Conceptualizing, Building, and Evaluating University Practices for Community Engagement

Vincent Ilustre, Ana M. López, and Barbara E. Moely

Abstract

Tulane University's unique situation after Hurricane Katrina devastated New Orleans in 2005 led to a reinvention of the university with a focus for students and faculty on community engagement. This article tells the story of the formation of Tulane's Center for Public Service, and its programs and activities. The article also highlights perceptions of students, faculty, and community agency members on aspects of Tulane's endeavors to encourage and support university-community engagement.

Conceptualizing, Building, and Evaluating University Practices for Community Engagement

*I*n August 2005, Hurricane Katrina and the resulting levee breaches inflicted more than $650 million in damages and losses on Tulane's campuses, closing the university for an entire semester and dispersing 13,000 students and 7,000 faculty and staff members throughout the country. In the aftermath, Tulane University had to fight for survival and to reconfigure itself—academically, physically, and financially—for the future. This article outlines how the university reinvented itself, both in response to community needs and in order to survive, with a special emphasis on the creation of an undergraduate curricular public service requirement. Tulane's journey to embedding engagement at the heart of a research university's mission is unique, given its genesis in a catastrophic crisis, yet the lessons learned and outcomes achieved resonate across higher education in the 21st century. It is remarkable that in fall 2005, almost simultaneously with Tulane's efforts to redefine itself as an engaged university, Campus Compact and the Jonathan M. Tisch College of Citizenship and Public Service at Tufts University convened scholars from research universities to discuss how their institutions were promoting engagement on their campuses and in their communities, and taking a leadership role in civic engagement. The Research University Civic Engagement Network (TRUCEN) emerged out of this meeting, and works to "advance civic engagement and engaged scholarship among research universities and to create resources and models for use

across higher education" *(Campus Compact, 2011)*. Tulane's efforts represent a bold vision for civic and community engagement, and the research with students, faculty members, and community partners corroborates the impact of embracing and advancing engaged scholarship as a central component of the university.

After the Storm

The city of New Orleans experienced unprecedented damages and losses after Hurricane Katrina and the flooding caused by the failure of the levee protection system. About 80% of the city was under water, including vast residential areas where many of the approximately 1,500 casualties drowned and/or suffered fatal injuries. Seventy percent of all housing units in New Orleans suffered damage from the storm and/or flooding. Over a million people were displaced throughout the metropolitan region, although more than 100,000 remained in their homes (despite a mandatory evacuation order), and 20,000 sought shelter in the Superdome. Many of those displaced were unable to return for months; some never have. A year after Katrina (July 2006), the city's population stood at half of its pre-storm number. Four years later, it was back up to only about 80% of what it was before. Total damages from the disaster were staggering—$135 billion—and while federal spending in the region was substantial, $75 billion of the $120.5 billion of federal funding went to emergency relief, not rebuilding. Private insurance claims covered less than $30 billion of total losses *(Greater New Orleans Community Data Center, 2011)*.

For Tulane University, the storm could not have come at a worse moment. Saturday, August 26, 2005, was freshman orientation day, and the campus was alive with parents and students looking to settle into their dorms and new collegiate lives. Instead, the president of Tulane University called an emergency town hall meeting. Rather than welcome the students with the pomp and circumstance of an official convocation, he greeted them and politely asked them to evacuate from the campus and the city as quickly as possible. Those students unable to secure their own exit from the city were bused to temporary quarters at Jackson State University in Mississippi.

Within a day of the storm, it was clear that the university would face the most challenging crisis of its entire history. Tulane's president, who had remained on campus, recalls watching the water rise and realizing that drastic measures would be needed for the university to survive: faculty, staff, and students were scattered

throughout the nation, and communication was impossible as there were no telephones or Internet access. Within 48 hours, a skeleton team of administrators gathered in temporary headquarters in a Houston hotel and helped make several key decisions. Tulane would close for the 2005 fall semester and reopen in January 2006. All employees would be kept on payroll as long as possible, and the university would reach out to the higher education community and associations for support, especially for accommodations for students and faculty members *(Tulane, 2010b)*. Tulane recovered largely due to the alacrity and decisiveness of these moves. The challenges, however, remained enormous and multifaceted. Much had to be accomplished before the university could reopen in 2006, ranging from "practical" issues like salvaging university assets (e.g., the libraries), restoring physical facilities, and re-establishing communication channels for students, faculty, and staff, to intangibles such as how to ensure that students and faculty would return and how to restructure the university to secure its intellectual and financial sustainability. A larger team of administrators, gathered in Houston, deployed to address these challenges as well as to begin work on what would become Tulane's "Renewal Plan," a roadmap to guide the university's immediate recovery and its future.

The Renewal Plan

The Renewal Plan was developed with input from a blue-ribbon group of internal and external advisors and experts, including Tulane's Board of Administrators, the president's faculty advisory committee, and senior administrators from several of the nation's leading academic institutions and educational foundations. These advisors considered many options, including the dissolution of Tulane's assets and the closing of the university. Fortunately, a less draconian plan was devised that nevertheless represented the most sweeping reorganization of an American university in more than a century. Its purpose was to re-affirm, strengthen, and focus the university's academic mission and to build on Tulane's vision and core values, while strategically addressing its current and future operations in a post-Katrina era. Tulane was one of the few functioning institutions in the city, and its leaders recognized their responsibility to serve the community with the university's physical, creative, and intellectual resources. The keystone of Tulane's Renewal Plan became a conscious and deliberate commitment to engagement at all levels *(Tulane University, 2006)*.

The institutional success Tulane enjoys today is a testament to the Renewal Plan's effectiveness. The Renewal Plan streamlined the

organization of the university by creating one college for all under-graduates—Newcomb-Tulane—and by reorganizing the schools within two new units, the School of Liberal Arts and the School of Science and Engineering. Some departments and programs were eliminated; admissions were suspended for 17 doctoral programs. Above all, the Renewal Plan focused on the undergraduate experience and confirmed Tulane's pursuit of "cultivating an environment that focuses on learning and the generation of new knowledge" by enhancing the value of the undergraduate collegiate experience and making it more campus- and student-centric. In addition to requiring on-campus living for all first- and second-year students, the Renewal Plan enacted three modifications *(Brownell & Swaner, 2010; Kuh, 2008)* to the undergraduate curriculum. The first change was to require a first-year seminar for all incoming students. Prior to 2006, Tulane's first-year seminar series, Tulane InterDisciplinary Experience Seminars (TIDES), had been optional. A second change was a capstone experience requirement for each major. The third change was the incorporation of "public service" into each student's degree program. The decision to include a public service requirement rested on the premise that all students graduating from Tulane should learn a sense of civic responsibility as part of their education. "The Tulane University undergraduate education serves to create engaged, ethical and thoughtful citizens whose actions and endeavors make a difference in society" *(Tulane University, 2005)*.

Beyond curricular changes, the Renewal Plan emphasized the importance of engagement throughout the university:

> As appropriate, Tulane's programs will be shaped by the university's direct experience with the unprecedented natural disaster of Hurricane Katrina. This experience will provide faculty, staff and students with equally unprecedented research, learning and community service opportunities that will have a lasting and profound impact on them, the city of New Orleans, the Gulf Coast region, and other communities around the world. *(Tulane University, 2005)*

The choice of the term "public service," rather than "service-learning," to define the graduation requirement pointed to this aspirational goal. Although service-learning would be integral to the new requirement, "public service" allowed room for other kinds of engaged activities such as community internships and community-based research.

