

COMMITTEE: Service Learning

MEETING DATE: October 16, 2012

PERSON PRESIDING: Dotson-Blake

REGULAR MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE: Dotson-Blake, Weitz, Goodman, Deena, Quinn, Kavanagh, Sasnett

EX-OFFICIO MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE: McCunney, Ballard, Hegde, Fazzone

OTHERS IN ATTENDANCE: Lee

ACTIONS OF MEETING

Agenda Item: Update on information shared in Faculty Senate

Discussion: Dotson-Blake created a paper announcement about the committee's creation. It was placed at each Senator's desk, since there was limited time for announcements.

Action Taken: None taken.

Agenda Item: Discuss Goals for 2012/2013

Discussion:

Kavanagh read a list of goals prepared for the meeting:

1. Define Service Learning
2. Determine the review process in the context of the new definition
3. Create action plan for bringing more courses that already provide service learning in to the fold
4. Look for possible collaborations that may exist
5. Make recommendations for updating course catalogs
6. Outreach
7. Survey current service learning designated professors and find out what is being done well and where challenges exist.

Discussion of Goals:

- Dotson-Blake said that these aligned with discussions that she has had with McCunney.
- A brief discussion about possible partnerships was launched and this will be a subject we return to.

Further discussion included areas of concern facing service learning at ECU, including:

- Lack of infrastructure, marketing, and a common definition of service learning (Fazzone)
- We don't have a budget. Recommendations can go to VSLC and to the Senate, but many of those things are not things we can do on our own. Assessment is one of those pieces. We can participate in collection, but it VSLC might have to be the drivers of the assessment. (Dotson-Blake)
- Faculty members are not responding to the service learning designation and applying: why?
- The time and commitment taken to apply (Sasnett)

- Switching instructors on a class from semester to semester: what happens to the service learning designation and to the community connection? (Sasnett)
- Should service learning be a course-specific designation, or would activity specific or some other model be more useful? Is it the partnership what we're designating, or the activity, or the class? Unit designation for service learning? (Fazzone)
- How to work with faculty to incorporate this in to their promotion and tenure model, and get service learning in to their research.
- Gauging investment level of chairs and deans (besides conceptually).
- Have to maintain high quality standards, but we want to make sure people can get this, and that we don't turn a lot of people down. It is a balance. (Ballard)

Some suggestions were raised as ways to increase the knowledge of service learning on campus and improve our processes, including:

- Questionnaires of current service learning instructors (Kavanagh)
- Forming focus groups, and having critical conversations with faculty. (Fazzone)
- Service learning faculty institute where one receives recognition for inclusion
- A continuum of service learning: fully designated to less fully designated.
- Summer institutes have been suggested in the past, but this comes down to funding (Ballard)
- Write grants, but this comes down to time (Ballard)
- Designated courses should submit their student reviews to us. (Fazzone)
- When the students do projects, identify what they are doing and how it relates. Could we have a contract with the student? Makes assessment a lot easier. (Fazzone)
- Make an online form for applying. General course content for projects. Grid: course outcomes and objectives. Standardized way to be able to fill this out. (Fazzone)
- Evaluate effectiveness of the service learning: Faculty duty? Ballard said a faculty member asked for help with this kind of assessment last year, but we didn't have it. Students have to demonstrate learning in order to be graded. Don't give credit for just doing the hours, they have to be graded to show the learning occurred. Dotson-Blake noted that that is why the reflection component is included.

Ideas for Conference/Faculty Institute

- Budget of \$10,000 for the conference. Could we use part or all of this money to put together a faculty institute? What if we had a white paper to justify something like that? (McCunney)
- Institute: some sessions would be open to everyone, and then fellows will be in some sessions on their own.
- Collaboration: Beth's office, Student Affairs, Academic Affairs, they all have a little money. Multiple contributions, would matching an option? (Fazzone)
- Paul Gemperline was very excited about Graduate involvement of service learning. Ask him to consider helping. (Ballard).
- Poster sessions have been conducted in the past; is this really seen as an honor, and what if they don't want to take part? Consideration of invited posters.
- Maybe we can build this in to the service learning application: Have a clause that they have done a service learning course, they should come and present for us.

