project development, etc.).</p>
<p>IMPLEMENTATION LEVEL:</p>	<p>Absent</p>	<p>Below Baseline</p>	<p>Baseline</p>	<p>Above Baseline</p>
<p>WEIGHTED SCORE:</p>	<p>0</p>	<p>5.6</p>	<p>7.5</p>	<p>9.4</p>

Element #14: Appropriateness of Service Activities for Students

The service activities are contextually appropriate for students' level of skill/knowledge/experience

<p>Is there evidence that the service activity is appropriate for the course and students?</p>	<p>Element is absent based on existing evidence.</p>	<p>The overall service activity seems somewhat APPROPRIATE for the course or student level, but this is not specified or clear; or, the service activities include components that appear too simple or too challenging for students.</p>	<p>Service activities seem APPROPRIATE for the course level (e.g. a first-year course vs. a graduate course) or the student level (e.g., novice experience vs. prior knowledge and expertise required).</p>	<p>All service activities are clearly and explicitly APPROPRIATE to both the course level and the student level, and these activities are neither too challenging nor too simple.</p>
<p>IMPLEMENTATION LEVEL:</p>	<p>Absent</p>	<p>Below Baseline</p>	<p>Baseline</p>	<p>Above Baseline</p>
<p>WEIGHTED SCORE:</p>	<p>0</p>	<p>5.6</p>	<p>7.5</p>	<p>9.4</p>

Element #15: Connection between Service and Learning
The service activities and learning goals/objectives are linked

Is there evidence of how the service activities and the learning goals relate to each other?	Element is absent based on existing evidence.	The service activities seem likely to RELATE to some of the course's learning goals/objectives, but this relationship may be superficial, implicit, or unclear.	There is clear evidence of how at least some part of the service activities RELATES to the course's learning goal(s)/objective(s).	Most or all service activities are clearly and explicitly RELATED to the course objectives and learning goals.
IMPLEMENTATION LEVEL:	Absent	Below Baseline	Baseline	Above Baseline
WEIGHTED SCORE:	0	6.4	8.5	10.6

Element #16: Authentic Community-Based Need
The service activities are based on a clear, meaningful community-identified issue/need

Is there evidence that the service activities respond to a community-identified need?	Element is absent based on existing evidence.	The service activities seem likely to relate to a community NEED, but it is not clear whether the community or partner has identified this issue as a priority.	The service activities clearly relate to some NEED or issue identified in consultation with the community or partner.	The service activities are directly responsive to a clear and substantive NEED or issue that the community or partner has identified and that contributes to the public good.
IMPLEMENTATION LEVEL:	Absent	Below Baseline	Baseline	Above Baseline
WEIGHTED SCORE:	0	6.4	8.5	10.6

EVIDENCE/NOTES:

Element #17: Appropriate Duration/Intensity of Service*The service activity's duration or intensity seems appropriate for community needs and course learning goals.*

Is there evidence of appropriate duration, scope, or intensity of the service activity?	Element is absent based on existing evidence.	The level of DURATION OR INTENSITY of service activities seems inadequate given the community needs and/or course learning goals.	The level of DURATION OR INTENSITY of service activities seems appropriate for the community needs or course learning goals.	The level of DURATION OR INTENSITY of service activities is based explicitly on community needs and course learning goals.
IMPLEMENTATION LEVEL:	Absent	Below Baseline	Baseline	Above Baseline
WEIGHTED SCORE:	0	5.6	7.5	9.4

EVIDENCE/NOTES:

Sum of Dimension II _____

Dimension III: Student Dimension (3 Elements)**Element #18: Student Preparedness for Service-Learning***Students are prepared for the service-learning experience*

Is there evidence that students are intentionally prepared for the service-learning experience?	Element is absent based on existing evidence.	Course opportunities for student PREPARATION are generic, minimal, or not focused on the specific needs of the service-learning experience.	The course incorporates at least one intentional and customized opportunity that ensures students have adequate PREPARATION for their service-learning experience.	The course incorporates multiple or comprehensive intentional and customized opportunities that ensure students have adequate PREPARATION for their service-learning experience.
IMPLEMENTATION LEVEL:	Absent	Below Baseline	Baseline	Above Baseline
WEIGHTED SCORE:	0	5.3	7.0	8.8

EVIDENCE/NOTES:

Element #19: Relevance of Service Activity
The course helps clarify the service-learning experience’s relevance to students’ interests, lives, etc.