Implementing the Renewal Plan

The Renewal Plan was approved by the Board of Administrators and released to the university community and the public in December 2005. Change is never easy in a university setting, but the vast organizational and cultural changes called for by the Renewal Plan were especially challenging. With most of Tulane's faculty, students, and staff far from campus, it was impossible to establish community-wide discussions and consensus about these strategic changes to the culture of the university. Only a small number of faculty, members of a university senate committee charged with decision-making authority when the senate is unable to meet, had been involved in the Renewal Plan discussions. The need to move quickly, and to operationalize large-scale engagement activities within a short time frame, all while academic programs were being restructured or eliminated, created much resistance, especially from faculty members and deans. Still, a sizable group of faculty members and students clearly had already been moving in this direction on their own. Over the 2005 fall semester, many Tulane students had undertaken relief efforts and community service, with some even creating their own nonprofit organizations. Faculty members also began to engage with the community in different ways, and to develop community-based research projects. As the engagement focus gained momentum, it became evident that Tulane could not fully realize its potential as an engaged campus without the full support of the broader campus community. It was not until the university began to implement more collaborative processes for dialogue and debate that the Renewal Plan began to garner broader support for making engagement a more central feature of Tulane's work.

As envisioned by the Renewal Plan, the hub of campus engagement at Tulane would be the newly created Center for Public Service, which would subsume the Office of Service Learning. The center was envisioned as independent of any school. It was charged with strengthening and expanding the connections between academic study and public service. It would create new innovative initiatives, provide better integration and collaboration among existing programs, and seek service opportunities that would contribute directly to the reconstruction of New Orleans. Above all, it was charged with the creation and maintenance of the new undergraduate graduation requirement in public service. Making this happen quickly presented significant challenges. First was the challenge of establishing an inclusive organizational structure and negotiating with other offices such as the Office of Community

Service in the Student Affairs division. The collaborative working relationships between Tulane organizations would allow the Center for Public Service to forge deeper relationships with its community partners and create better learning environments for Tulane students, as well as to contribute more effectively to building community capacity.

Building the Center for Public Service

With the support of the provost and other administrators, the Center for Public Service was created as Tulane University's principal gateway to the community, encompassing service-learning, community-based research, community-based internships and research projects, and community service.

Faculty Executive Committee

The formation of the Faculty Executive Committee was integral to shaping the mission of the Center for Public Service. The committee was made up of senior faculty members representing each of the undergraduate schools and colleges. Each committee member had extensive experience in service-learning or experiential education. The initial tasks of the committee were to formulate the center's overall mission and to create the framework for the public service graduation requirement. A mission statement was developed for the center:

> The inauguration of the Center for Public Service reflects Tulane University's renewed sense of purpose within a city and region rising from devastation. Recognizing that active civic engagement builds strong, healthy communities and responsible citizens, the Center for Public Service merges academic inquiry with sustained civic engagement. The Center is a forum for students, faculty, and community partners to work together to address urgent and long-term social challenges and opportunities. Our approach to learning prepares Tulane University students to participate more fully in today's complex society in intellectually rigorous ways. Tulane University's Center for Public Service supports a university curriculum and research agenda by uniting academics and action, classroom and communities through which students, faculty, and community partners dedicate themselves to the transformation of civic life. *(http://tulane.edu/cps/about/objectives.cfm)*

The Faculty Executive Committee was charged with overseeing the academic components of the center's mission. The first and paramount responsibility of the committee was to define the public service graduation requirement. The committee implemented a two-tiered academic requirement "grounded in a sustained sequence of learning articulated by the Center's mission. Instituting a cumulative and reflective graduation requirement makes explicit the ideal that education uniting public service and scholarship can be a transformative experience" *(Tulane University, 2011b)*. To complete the requirement, students must

- successfully complete one service-learning course at the 100, 200, or 300 level before the end of their sophomore year or fourth semester on campus; and

- during their junior or senior year (after four semesters of coursework), participate in one of five approved academic experiences:

  - a service-learning course (advanced level);
  - an academic service-learning internship;
  - a faculty-sponsored public service research project;
  - a public service honors thesis project; or
  - a public service–based international study abroad program.

The Faculty Executive Committee is responsible for approving all courses and activities that count toward the requirement. Three subcommittees (curriculum, petition, and partnership) were established to ensure that the requirement has a solid academic footing, to ensure students' safety, and to ensure that activities benefit community-identified needs. The curriculum subcommittee is charged with reviewing all courses submitted for service-learning designation. Courses approved by the committee are further reviewed and approved by the undergraduate Newcomb-Tulane College Core Curriculum Committee. The dual approval process ensures the integrity of both the service-learning activity and academic content of the course. The petition subcommittee is responsible for approving any non-course-related academic activities for which students request public service requirement credit. These activities include independent study and honors thesis projects that have a public service component, international study abroad programs, and service-learning courses taken from other universities. Finally, the partnership subcommittee ensures that activities are suitable, establishing guidelines for certain activities and

overseeing safety considerations. Unlike the other subcommittees, the partnership subcommittee includes not only faculty members from the Executive Committee, but also members of the university's General Counsel's Office, Public Safety Office, and Risk Management. Each subcommittee is staffed by a member of the Center for Public Service, in order to provide information and context for issues being considered.

Positioning the Center for Public Service

The executive director of the Center for Public Service reports directly to the provost, and is a member of the university's Administrative Council. Placement of the center under the chief academic officer facilitates efforts to ensure that schools and academic units are engaged in providing students opportunities to complete the public service graduation requirement through courses and other offerings. The center is centrally located on the campus, allowing students, faculty members, and community members easy access to its services and resources. Both the reporting line and the location of the office have been essential in establishing the importance of the requirement and the center and demonstrating the backing and support of the leading administrative units.

Center Staffing

Twenty-four staff members are grouped into four operational units: Faculty Training and Support, Student Training and Leadership Development, Campus-Community Partnerships, and Community-Based Programs. These units provide direct service to the three core constituency groups of the center: faculty, students, and community. The Community-Based Programs unit provides direct assistance to members of the community through education programming, including an Upward Bound program for high school students, and a school-based literacy program for elementary and middle school children. Both of these programs are primary placement areas for Tulane student service-learning activities and internships. Transportation services for all service-learning students are provided by a university-wide transportation unit.

The Center for Public Service Advisory Committees

Three advisory committees represent the views of constituency groups in the center's programming. Members of the advisory com-

mittees are selected from a pool of candidates that express interest as well as those that are "high" users of the center's programming and services. The center's executive director annually presents the membership slate to the Executive Committee for final approval. Meeting at least three times a year, a Faculty Advisory Committee and a Community Partner Advisory Committee provide feedback on the center's programming and inform the center's leadership about issues important to their constituencies. A Student Advisory Committee is responsible for increasing the role of volunteerism on campus by coordinating a grants program and other activities. A Community-Based Research Committee promotes research undertaken in conjunction with communities through activities like a grants program. The Community-Based Research Committee grants awards ranging from $3,000 to 5,000 to three to five faculty members annually.

