Robert G. Bringle
Julie A. Hatcher

Implementing Service Learning in Higher Education

We gratefully acknowledge the comments of Amy Driscoll, Catherine Ludlum, Keith Morton, William Plater, Tim Stanton, and Pam Velo on a draft of this article.

Robert G. Bringle is associate professor of psychology and director, Office of Service Learning, and Julie A. Hatcher is associate instructor of education and assistant director, Office of Service Learning at Indiana University- Purdue University Indianapolis.

Journal of Higher Education, Vol. 67, No. 2 (March/ April 1996)

In a recent article, "Creating the New American College," Ernest Boyer challenges higher education to reconsider its mission to be that of educating students for a life as responsible citizens, rather than educating students solely for a career. By doing so, the "New American College" will take pride in connecting theory to practice in order to meet challenging social problems, particularly those faced by universities in urban settings. As Ira Harkavey of the University of Pennsylvania Center for Community Partnerships has noted, "Universities cannot afford to remain shores of affluence, self-importance and horticultural beauty at the edge of island seas of squalor, violence and despair" [5, p. A48]. Emphasizing service has the potential to enrich learning and renew communities, but will also give "new dignity to the scholarship of service" [5, p. A48].

Universities have valuable resources (for example, students, faculty, staff, classrooms, libraries, technology, research expertise) that become accessible to the community when partnerships address community needs. They also have a tradition of serving their communities by strengthening the economic development of the region, addressing educational and health needs of the community, and contributing to the cultural life of the community [12, 23, 27]. Emphasizing the value of community involvement and voluntary community service can also create a culture of service on a campus [for example, 17, 26].

From a programmatic perspective there are two salient means through which universities support and promote community partnerships: (a) extracurricular and (b) curricular. On campus a significant number of college students actively participate in extracurricular community service through student organizations, the activities of student service offices and campus-based religious organizations [for example, 1, 24]. Many faculty, staff, and students, particularly those at urban campuses, are involved in their communities (for example, neighborhood development, community agencies, churches, youth work) independent of the university.

Academic programs can also engage students in the community. Professional schools in particular create a variety of experiential learning opportunities for their students (for example, clinicals, internships, co-op programs, field experiences, practica, student teaching). However,

the learning objectives of these activities typically focus only on extending a student's professional skills and do not emphasize to the student, either explicitly or tacitly, the importance of service within the community and lessons of civic responsibility.

We view service learning as a credit-bearing educational experience in which students participate in an organized service activity that meets identified community needs and reflect on the service activity in such a way as to gain further understanding of course content, a broader appreciation of the discipline, and an enhanced sense of civic responsibility. Unlike extracurricular voluntary service, service learning is a coursebased service experience that produces the best outcomes when meaningful service activities are related to course material through reflection activities such as directed writings, small group discussions, and class presentations. Unlike practica and internships, the experiential activity in a service learning course is not necessarily skill- based within the context of professional education.

Service learning provides an additional means for reaching educational objectives, and academic credit is appropriate for service activities when learning objectives associated with the service are identified and evaluated. Faculty who use service learning discover that it brings new life to the classroom, enhances performance on traditional measures of learning, increases student interest in the subject, teaches new problem solving skills, and makes teaching more enjoyable. In addition, service learning expands course objectives to include civic education. Benjamin Barber, of the Walt Whitman Center for the Culture and Pol itics of Democracy, Rutgers University, considers service learning to be an indispensable method for citizenship education through which students learn the arts of democracy [2, 3].

Research has supported claims that have been made for the value of service learning in higher education. Markus, Howard, and King [21], using procedures that closely approximated a randomized control-group design, found that students in service learning sections had more positive course evaluations, more positive beliefs and values toward service and community, and higher academic achievement as measured on mid- term and final examinations. Other research supports the contention that service learning has a positive impact on personal, attitudinal, moral, social, and cognitive outcomes [4, 7, 8, 15].

The recent interest in service learning has been strengthened by the work of national organizations interested in combining service and education (for example, Campus Compact, American Association for Higher Education, Council of Independent Colleges, Council for Adult Experiential Learning, National Society for Experiential Education, National Youth Leadership Council, Partnership for Service-Learning), and the National Community Service Trust Act of 1993. Universities are particularly well suited to become national leaders in the development of service learning.

Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis is an urban university that has invested resources and personnel to establish an Office of Service Learning. In doing so, we (a) participated in Campus Compact's Summer Institute for the Project on Integrating Service with Academic Study and the Stanford Summer Institute on Service Learning, (b) attended national and regional conferences on service learning and experiential education, (c) reviewed the extant service learning literature, (d) collected information from many programs which were in various stages of institutionalizing service learning, (e) reviewed materials from eight university-based centers focusing on service, and (f) participated on the University of Colorado at Boulder listserv on service learning (Internet: SL@CSF.COLORADO.EDU). On the basis of this work, we developed the following model for implementing and institutionalizing service learning within higher education.