Suggestions for possible outreach for assistance:

- Portland State is the expert for service learning. May want to contact them for feedback (Sasnett)
They have rolled it in to the promotion and tenure component (Ballard)
- Campus Connections: HHP and Educational Leadership (Dotson-Blake)

Action Taken: This item was tabled until the next meeting, due to the lack of time for discussion.

Assigned additional duties to: Dotson-Blake collected the goals and plans to compare and compile them for the next meeting.

Agenda Item: Review Applications for Service Learning Designation

Discussion:

There were two complete applications for the Service Learning Designation for the Spring 2013 semester: HNRS 2116 and ISDN 4700-001.

Summary of discussion for HNRS 2116:

- Long list of possible projects was included as an attachment, and was in the form of a written email. It was suggested that this could possibly be reformatted for inclusion in the application.
- There was some concern about the integrity of the projects, since they would change every semester, as would the community partners. What criteria would be used to determine a good project and partnership?
- Would like to see a clear tie in to the coursework (Fazzone)
- What is the number of action hours that they are actually working on the project? Might vary by project. It is not clear. (Fazzone)
- It is clear from the email that the department has a role in defining in what will be done, but it is not clear how this will be expressed to the students. Normally we see a much more fleshed out project, maybe they could have the email list more formalized. (Dotson-Blake)
- Sees the student project presentation, but usually also see the activity. What are the hours spent doing the activity, and how do we acknowledge that they are doing it. (Fazzone)
- Response for #5 on the questionnaire needs to be included in the syllabus, since this was more unclear in the syllabus. One reason for requiring things in the proposal, the syllabus is the contract. Application is part of our history. (Dotson-Blake)
- Their intent is not reflected in the syllabus, need to make that more clear. Is research paper their service? Or is there some other service? (Dotson-Blake)
- You have a client, and you must somehow communicate with the client. A jury was mentioned: so the students and instructor select the project, and the clients come in later, or does the client come in and their needs met? Where is the partnership? (Weitz/Fazzone)

McCunney suggested that we grant designation as a starting point, then work on ongoing improvement. The question was posed: Do we perfect do we try to get it up front, or do we work with them? Weitz also agreed with the idea of a conditional approval, but no motion was raised. At around 5:00 the attendees expressed a need to leave.

Dotson-Blake offered two suggestions: either we could craft a cohesive response via email from the written comments and comments provided via email, or we could have them take us off the agenda for Faculty Senate and be put on to the next agenda in December (however, this would be too late to include the designations for Spring). The HNRS course will be offered in the Spring whether or not we give it the

designation. She reasoned that we would not want to send one through, but not the other, and both applicants got the applications in on time. Ballard suggested a subcommittee for review of the applications.

The committee did not discuss the application of ISDN 4700-001, or the partial application of Dr. Song's Art Education class.

Action Taken: It was decided that the meeting should be adjourned due to time constraints of the attendees, and that we should attempt to approve the 2 applications before the next meeting of the Faculty Senate. A subcommittee may be formed going forward to further discuss service learning applications, but subcommittee membership was not determined during the meeting.

Assigned additional duties to: Dotson-Blake will compile written responses and follow up with a draft response regarding the 2 applications via email. These will be presented at the Faculty Senate meeting on November 6.

Below are links to written responses sent to both academic units submitting courses for SL designation.

[IDSN 4700](#)

[HNRS 2116](#)

NEXT MEETING: November 13, 2012 at 3:30 in the VSLC Conference Room.

ITEMS TO BE DISCUSSED: Continue discussion of Goals, possibly review the application for a course that has only provided a partial application.