Faculty Development

Central to its core mission, the Center for Public Service provides resources and support for service-learning courses. To achieve the public service graduation requirement, more than 1,600 students engage in public service each semester by participating in one or more of over 250 service-learning courses offered each year. Thus, faculty development efforts are paramount. Each semester, the center offers a 10-week faculty seminar on the pedagogy and practice of service-learning. These stipend-bearing seminars enroll eight faculty members; each participant develops a service-learning course that he or she will teach subsequently. Since the center's inception in 2006, 132 faculty members have participated in these seminars. To further build faculty members' expertise, workshops have been offered by leaders in the field, such as Andrew Furco (associate vice president for public engagement, University of Minnesota), Barbara Holland (director of academic initiatives in social inclusion, University of Sydney) and Robert Bringle (executive director, Center for Service and Learning, Indiana University–Purdue University Indianapolis). Two workshops are offered each year and are meant to further the center's mission of engaging faculty members in topics related to engagement.

Community Partnerships

Community partnerships are central to the work of the Center for Public Service. Community members participate in the center's Community Partner Advisory Committee. A professional

development series provides opportunities for members of non-profit organizations to fully develop their organizations through workshops on program evaluation, grant writing, budget development, marketing, and other topics.

To help community organizations involve large numbers of Tulane's students, the Corporation for National and Community Service's AmeriCorps Volunteers in Service to America (VISTA) program has provided funds to the center to place 25 full-time volunteers in the community. Tulane, as a third-party provider, offers free housing for these volunteers who are placed in community agencies throughout the New Orleans area. These AmeriCorps VISTA volunteers help connect the university community to their agencies, often by supervising service-learning or internship students engaged in service at the site. Four days a week, they serve their agencies in various capacities; one day each week, all VISTA members come to Tulane's campus for professional development workshops, to share information, and to connect the work of their agencies with needs identified by service-learning courses or internships.

Student Leadership Opportunities

Student leadership development is another focus of the Center for Public Service. The Center provides workshops on issues dealing with race, poverty, and other areas of inequity, as well as skill-specific sessions on tutoring and mentoring, and supports two student leadership programs: the Service-Learning Assistants program, and the Public Service Fellows program. Twenty Public Service Fellows and 10 Service-Learning Assistants are designated each semester. Faculty and staff members recommend students for participation in both programs; the final selection is based on interviews.

Service-Learning Assistants program.

In the Service-Learning Assistants program, federal work-study students are trained for 6 months to assist faculty members, community partners, and students engaged in service-learning courses. After the initial training period, these students are partnered with two to three faculty members teaching service-learning courses, to act as "service-learning assistants." Service-Learning Assistants typically begin as second-semester freshmen, and work at the center for at least four semesters.

Public Service Fellows program.

Public Service Fellows are trained the week prior to a semester and work with faculty members and community agencies to implement service-learning courses. They receive public service graduation requirement credit through their participation in a platform course that focuses on civic engagement and leadership development. Platform courses have been offered in the fields of social work, communications, and Latin American studies. Public Service Fellows can participate in this program for at least four semesters in their junior and senior years.

Together, the programs not only develop student leaders, but also provide much-needed support to faculty members teaching in service-learning courses.

Connecting Campus and Community Electronically

The Web-based Center for Public Service Information System serves as a portal through which constituency groups can provide the center with information about themselves and their service activity needs. For community partners, it provides a means for advertising their agencies' needs to a larger community. Faculty members can search and find community partners for their courses and can submit their service-learning courses electronically for vetting by the Center for Public Service Curriculum Committee. The system allows students to find information about the agencies seeking students for volunteerism or internships. Students interested in internships can submit their applications through the system. The system also manages service-learning transportation reservations and provides data for center reports. For example, the system annually receives some 250 service-learning course approval forms, 300 internship applications, 400 community agency profiles and public service activity descriptions, and 3,000 requests for transportation.

Research Initiatives of the Center for Public Service

Continuing a tradition of research informing practice that has characterized Tulane's service-learning efforts over the past decade, the center has sponsored a number of research projects. These projects are designed to provide information about program functioning and challenges, as well as to contribute to the body of knowledge about the impacts of service-learning participation on

students, faculty, and community. Aspects of these research efforts are summarized in the sections below.

Student Perceptions of the Public Service Graduation Requirement

In instituting the public service graduation requirement, Tulane University administrators made assumptions about student reactions, since there was little literature about the impact of required academically based service in higher education. Some information was available for secondary school students *(Jones, Segar, & Gasiorski, 2008; Marks & Jones, 2004; Patterson, 1987)*, showing mixed findings, but little was known about college students' reactions. A research project was begun with students entering Tulane after Hurricane Katrina that followed them through their undergraduate years. The purpose of the study was to learn about their views of the new requirement and their plans for completing it, as well as their expectations for college, their previous experiences with community service activities, their attitudes toward community engagement, and their self-assessed knowledge and skills relevant to engagement.

Data were obtained in 2006 from first-year students (N = 290) and from 257 higher-level students, to allow comparisons of those who entered before and after the public service graduation requirement was implemented. The same survey was administered to two subsequent entering classes, those who matriculated in 2007 (N = 185), and in 2008 (N = 195). The 670 first-year students who completed our surveys constituted 17.8% of the 3,766 students who entered the university in those years. Detailed information about measures, data collection procedures, and sample characteristics is provided in Moely and Ilustre *(2011)*.

Incoming first-year students gave reasons for choosing Tulane and described expectations for college that reflected greater interest in community engagement than was the case for the group of students who had entered the university before 2006. The incoming students expressed positive views of the public service graduation requirement, as shown in Table 1, with the majority agreeing that it was a "good idea" or "OK" and most planning to do more than the amount of service required for graduation.

Table 1. First-year Students' Views of the Public Service Graduation Requirement

Evaluating and Planning for the Public Service Requirement:	Time 1 First-year Students (N = 670)	Time 2 Students Surveyed after Two Years of Study (N = 250)	Time 3 Students Surveyed Shortly before Graduation (N =112)
Evaluation: *"Do you think that learning about academic subject matter through public service experiences is…"*			
A good idea	57%	64%	66%
OK	31%	29%	30%
No opinion	6%	1%	0%
A bad idea	6%	5%	4%
Plans: *"How much public service (do you plan to do/are you doing) while here at Tulane?"*			
I plan to become very active in the community	27%	14%	15%
More than the amount required if it seems beneficial	57%	61%	70%
Just the amount that is required, no more	16%	25%	15%

Views of the requirement varied as a function of student gender, high school service experiences, and attitudes toward community engagement *(Moely & Ilustre, 2011)*. Specifically, women were more positive than men. Those who reported having engaged in service as a volunteer or for a service-learning course, and having enjoyed service activities, were more likely to express positive views of the requirement than those who did not report having had these experiences. Those who indicated that opportunities for service had influenced them in selecting Tulane University and who expected to be involved in the community were more positive than those who did not share these expectations. With regard to civic attitudes, students who expressed a strong sense of civic responsibility and a valuing of community engagement were more positive than those who did not express these values, as were those interested in seeking knowledge about the community and social issues. Students who felt that they had strong social and leadership skills were more positive about the requirement, as well. These patterns persisted in the 2007 and 2008 cohorts surveyed. Descriptions of

the statistical analyses leading to these conclusions are presented in Moely and Ilustre *(2011)*.

Students who had completed the surveys as incoming students in 2006–2008 (Time 1) were invited to complete a second survey (Time 2) at the beginning of their junior year. Data were obtained at Time 2 from 147 students who had taken part in the original surveys (22% of those in the original samples, who were still enrolled at the time of the second survey), along with 103 students who had not completed the original survey. In comparison with Tulane undergraduate data for those years, 3,106 of the students entering in those years were still enrolled for the fall of their junior year. The 250 students in our Time 2 survey represent just 8% of the total number of same-year students on campus at the times the survey was distributed.