Comprehensive- Action Plan for Service Learning (CAPSL)

Developing service learning at the institutional level has been characterized as a cycle that includes awareness, planning, prototype, support, expansion, and evaluation [20, pp. 37-38]. This model of institu tional change was based on the 44 institutions that participated in the, three-year Campus Compact Project on Integrating Service with Academic Study. Based on our examination of service learning programs nationwide and our discussions with many more experienced persons, we have expanded this model and have applied it to additional constituencies. The resulting model, the Comprehensive Action Plan for Service Learning (CAPSL), identifies four constituencies on which a program for service learning (for example, an office of service learning) needs to focus its principle activities: institution, faculty, students, and community. Although this is not an exhaustive list of constituencies to be considered in service learning programming, these four constituencies must be included for the initial efforts to be successful.

CAPSL also identifies a sequence of activities/ tasks/outcomes to be pursued for each of the four constituencies (see Table 1). Following initial planning, activities need to increase awareness within each constituency concerning the general nature of service learning. This educational process is helped by having at least one concrete example or prototype course available. An office of service learning can then expand the development of service learning by gathering resources and designing activities for each constituency. The office also needs to document the implementation of service learning (monitoring) and the outcomes of service learning (evaluation). The results of all these efforts should be recognized publicly in the media and through scholarship and research published in professional journals. Finally, evidence of growth and maturity will be reflected in the degree to which service learning becomes institutionalized.

The sequence of activities identified by CAPSL represents a heuristic that can focus attention on important steps of planned change and

TABLE 1				
Comprehensive Action Plan for Service Learning (CAPSL)				
	Institution	**Faculty**	**Students**	**Community**
Planning **Awareness** **Prototype** **Resources** **Expansion** **Recognition** **Monitoring** **Evaluation** **Research** **Institutionalization**				

practice the pattern will seldom be linear. Instead, there may be numerous cycles back and forth across activities. However, as Wood [33] observes, even though change is not linear or uniform, "what is important is to maintain the direction, to keep to the course" (p. 53). CAPSL provides that direction by identifying a sequence of actions for strategic planning by prioritizing activities and providing a basis for monitoring progress. There is a rationale to the ordering of tasks in CAPSL which presumes that an activity may be premature if other previous tasks have been neglected. For example, faculty development efforts mentioned under expansion (for example, service learning course development stipends) will be of limited effectiveness if faculty do not understand service learning. Nor should the sequence of tasks be considered lock step such that an earlier step needs to be accomplished in its entirety before the next step is attempted (for example, all or most faculty do not need to understand service learning in order to proceed with expansion, only enough to justify those efforts). It is not assumed that progress across the constituencies goes at the same pace. Programmatic development will typically occur unevenly in a mix of small increments and a few big jumps.

Institutions

CAPSL describes a model for the development of service learning in universities at the institutional level (see **Table 2** for examples). A small group of key individuals (administrators, faculty, students, staff, community leaders) with the appropriate interest, motivation, and skills is needed to execute-the critical first steps. As Wood [33] points out, "Educational programs . . . need champions. Those champions must be found in the faculty if an innovation is to be profound and long-lasting. Administrators should -not be shy about seeking out faculty champions" (p. 53). The planning stage needs to include a self-assessment on the following items: (a) where the institution is and where it is going; (b) the institutional, student, and faculty culture, climate, and values [31]; and (c) the resources and obstacles for developing service learning in the institution. Individuals in this group will benefit from discussions with individuals at institutions with more mature programs and at conferences that include service learning as a topic. A strategic action plan for implementing service learning can then be developed [for example, 19, 30] and institutional commitments (for example, budget, office space, personnel commitments) can be secured. As Schmidtlein [28] points out, the key to successful change is, "adapting planning practices

TABLE 2

Examples of Institutional Activities

	Institution
Planning	• Form a planning group of key persons • Survey institutional resources and climate • Attend Campus Compact Regional Institute • Develop a Campus Action Plan for service learning • Form an advisory committee