Is there evidence of course activities that attempt to connect the service-learning experience to students’ interests, prior or future experiences, or prior or future coursework?	Element is absent based on existing evidence.	There is some evidence of an activity (e.g., reflection, discussion, or assignment) that appears related to helping students FIND RELEVANCE in the service-learning experience, but it is not fully developed or specified.	At least one well-developed activity (e.g., reflection, discussion, or assignment) appears related to helping students FIND RELEVANCE in the service-learning experience (e.g., to their interests, their prior or future experiences, or other coursework).	More than one well-developed activity (e.g., reflection, discussion, or assignment) is clearly related to helping students FIND RELEVANCE in the service-learning experience (e.g., to their interests, their prior or future experiences, or other coursework).
IMPLEMENTATION LEVEL:	Absent	Below Baseline	Baseline	Above Baseline
WEIGHTED SCORE:	0	5.3	7.0	8.8

Element #20: Student Voice
The course incorporates opportunities/activities for student voice (e.g., autonomy, choice, creativity, leadership, influence) in the service-learning experience

Is there evidence of opportunities for students to exercise choice, autonomy, creativity, or leadership in the selection, planning, or delivery of the service-learning experience?	Element is absent based on existing evidence.	Students have opportunities to INFLUENCE the service-learning experience in terms of selection or logistics, but these choices may be trivial, unclear, or underspecified.	Clear opportunities are present for students to INFLUENCE, select, or give leadership to at least some substantive elements of the selection, planning, or delivery of the service-learning experience.	Clear and reasoned opportunities are present in several aspects of the course for students to INFLUENCE, select, or give leadership to many key elements of the selection, planning, or delivery of the service-learning experience.
IMPLEMENTATION LEVEL:	Absent	Below Baseline	Baseline	Above Baseline
WEIGHTED SCORE:	0	5.3	7.0	8.8

EVIDENCE/NOTES:

Dimension IV: Instructor Dimension (3 Elements)

Element #21: Instructor's Knowledge of Service-Learning Pedagogy

The instructor has knowledge about service-learning pedagogy and expertise in how to apply it

<p>Is there evidence that the course instructor has knowledge and/or experience with service-learning pedagogy?</p>	<p>Element is absent based on existing evidence.</p>	<p>The instructor has minimal or basic knowledge and/or experience with service-learning PEDAGOGY (e.g., consulting with introductory resources about service-learning pedagogy and/or relying on the expertise of others).</p>	<p>The instructor has moderate knowledge and/or experience with service-learning PEDAGOGY (e.g., engaging with books and materials, attending workshops and conferences, and/or participating in consultations).</p>	<p>The instructor has advanced knowledge of and experience with service-learning PEDAGOGY (e.g., longevity of practice, leadership roles in advancing service-learning on the campus, seeking out additional opportunities to deepen their practice, and/or producing service-learning scholarship).</p>
<p>IMPLEMENTATION LEVEL:</p>	<p>Absent</p>	<p>Below Baseline</p>	<p>Baseline</p>	<p>Above Baseline</p>
<p>WEIGHTED SCORE:</p>	<p>0</p>	<p>5.6</p>	<p>7.5</p>	<p>9.4</p>

EVIDENCE/NOTES:

Element #22: Instructor's Knowledge of Community
The instructor is knowledgeable about community partners, contexts, needs, and norms

<p>Is there evidence that the course instructor is knowledgeable about the partner and/or community context, needs, and norms for the course service activities?</p>	<p>Element is absent based on existing evidence.</p>	<p>The instructor has minimal or basic knowledge about the COMMUNITY partner or context/norms/needs for course service activities (e.g., initial introduction to community; relying on other instructors, community engagement professionals, or secondary materials for information about the community or partner; assumptions of community needs).</p>	<p>The instructor has sufficient knowledge of the COMMUNITY context appropriate for the course service activities (e.g., prior experience with the community or partner; awareness of community strengths and community-identified needs; personal participation in community work; knowledge from relevant sources such as readings or courses).</p>	<p>The instructor has advanced or deep knowledge about the COMMUNITY context and norms where service activities are taking place (e.g., ongoing experience with/in the community; deep knowledge from relevant sources; seeking leadership roles in the community; experience working alongside own students; deep understanding of historical context).</p>
<p>IMPLEMENTATION LEVEL:</p>	<p>Absent</p>	<p>Below Baseline</p>	<p>Baseline</p>	<p>Above Baseline</p>
<p>WEIGHTED SCORE:</p>	<p>0</p>	<p>6.0</p>	<p>8.0</p>	<p>10.0</p>

EVIDENCE/NOTES:

Element #23: Instructor's Knowledge of Societal Issues

The instructor has understanding of the societal issue(s) that undergird the service-learning experience

Is there evidence that the instructor has understanding or knowledge of the societal issues that the service-learning experience addresses?	Element is absent based on existing evidence.	The instructor has minimal or basic knowledge about the societal ISSUE(s) that the service-learning experience addresses (e.g., has little personal or professional experience on the topic; relies predominantly on a one-sided source of information about the issue, etc.).	The instructor has moderate understanding or knowledge of the societal ISSUE(s) that undergird the service-learning experience (e.g., has developed or can explain a view of complex and diverse perspectives relating to the issue, from readings, courses, or engagement with the issue).	The instructor has advanced, holistic understanding or knowledge of the societal ISSUE(s) that undergird the service-learning experience (e.g., conducts research on the issue; is personally engaged deeply with organizations working on this issue; has substantive historical background knowledge or preparation in this issue area).
IMPLEMENTATION LEVEL:	Absent	Below Baseline	Baseline	Above Baseline
WEIGHTED SCORE:	0	5.6	7.5	9.4