All students who participated in the survey in 2006 and 2007 have been contacted shortly before graduation from the university for a final assessment (Time 3); the third cohort will be surveyed again in spring 2012. Following up on questions asked at Time 1, students were asked again at Times 2 and 3 about their views of the public service graduation requirement and about the extent of their involvement in the community. As shown in Table 1, students who were surveyed after 2 years or 4 years of study at the university remained positive about the requirement. Although they were engaging in less service than they had planned at Time 1, the majority were engaged in more service than the amount required for graduation.

The 2012 senior survey will complete data collection for the college years, so that developmental changes from college entry to graduation can be described. Analyses will look at change over time in students' civic attitudes, knowledge, and skills, and how such changes are related to their experiences in service-learning and other community-based activities.

A follow-up survey is planned for alumni/alumnae, to learn about their current activities, postgraduate studies, and career commitments. The survey will seek information about the graduates' satisfaction with their public service activities while at the university, as well as the ways in which public service experiences may have influenced their subsequent life choices.

Faculty Members' Perspectives

As Tulane's public service program has grown, with more and more faculty participation, we were interested in learning

about how Tulane faculty members view their involvement with service-learning and the Center for Public Service. A survey was created, shown in the Appendix, for faculty who had offered service-learning courses. The survey asked about their motives for involvement in service-learning, rewards and recognition for involvement in service-learning, their work with New Orleans and Gulf Coast communities, activities involved in their service-learning course implementation, their perceptions of students' reactions to service-learning, and how they had gained knowledge about the theory and practice of service-learning.

The survey was distributed in 2009 to approximately 70 faculty members who had offered courses for the public service graduation requirement during 2008–2009; 34 (49%) of those invited completed the survey. (A total of 206 faculty members taught undergraduates in 2008–2009.) Respondents included 16 tenure-track faculty (47%), 15 (44%) with non-tenure-track appointments, and three who identified themselves as non-tenure-track administrators with instructional responsibilities. Areas of study represented were the humanities (47%), sciences (15%), social sciences (12%), and international programs (12%), with smaller numbers representing the arts, business, and education. The majority of the respondents were experienced with service-learning: 23 (68%) had offered service-learning courses for 2 years or more and had taught several different courses; only 11 (32%) had taught just a single course.

When asked to indicate the importance of various reasons for participating in service-learning (Table 2), the respondents' highest ratings were given to items having to do with strengthening the New Orleans community (e.g., wanting to contribute to the revitalization of New Orleans, interest in contributing to the work of community partners). Also of importance was the opportunity service-learning activities provided for enhancement of teaching. Respondents agreed that students learned course content better when they applied course concepts in their service. They perceived that students were attracted to service-learning courses because of the public service graduation requirement, because of their students' interest in the community, and because their students believed that service-learning would aid their career development. Respondents agreed that service-learning was becoming important in their discipline, but they did not feel that service-learning supported or strengthened their own research. Respondents reported little external influence on their decisions about being involved in service-learning. Neither their departments nor their students

influenced their decisions about course offerings. In short, respondents' motives for engaging in service-learning were primarily based on their values regarding community engagement, their interest in invigorating their teaching, and their desire to benefit students.

Table 2. Faculty Members' Reasons for Participating in Service-Learning

Question: *Why are you doing service-learning?*	N	M	SD
CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE COMMUNITY			
I want to contribute to the revitalization of New Orleans.	32	4.47	.67
I am interested in contributing to the work of my community partner(s).	31	4.19	1.01
TEACHING ENHANCEMENT			
I am interested in trying out new teaching methods.	32	3.91	1.23
Service-learning energizes my teaching.	32	3.50	1.11
My students learn course content better when they apply course concepts in their service.	31	3.55	.99
I enjoy teaching more when I do service-learning.	32	3.28	.92
Service-learning attracts more students to my courses because of the public service requirement.	31	3.26	.89
Service-learning attracts more students to my courses because of their interests in the community.	31	2.97	.95
Service-learning attracts more students to my courses as part of their career development.	29	2.97	.98
DISCIPLINARY EMPHASIS			
Service-learning is becoming an important part of my academic discipline.	32	2.78	1.18
My service-learning courses support or stregthen my own research.	32	2.47	1.16
My department requires me to offer service-learning courses.	31	2.23	1.52
My students have urged me to offer service-learning courses.	30	1.73	.83
REWARDS			
My service-learning courses contribute to my teaching portfolio.	31	3.26	1.55
I get financial rewards for offering service-learning courses.	32	1.81	1.06
Service-learning helps with my promotion and tenure review or other (yearly) reviews.	31	1.74	1.03

Note: Responses could range from 1 = Never to 5 = Always true.

The importance of such personal motivation for involvement in service-learning is consistent with previous research. For example, Furco and Moely *(2012)* found, in a large multi-campus study, that respondents most often mentioned benefits to students as their reasons for engaging in service-learning. Others in their study mentioned intrinsic rewards (e.g., feeling good about course quality, more satisfied with teaching, more challenged by and interested in teaching). Still others emphasized benefits to the community. Few expected to receive extrinsic rewards for service-learning. Extrinsic rewards generally had to do with departmental or administrative recognition of their teaching efforts. As indicated in Table 2, Tulane faculty agreed that service-learning courses contributed to their teaching portfolios, but other rewards were minimal. For example, most respondents did not receive financial rewards for offering service-learning courses, nor did they feel that service-learning would help with their promotion and tenure reviews. Similarly, when asked about their productivity reports or dossiers for promotion and tenure, participants were more likely to report service-learning activities as part of teaching accomplishments than as a service activity. They were unlikely to mention service-learning in relation to their research (see Table 3).

Table 3. Faculty Members' Reports of their Service-learning Activities in Evaluations

Question: *To what extent have you emphasized service-learning accomplishments in your yearly productivity reports or your dossier for promotion and tenure?*	**N**	**M**	**SD**
Reporting on my teaching	27	3.48	.75
Reporting on my service	27	2.59	1.31
Reporting on my research	27	1.30	.72

Note: Responses could range from 1 = Never to 5 = Always true.

Faculty members reported nascent involvement in scholarship related to service-learning. For instance, nine respondents (26%) had presented papers on their service-learning work at a conference. Thirteen (38%) had written grants to support community-based programs or research projects. Nine had completed community-based research projects. Only four had involved graduate students in their research projects. None had published articles in professional journals. There was, however, considerable interest among respondents in developing research initiatives. For example, some respondents suggested that there be formal structures (e.g., workshops, seminars) to support community-based research, exposure

to active researchers to help develop community-based research projects, and incentives (e.g., financial support) for community-based research efforts.

Working with Communities

Over the total time that these faculty members had been involved with service-learning, they had worked with up to 12 different community partners (median = 4.0). Respondents most often relied upon Center for Public Service staff members to identify community agencies with which they might partner. Rarely was the relationship initiated by a community agency at the time of this survey.

Respondents indicated considerable direct community contact, with visits to the partner agencies at the beginning and during the semester. They also relied on staff from the Center for Public Service to provide liaison with the community partners (Table 4). Community partners were involved in various ways in the service-learning course. At the beginning of the semester, they conducted orientations for service-learning students at the agency and came to classrooms to introduce the service activities. During the semester and at the end, they gave feedback to the faculty members about student performance and sometimes came to the classroom to participate in a reflection session. Community partners less often participated in course syllabus development. Although they often gave feedback about students, only five faculty participants (22%) described a role for community partners in determining grades, and this role was primarily that of reporting student attendance and hours of service.

Respondents were questioned about the feedback they received from the community about their service-learning courses. Eighteen (53%) reported positive reactions from community partners about the students and the work that they did. Four respondents (12%) reported that community partners' evaluations depended upon the nature and extent of students' contributions. As one faculty member indicated, feedback from the community included "Praise for reliable and hardworking students and complaints about unreliable and disengaged students."

Table 4. How Do Faculty Members Work with Community Partners?

Question: *In working with community agencies, please indicate the extent to which the statement is true for you:*	**N**	**M**	**SD**
CAMPUS COMMUNITY CONTACT			
I visit the agency at least one time before the semester begins.	33	3.82	1.29
I visit the agency at least one time during the semester.	33	3.76	1.25
A CPS staff member handles relationships with the agencies at which my students work.	33	3.30	1.13
I have no direct contact with community agencies.	32	1.44	.80
COMMUNITY PARTNERS' CONTRIBUTIONS TO SERVICE-LEARNING COURSE			
The community partner conducts onsite orientations.	32	4.44	.95
The community partner comes to my classroom to introduce the service option.	32	3.50	1.37
The community partner gives me feedback about student performance.	33	3.67	1.29
The community partner contributes to course syllabus development.	32	2.41	1.32
The community partner comes to my classroom to participate in a reflection session.	32	1.97	1.20

Note: Responses could range from 1 = Never to 5 = Always true.

Service-Learning Course Characteristics

Required or optional participation?

Eleven faculty respondents (32%) required all students enrolled in their classes to do service-learning. Fifteen (44%) offered service-learning as an option rather than requiring it of all students in the class, and eight (24%) indicated that they had used both approaches. Reasons for these choices were as follows.

Five (15%) of those who required service-learning for all students emphasized enhanced learning in a cohesive classroom (e.g., "I've learned over time that the optional idea creates two separate courses and interrupts rather than enhances learning." "Helps with the organization of the course and learning goals for us all to be doing the same project. Partner is also more of a focus." "I want all students to be having the same experience to facilitate learning during class discussions.") Others mentioned requirements of the students' degree program.

Among those who made service-learning optional, eight (24%) respondents indicated that they were guided by consideration of course characteristics. For example, some indicated that they would

not be able to manage the large number of students who would be doing service-learning if it were required for their classes of 30 to 70 students. Others reported that their departments required them to make service-learning optional. Still others mentioned not wanting to put unwilling students into a community agency.

Learning goals.

The survey asked faculty members whether their goals for students differed depending upon whether or not the students were doing service-learning (see Appendix). Respondents were divided equally in their responses, with 15 (44%) saying that goals differed, and 15 (44%) saying that they did not. Among those who said that goals differed, four mentioned civic or social goals for service-learning. The following quotes illustrate two perspectives on what service-learning should accomplish. The first perspective is oriented toward social activism:

> I expect service-learning students to think, and be more involved in, activism, community-oriented thinking, and to bring their reflections and experiences back to the classroom.

> I expect students doing service-learning to be more thoughtful and engaged in current events, social issues, environmental issues, and personal responsibility/activism/social responsibility.

The second perspective focuses on developing interpersonal competence:

> If students are doing service-learning, my goals become much more ambitious; rather than simply become fluent in some particular thread of academic discourse, I expect, in addition to that, for them to learn to collaborate together and with people outside the class in flexible, creative problem-solving ventures that require both leadership and a willingness to listen.

Nine (27%) respondents who said that goals did *not* differ indicated that course goals were separate from service-learning, with service-learning serving as a way to enhance learning. Two participants were negative about how service-learning could contribute

because of their difficulties in finding service activities that would correspond with and enrich their academic course content.

Student Feedback

Twelve faculty respondents (35%) reported that their students gave them positive feedback about their service-learning experiences. Five respondents (14%) mentioned only negative aspects, while thirteen (38%) mentioned both positive and negative reactions by their students.

Table 5. How do Faculty Members Learn about Service-learning Theory and Methods

Question: *How have you gained information about service-learning theory and practice?*	N	M	SD
INDIVIDUAL OR FORMAL SUSTAINED INVESTIGATION			
Informal conversations about service-learning with colleagues	33	3.09	1.16
My own reading and exploration	33	3.03	1.05
Service-learning faculty development seminar at the Center for Public Service or its predecessor, the Office of Service Learning (8- to 10-week sessions of small faculty groups)	33	2.88	1.17
SINGLE-SESSION TRAININGS			
Center for Public Service or Office of Service Learning service-learning workshops (one-half to one-day workshops)	32	2.16	.85
Lectures or discussions on service-learning organized by the Center for Public Service or the Office of Service Learning	32	2.16	.85
OTHER RESOURCES			
Use of on-line resources (e.g., the Service-Learning Clearinghouse)	33	1.94	1.03
Attendance at one or more service-learning/community engagement conferences	33	1.76	.90
Sessions on service-learning organized by my department	32	1.66	.94
Use of the Center for Public Service library	32	1.53	.76
Preparation for service-learning when I was at another university	31	1.29	.82

Note: Responses could range from 1 = Never from this source to 4 = Very often from this source.

Faculty Preparation for Service-Learning

As indicated above, the Center for Public Service offers faculty members a variety of services aiming to enhance their expertise in

service-learning. Participants were positive about both the faculty development seminars and single-session workshops and discussions as ways of gaining information about service-learning theory and practice. However, as indicated in Table 5, they were especially positive about their efforts to learn through conversations with colleagues and through their own reading and exploration. They were less likely to take advantage of online resources or the Center for Public Service library or to have attended conferences on service-learning and community engagement.

This "snapshot" of faculty views 3 years after establishing the Center for Public Service gives a generally positive picture of faculty involvement. As in other faculty surveys *(Furco & Moely, in press)*, the motivation for involvement in service-learning is primarily intrinsic, with emphasis on personal values of community engagement and interest in enhancement of instruction. The support faculty receive from the Center for Public Service provides opportunities to learn about theory and practice of service-learning and aids their community collaborations, yet does not constrain their approaches to instruction, as shown by the various ways in which faculty members choose to structure their service-learning courses.

Since the time of this survey, additional faculty members have taken part in seminars and workshops, and university departments have made a commitment to providing academically based public service opportunities for their students. Ways of recognizing faculty for excellence in service-learning instruction have been established (awards, featured articles in university publications, etc.), and "engagement" has become a campus-wide theme *(Tulane University, 2011a)*. Similarly, there is change on the community side: As the city of New Orleans recovers from the devastation of 2005 and experiences a rebirth of creativity and growth *(Nolan, 2011)*, there may be changes in the ways in which faculty view and interact with the community. Future surveys can use the information we have obtained to trace changes in faculty views and practices over time and in response to changing campus and community conditions.