EVIDENCE/NOTES:

Sum of Dimension IV _____

Dimension V: Community Partner and Partnership Dimension (5 Elements)

Element #24: Site/Partner Appropriateness <i>Service partners or locations are appropriate, given focus of course, level of students, focus of societal issue</i>				
Is there evidence that the community partners or sites are appropriately chosen for this course?	Element is absent based on existing evidence.	Community partners or service sites may be minimally indicated; while some community partners or site(s) could be APPROPRIATE for this course, the rationale for partner or site choices is not clear or made explicit.	Most community partners or site(s) for service activities are identified and appear APPROPRIATE and relevant to the focus of the course and objectives.	All community partners or site(s) are clearly identified and APPROPRIATE and relevant, with explicit reference to at least two of the following: focus of the course (e.g., placement gives students insight into the course themes), level or preparation of students (e.g., students will be able to carry out appropriate activities for their level), and societal issue (e.g., students will learn about the societal issue at the site).
IMPLEMENTATION LEVEL:	Absent	Below Baseline	Baseline	Above Baseline
WEIGHTED SCORE:	0	6.0	8.0	10.0
Element #25: Guidance and Supervision of Students <i>The community partner provides supervision, training, direction, and/or guidance to support students' experience</i>				
Is there evidence of the community partner providing guidance to or supervision of students?	Element is absent based on existing evidence.	The community partner plays a minor role in the supervision, training, direction, or GUIDANCE of students' experience.	The community partner is involved in GUIDANCE of students' experience (e.g., supervision, training, or direction of students).	The community partner plays a major role in GUIDANCE or supervision throughout the students' experience (e.g., on-site supervision, training, and/or direction).
IMPLEMENTATION LEVEL:	Absent	Below Baseline	Baseline	Above Baseline
WEIGHTED SCORE:	0	5.6	7.5	9.4

Element #26: Community Partner Co-Educator Role*Community partners have a co-educator role and provide input in shaping the service-learning experience*

Is there evidence of the community partner(s) serving in the co-educator role or having voice in shaping the service-learning experience for students?	Element is absent based on existing evidence.	Community partner(s) are implicitly involved in shaping the service-learning experience, but details on how they PARTICIPATE as a co-educator are unclear.	Community partner(s) PARTICIPATE in some way as a co-educator (e.g., designing the service-learning experience, presenting to the class, providing readings, delivering lessons to students, and/or providing feedback on student work).	Community partner(s) PARTICIPATE in more than one meaningful way as a co-educator throughout the course (e.g., designing the service-learning experience, presenting to the class, providing readings, delivering lessons to students, and/or providing feedback on student work).
IMPLEMENTATION LEVEL:	Absent	Below Baseline	Baseline	Above Baseline
WEIGHTED SCORE:	0	5.6	7.5	9.4

Element #27: Community Capacity for Service-Learning*Community partners have the capacity to support and participate fully in the service-learning experience*

Is there evidence of the community partner(s) having capacity to support and fully participate in the service-learning experience?	Element is absent based on existing evidence.	Community partner(s) may have minimal or unclear CAPACITY to fully support, participate in, or fulfill the agreed upon service activities.	The identified community partner(s) have acceptable CAPACITY to allow students to carry out the required service activities, in terms of staffing, knowledge, and availability.	Community partner(s) have clearly demonstrated CAPACITY to fully support the required student service activities, in terms of staffing, knowledge, availability, and experience.
IMPLEMENTATION LEVEL:	Absent	Below Baseline	Baseline	Above Baseline
WEIGHTED SCORE:	0	6.0	8.0	10.0

EVIDENCE/NOTES:

Element #28: Instructor and Community Partner Connection*A partnership or relationship exists between the instructor and the community or community partner(s) for service-learning*

Is there evidence of a connection between the instructor and the community partner(s)?	Element is absent based on existing evidence.	The instructor and community partner(s) have agreed to collaborate, but their CONNECTION is superficial or transactional.	The instructor and the community partner(s) have established a CONNECTION including communication and/or meetings in advance of the course; key understandings of how they collaborate have been addressed.	The instructor and all community partner(s) have a strong, ongoing CONNECTION and partner relationship based on previous collaboration, mutual trust, and/or extensive communication/meetings.
IMPLEMENTATION LEVEL:	Absent	Below Baseline	Baseline	Above Baseline
WEIGHTED SCORE:	0	6.0	8.0	10.0

EVIDENCE/NOTES:

Sum of Dimension V _____