Community Partner Perceptions of Partnership Development and the Benefits of Collaboration

A survey was administered during 2007 and 2008 in order to learn how Tulane University's efforts were being viewed by community agencies who were participating in service-learning efforts at the time *(Buberger, Moely, & Hebert, 2009)*. The survey was distributed to agencies that had worked with the Center for Public Service's programs. Survey forms were returned by representatives

of 86 of the 330 agencies contacted (26% response rate). These 86 agencies were involved with the fields of education (27%), health and medicine (13%), and environmental issues (13%), with smaller numbers involved with the arts and cultural issues, community development, social services, and housing. Annually, the number of students with which each agency worked ranged from one student to more than 100. These agencies had worked with Tulane programs for 1 to 21 years (Median = 2 years).

The survey included questions about an agency's history and current involvement with the university's service-learning and volunteer programs, along with other aspects of the partnership. The focus was on community partners' views of the maturity of the partnership and their perceptions of the benefits of collaboration. Agency representatives were asked to describe their partnerships with the university along several dimensions that Schmidt, Solis, and Phillips *(2006)* proposed in characterizing a developmental model of partnership formation. Survey items shown in Table 6 were created to focus on the extent to which community partners felt that they had established with their university partners a mutual body of knowledge concerning how the partnership works, which Schmidt et al. referred to as "Shared Knowledge."

The items in Table 6 were created on the basis of the Schmidt et al. *(2006)* model to assess three levels of shared knowledge: At the emerging level, contact has been made and initial discussions of needs and goals have taken place, but partners do not know much about each other's ways of working or intentions for the relationship. At the *established* level, in addition to the positive attributes at the emerging level, the community partner reports that efforts by faculty and staff have resulted in shared understanding. There is a solid relationship base so that even when personnel changes occur or needs change, the partnership can survive. At the sustaining level, positive attributes of the emerging and established levels are still strong, but in addition, community partners and university personnel know one another well enough to anticipate each other's needs and to collaborate and network in ways that go beyond the original partnership.

This model of partnership development is consistent with those presented by others. For example, Janke *(2009)* proposed viewing partnerships in terms of the development of a "partnership identity" in which participants come to share common perspectives. Partnership identity is strong when members of the partnership articulate the same mission or purpose, describe themselves as members of the same team, have created formal and informal structures to coordinate their work, and share the expectation that the partnership will endure.

Table 6. Share Knowledge in University-Agency Partnerships

Question: *[Consider] your recent experiences working with Tulane students and the service-learning program. Please indicate your agreement with each of the statements below.*

Emerging Level	N	Mean (SD)
Contact between the University/Center for Public Service and my agency can be initiated by either one.	83	4.67 (.68)
Individuals from the University/Center for Public Service and my agency have discussed our needs and how the university can meet some of them.	83	4.37 (.68)
I have found University/CPS staff members to be sensitive to my agency's needs.	83	4.34 (.89)
There is general agreement between the campus and my agency on the goals for students' public service.	85	4.33 (.79
Alpha coefficient = .81 (4 items, N = 80) **Summary score:**	80	**4.43 (.61)**
Established Level		
The collaboration between the University/Center for Public Service and my agency is strong enough to survive changes in the needs or goals of either institution.	85	4.21 (.98)
It is easy for me to address problems or needs with University/Center for Public Service representatives.	84	4.19 (.94)
Individuals from the University/Center for Public Service understand how my agency functions.	84	4.08 (1.01)
I have found University faculty members to be sensitive to my agency's needs.	84	4.02 (1.05)
Individuals from the University/Center for Public Service and my agency have shared our schedules and developed a mutually satisfying plan for placing students at my agency.	84	4.00 (1.17)
Individuals from the University/Center for Public Service have spent time at my agency.	84	3.96 (1.34)
Alpha Coefficient = .84 (6 items, N = 81) **Summary score:**	81	**4.06 (.82)**
Sustaining Level		
Members of my agency and University/Center for Public Service representatives know each other well enough to anticipate each other's needs.	85	3.48 (1.15)
Members of my agency work with University/Center for Public Service representatives to develop new projects that go beyond immediate student service (e.g., developing new programs, writing grants, etc.)	83	3.30 (1.37)
I am aware of the full range of campus public service opportunities that are available to students.	84	3.24 (1.22)
Alpha Coefficient = .73 (3 items, N = 82) **Summary score:**	82	**3.34 (1.01)**

Note: Responses could range from 1 = Strongly disagree to 5 = Strongly agree.

Table 7. Benefits to Agency, Community, and Self Rated by Community Partners

Question: *What does your agency/community/you gain from collaborating with the university through CPS?*	N	M	SD
Agency Benefits: Work Accomplished			
A greater amount of agency work accomplished	80	3.94	1.04
Enhanced reputation of my agency in the community	81	3.62	1.22
Enhanced agency programs	77	3.43	1.12
Increased civic engagement of my agency in the community	78	3.47	1.28
Increased access to University resources	80	3.44	1.23
Diversified workforce at my agency	80	2.91	1.26
Alpha **Coefficient = .87 (6 items, N = 74)**			
Summary score:	**74**	**3.47**	**.93**
Agency Benefits: Research, Projects			
Special projects for my agency	81	3.79	1.10
Research that benefits my agency's work	81	3.28	1.34
Research to gain information about the populations served by my agency	76	2.87	1.34
Preparation of grant proposals to support or expand my agency's work	79	2.25	1.17
Alpha **Coefficient = .84 (4 items, N = 75)**			
Summary score:	**74**	**3.03**	**1.03**
Benefits to the Community Served by the Agency			
Improved outcomes for clients of my agency	31	3.10	1.11
Agency services more readily available	32	2.94	1.19
Increased social access and networking opportunities	34	2.65	1.28
Increased access to University resources	32	2.63	1.21
New services available	33	2.55	1.25
Improvements in legal, political, and social policies affecting the community	33	2.00	1.15
Alpha **Coefficient = .74 (6 items, N = 29)**			
Summary score:	**29**	**2.57**	**.80**
Benefits to the Respondent			
Opportunities to educate university students	36	3.64	.72
Assistance with my work	36	3.25	1.05
New ideas	36	3.24	.97
Increased energy/enthusiasm for my work	34	3.15	1.05
Professional development	35	3.06	1.06
Alpha **Coefficient = .77 (5 items, N = 29)**			
Summary score:	**34**	**3.27**	**.71**

Note: Responses could range from 1 = No benefit to 5 = Strong benefit.

In testing the Schmidt et al. *(2006)* model, the lower levels of development would be expected to be more fully achieved than those at the higher levels. The ratings of items by agency participants shown in Table 6 confirm this expectation, in that attributes characterizing earlier levels of development show higher mean scores than those characterizing higher levels.

It has been suggested *(e.g., Janke, 2009; Schmidt et al., 2006)* that partnership maturity or mutual quality should be related to benefits to the participating agency and to the community served, as well as to the university and its students. In order to explore this relationship, community agency respondents were asked to evaluate the extent to which their partnership yielded benefits to the agency's work and special projects and research. Relevant survey items are shown in Table 7. For some of the participants, information was also available on their views of benefits to the community served by the agency and to the individual completing the survey (usually this person was the on-site supervisor of Tulane students). Ratings for benefits were generally very positive, as shown in Table 7.

As was expected, respondents' reports of the benefits of the program for the agency's functioning and special projects, for the people served by the agency, and for the participants themselves, were all highly related to the development of shared knowledge, as shown in Table 8. Other factors that might be related to perceived benefits were also examined: The number of students engaged in service at the agency was important to perceived agency benefits, in that larger numbers of students would be able to accomplish more work for the agency. However, the amount of time that the agency had spent working with the university was not significantly related to perceived benefits. Quality of the relationship is more important than the time over which the relationship has been in existence.

In summary, community partners participating in our surveys held generally positive views of the value of their involvement with the university in planning and implementing service-learning experiences for students. The benefits reported are related to the quality of the relationship, as reflected by shared knowledge, much more than to simply the time over which the partnership has been in effect. The faculty survey indicated frequent contact between faculty and agency, as well as between center staff and agency representatives, so that shared knowledge can develop rapidly and benefits can be realized soon after a partnership is begun.

Ongoing research with Tulane's community partners elaborates other dimensions of the Schmidt et al. *(2006)* model and their

importance with regard to benefits. Another study is concerned with the ways agencies deal effectively with relatively large numbers of service-learning students. This work will make it possible for the center to prepare agencies to handle problems that can arise when attempting to implement a large-scale service-learning program.

Table 8. Correlations of Level of Shared Knowledge, Numbers of Students Served, and Partnership with Agency Representatives' Views of Benefits

Benefits	Correlations of Shared Knowledge with Benefits	Correlations of Number of Students Placed at Agency with Benefits	Correlations of Duration of Partnership with Benefits
Agency Benefits: Work Accomplished	.59** N = 65	.43** N = 65	-.04 N = 70
Agency Benefits: Projects, Research	.46** N = 68	.30** N = 65	-.17 N = 71
Benefits to Community	.71** N = 27	.32 N = 28	.19 N = 29
Benefits to Respondent	.53** N = 31	.22 N = 33	.27 N = 34

*Note: ** $p < .01$.*

Future Directions for Tulane University's Community Engagement

The efforts at Tulane University following Hurricane Katrina are producing impact on both the university and the New Orleans and Gulf Coast communities. Faculty members have enriched their teaching and are beginning new kinds of scholarship. Faculty members' interest in research that involves the public service program is increasing; growing interest has also been seen among faculty members who are engaging in research activities in collaboration with the local community. An ad hoc Committee on Promotion and Tenure was recently created to begin discussion on how engaged scholarship should be considered in the promotion and tenure process; the committee's first task is to provide guidelines for faculty members on incorporating engaged scholarship in their dossiers. Communities are acquiring different views of the university and its students.

The first 5 years of the Center for Public Service focused on developing the infrastructure to support Tulane's public service graduation requirement. The goal for the next 5 years is to better

serve the center's constituencies. With over 400 community organizations wishing to partner with the university, the center's staff hopes to actively engage with them, and make sure that university resources address their identified needs.

Although Tulane's commitment to engagement originated in the throes of the most desperate crisis the university had faced since the Civil War, 6 years after Katrina, it has fully permeated all facets of university life. Tulane's university-community engagement has become one of the most prominent elements of its undergraduate admissions materials *(Cowen, 2011)*. In 2010, the university launched Tulane Empowers, both a capital campaign and a strategy, whereby the university is purposefully dedicating resources to helping people build a better world *(Tulane, 2011c)*. Tulane Empowers commits the institution to social innovation and the development of the next generation of community-minded leaders, by empowering students, faculty, and staff to develop and put into action solutions to society's greatest challenges, including public education, public service, urban development, cultural studies, community health, and disaster response. It is hoped that the Tulane Empowers capital campaign will support and strengthen Tulane and its community partners.

References

Brownell, J. E., & Swaner, L. E. (2010). *Five high-impact practices: Research on learning outcomes, completion, and quality.* Washington, DC: Association of American Colleges and Universities.

Buberger, A., Moely, B. E., & Hebert, A. (2009, March). *Tulane University's Center for Public Service: Emerging, establishing, and sustaining community partnerships.* Paper presented at the Gulf South Summit on Service-Learning and Civic Engagement through Higher Education, Baton Rouge, LA.

Campus Compact. (2011). Civic engagement at research universities. Retrieved from http://www.compact.org/initiatives/civic-engagement-at-research-universities/

Cowen, S. (2011). A message from the president. Retrieved from http://admission.tulane.edu/about/whytulane/president.php

Furco, A., & Moely, B. E. (2012). Using learning communities to build faculty support for pedagogical innovation: A multi-campus study. *Journal of Higher Education, 83*(1), 128-153.

Greater New Orleans Community Data Center. (2011). *News release: Facts for features Hurricane Katrina impact.* Retrieved from http://www.gnocdc.org/Factsforfeatures/HurricaneKatrinaImpact/index.html

Janke, E. M. (2009). Defining characteristics of partnership identity in faculty-community partnerships. In B. E. Moely, S. H. Billig, & B. A. Holland (Eds.), *Creating our identities in service-learning and community engagement* (pp. 75–101). Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing, Inc.

Jones, S. R., Segar, T. C., & Gasiorski, A. L. (2008). "A double-edged sword": College student perceptions of required high school service-learning. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning, 15*(1), 5–17.

Kuh, G. D. (2008). *High-Impact educational practices: What they are, who has access to them, and why they matter*. Washington, DC: Association of American Colleges & Universities.

Marks, H. M., & Jones, S. R. (2004). Community service in the transition: Shifts and continuities in participation from high school to college. *Journal of Higher Education, 75*(3), 307–339.

Moely, B. E., & Ilustre, V. (2011). University students' views of a public service graduation requirement. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning, 17*(2), 43–58.

Nolan, B. (2011, August 28). 6 years later, Hurricane Katrina's scars linger alongside robust recovery. *New Orleans Times-Picayune*. Retrieved from http://www.nola.com/katrina/index.ssf/2011/08/6_years_later_hurricane_katrin.html

Patterson, E. W. (1987). Effects of participation in required and not required community service programs on the process of self-actualization in high school students (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Abstract available at http://www.servicelearning.org/library/resource/3292

Schmidt., A., Solis, L., & Phillips, C. (2006). *Partners in teaching: Five key practices that build and maintain healthy and reciprocal partnerships.* Paper presented at the annual Continuums of Service Conference, Bellevue, WA.

Tulane University. (2005). *Renewal plan*. Retrieved from http://renewal.tulane.edu/renewalplan.pdf

Tulane University. (2006). *Survival to renewal*. Retrieved from http://renewal.tulane.edu/

Tulane University. (2010a). *Center for Public Service*. Retrieved from http://tulane.edu/cps/

Tulane University. (2010b). *Katrina remembered*. Retrieved from https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=bRzGOgS2esI

Tulane University. (2011a). *Community engagement at Tulane University.* Retrieved from http://tulane.edu/communityengagement/

Tulane University (2010a). *Our Mission*. Retrieved from

http://tulane.edu/cps/about/objectives.cfm

Tulane University. (2011b). *Public service graduation requirement*. Retrieved from http://tulane.edu/cps/students/grad-requirement.cfm

Tulane University. (2011c). *Tulane Empowers*. Retrieved from http://tulane.edu/empowers/

About the Authors

Vincent Ilustre is the executive director of the Center for Public Service at Tulane University. He is an adjunct faculty member of the A. B. Freeman School of Business at Tulane and teaches introductory courses in management and leadership. He earned his bachelor's degree in political science and sociology and master's degree in business administration from Tulane University.

Ana M. López is associate provost for faculty affairs and director of the Cuban and Caribbean Studies Institute at Tulane University. She is an associate professor in the Department of Communication and teaches film and cultural studies. Her research is focused on Latin American and Latino film and cultural studies. She is currently working on early sound cinema in Latin America and the radiophonic imagination. López earned her bachelor's degree from Queens College, and her master's degree and Ph.D. in communication from the University of Iowa.

Barbara E. Moely is professor emerita in psychology and research affiliate at the Center for Public Service at Tulane University. Her research has been concerned with factors affecting college students' civic attitudes and skills, academic and community engagement, retention in college, and reactions to a public service graduation requirement. She has also published research on campus-community partnerships and faculty development for service-learning. Moely earned her bachelor's and master's degrees in psychology from the University of Wisconsin and her Ph.D. in psychology from the University of Minnesota.

Appendix: Faculty Survey Questions

(After completing an IRB-approved consent form, the participant received the instructions and survey form below.)

Thank you for agreeing to complete this survey. Your views will help the Center for Public Service (CPS) staff as they attempt to meet your needs in carrying out your service-learning courses and other community engagement activities. Although we will not ask you to provide your name for the survey, we would like you to indicate some things about your role at the University.

What is your academic department at Tulane? _____

What is your rank?
___ Professor
___ Associate Professor
___ Assistant Professor
___ Professor of Practice or Clinical Professor
___ Instructor
___ Visiting Professor
___ Other: Please describe:

What is your tenure status at Tulane?
___ Tenured professor
___ Passed third-year review, approaching tenure evaluation
___ Tenure track position, approaching third-year review
___ Professor of practice
___ Graduate student TA
___ Other non-tenure track position

Your Service-learning Experiences

When did you offer your first service-learning course?
___ Five or more years ago
___ 4 years ago (2004-2005)
___ 3 years ago (2005-2006)
___ 2 years ago (2006-2007)
___ last year (2007-2008)
___ during the fall 2008 semester
___ during the spring 2009 semester

How many different service-learning courses have you taught (counting each uniquely-titled course just once)? _____
How many total service-learning offerings have you given (counting all sections offered)? _____
With how many different community partners have you worked? _____
In the current academic year (2008-2009), how many service-learning sections are you offering? _____

How many community partners have been involved in the courses you offered this year? _____

WHY are you doing service-learning? Please use the five-point scale to indicate:
> 1 = Never true
> 2 = Rarely true
> 3 = Sometimes
> 4 = Often true
> 5 = Always true

___ I am interested in trying out new teaching methods.
___ My department requires me to offer service-learning courses.
___ Service-learning is becoming an important part of my academic discipline.
___ Service-learning energizes my teaching.
___ I enjoy teaching more when I do service-learning.
___ My students have urged me to offer service-learning courses.
___ Service-learning attracts more students to my courses because of the public service requirement.
___ Service-learning attracts more students to my courses because of their interests in the community.
___ Service-learning attracts more students to my courses as part of their career development.
___ My students learn course content better when they apply course concepts in their service.
___ I am interested in contributing to the work of my community partner(s).
___ I want to contribute to the revitalization of New Orleans.
___ My service-learning courses support or strengthen my own research.
___ Service-learning helps with my promotion and tenure review or other (yearly) reviews.
___ My service-learning courses contribute to my teaching portfolio.
___ I get financial rewards for offering service-learning courses.
___ Other. Please explain:

How have you gained information about service-learning theory and practice? Please answer using the following scale:
> 1 = Never from this source
> 2 = Rarely from this source
> 3 = Frequently from this source
> 4 = Very often from this source

___ Service-learning faculty development seminar at the Center for Public Service or its predecessor, the Office of Service Learning (8- to 10-week sessions of small faculty groups)
___ CPS or OLS Service-learning workshops (one-half to one-day workshops)
___ Lectures or discussions on service-learning organized by CPS or OLS
___ Preparation for service-learning when I was at another university.
___ Attendance at one or more service-learning/community engagement conferences
___ Sessions on service-learning organized by my department

___ Informal conversations about service-learning with colleagues
___ My own reading and exploration
___ Use of the CPS library
___ Use of on-line resources (e.g., the Service-learning Clearinghouse)
___ Other. Please describe:

What article, book, or experience has been most influential in shaping your approach to service-learning? Why was this important to you?

In your service-learning courses:

How do you identify community partners? Use the following scale
      1 = Never
      2 = Rarely
      3 = Frequently
      4 = Very Often

___ CPS staff members assist me
___ I find community partners on my own
___ I have been approached by community agencies wanting to work with my courses.
___ I have long-standing relationships with certain community agencies.

In working with community agencies, please indicate the extent to which the statement is true for you by placing a number in the box, as follows:
      1 = Never true
      2 = Rarely true
      3 = Sometimes
      4 = Often true
      5 = Always true

___ I visit the agency at least one time before the semester begins.
___ I visit the agency at least one time during the semester.
___ The community partner contributes to course syllabus development.
___ The community partner conducts onsite orientations.
___ The community partner comes to my classroom to introduce the service option.
___ The community partner comes to my classroom to participate in a reflection session.
___ The community partner gives me feedback about student performance.
___ A CPS staff member handles relationships with the agencies at which my students work.
___ I have no direct contact with community agencies.

When offering a service-learning course, do you (check one):
___ require all students in the class to do service-learning
___ make it an option for students to choose service-learning
___ I have taken each of these approaches.

How do you decide which of these options to use?

Do your goals for student learning vary depending upon whether or not the students are doing service-learning? (Check one) ___ Yes ___ No
Please explain.

How do you consider the service-learning component of a class in assigning grades?
(Please describe briefly, including, if relevant, the role of the community partner in determining grades.)

Have you ever had a student worker from CPS to assist with your service-learning course?
(Check one) ___ Yes ___ No
If so, was the student (check all that apply)
       ___ an undergraduate teaching assistant
       ___ a Public Service Fellow
       ___ a work-study student
       ___ a student doing an Independent Studies course with me
       ___ a volunteer
       ___ other. Please describe:

How did the student help you with your course?

To what extent do you find each of the following to be true of service-learning?
       Please answer using the following scale:

       1 = Never
       2 = Rarely
       3 = Frequently
       4 = Very often

___ Increases students' engagement
___ Enrichment of class discussions
___ Helps the community
___ Gives me access to/connections with community agencies needed for my research
___ Enriches my scholarship
___ Other. Please explain:

What are the most difficult things about offering a service-learning course?

What feedback have you received from the community with regard to your course(s)?

What comments have you received from students about service-learning?

Service-learning and Scholarship

How many conference presentations have you made on your service-learning work? _____

How many articles have you published based on your service-learning work? _____

How many community-based research projects have you done? _____

How many grants have you written to support community-based programs or research projects? _____

How many of your graduate students have become involved in community-based work? _____

Please explain ways in which your graduate students have been involved:

Have you mentioned service-learning accomplishments in your yearly productivity reports or your dossier for promotion and tenure? If so, to what extent did you emphasize it as each of the following? Use the 4-point scale as follows:

      1 = Not used in presenting this aspect of my record
      2 = Rarely mentioned
      3 = Sometimes mentioned
      4 = Very much emphasized in presenting this aspect of my record

___ Reporting on my **teaching**
___ Reporting on my **service**
___ Reporting on my **research**

Do you feel that service-learning participation has helped or taken away from your productivity? Please explain.

What had been difficult about getting involved in service-learning as scholarship?

Suggestions for CPS

What support from the CPS has been useful in your service-learning efforts?

What kinds of support would be useful in your service-learning efforts? Please specify.

(A final paragraph thanked the faculty member for participating and indicated how to return the survey.)