Awareness	• Inform key administrators and faculty groups about service learning and program development • Join national organizations (e.g., Campus Compact, National Society for Experiential Education, Partnership for Service-Learning) • Attend service learning conferences
Prototype	• Identify and consult with exemplary programs in higher education
Resources	• Obtain administrative commitments for an Office of Service Learning (e.g., budget, office space, personnel) • Develop a means for coordinating service learning with other programs on campus (e.g., student support services, faculty development) • Apply for grants
Expansion	• Discuss service learning with a broader audience of administrators and staff (e.g., deans, counselors, student affairs) • Support attendance at service learning conferences • Collaborate with others in programming and grant applications • Arrange campus speakers and forums on service learning
Recogniton	• Publicize university's service learning activities to other institutions • Participate in conferences and workshops • Publish research • Publicize service learning activities in local media
Monitoring	• Collect data within institution (e.g., number of courses, number of faculty teaching service learning courses, number of students enrolled, number of agency partnerships)
Evaluation	• Compile annual report of Office of Service Learning • Include service learning in institutional assessment
Research	• Conduct research on service learning *within* institution and across institutions
Institutionalization	• Service is part of university mission statement and service learning is recognized in university publications • Service learning is an identifiable feature of general education • Service learning courses are listed in bulletins, schedule of classes, and course descriptions • University sponsors regional or national conferences on service learning • Hardline budget commitments to sustain service learning programs

to the institution's unique characteristics" (p. 85). One of the best ways for a university to do this is with the help of Campus Compact's regional institutes that target institutional development.'

At some point in these early steps it is necessary to identify a person to assume leadership and administrative responsibility for subsequent program operations and to establish an office of service learning. The office of service learning will need to communicate to staff, students, faculty, and community agencies its mission and planned activities. As Rubin [26] notes, this is a more formidable task at a commuter university than at a small liberal arts college because of "the lack of personal relationships and informal networks" (p. 48).

Farmer [13] cautions that some educational change is ephemeral because "too often change agents focus too much on implementing change and too little on sustaining it" (p. 16). Thus, the efforts and investments devoted to initiating service learning must be complemented with the resources to sustain and expand the program. Institutions should examine their faculty reward structures and determine how they facilitate and inhibit faculty involvement in service learning. With development and maturity, service learning will become a significant component of the curriculum, and faculty and staff will participate in service learning organizations, share their success with other institutions, and contribute to professional conferences.

The university, as an institution, can be both the means of and the object of data collection that monitors program development, evaluates institutional outcomes, and publishes the results of this research in professional journals. The office of service learning should facilitate this research, which is critical to strengthening the knowledge base to promote and expand service learning within academia [16].

Academically, the prevalence of service learning courses is initial evidence that service learning is important to the institution. An additional sign of growth and maturity occurs when service learning transcends a collection of courses. For example, coordinated course sequences in service learning, service learning being integral to general education, and an entire curriculum organized around service learning [for example, 22] reflect increasing levels of programmatic development and maturity. Administratively, evidence that service learning is institutionalized would include having service and service learning as explicit parts of the institution's mission, long- range plans, institutional assessment, and hard-line budget allocations.

Faculty

Faculty involvement is critical because service learning in its most common form is a course-driven feature of the curriculum. Therefore, the work of an office of service learning must focus on interesting faculty in service learning and providing them with support to make the curricular changes necessary to add a service learning component to a course. Some faculty may already be using experiential learning activities that are similar to service learning. Identifying and involving interested and experienced faculty in planning (for example, forming a faculty advisory committee) is important to later activities (see Table 3 for examples). This needs to include formal and informal forums, for as Wood [33] points out, "the absence of such conversation virtually guarantees maintenance of the status quo" (p. 53).

Creating a common understanding of what constitutes service learning at a particular institution will pay dividends later. This can be accomplished through brochures, news releases, faculty workshops, brown bag talks, and presentations at departmental meetings. These activities can be helped by having a prototype course that provides a local example which includes a syllabus to read, an instructor who can share wisdom and advice, examples for how course components such as reflection and evaluation can be structured, and a group of students who are

advocates for service learning. In addition, syllabi that provide examples of service learning courses across the curriculum can be collected from other institutions.

A primary task of an office of service learning will be to facilitate course development. As a change agent, the office of service learning can expect to play many of the multiple roles identified by Farmer [13]: (a) catalyst, (b) solution giver, (c) process helper, (d) resource linker, and (e) confidence builder. A particularly important role is providing the opportunity for experienced faculty to meet one on one with interested faculty. The office can also gather resources (for example, syllabi, literature), provide support (for example, grants, faculty stipends), and plan faculty development activities (for example, workshops, campus speakers) that lead to the expansion of service learning courses. The office should regularly publicize the successes on campus and in the community.

Beyond those faculty who are initially curious, how can additional faculty be drawn to explore service learning? First, claims about service learning must be realistic, otherwise disenchantment and resentment will develop. Faculty are willing to explore change, including service learning, when the promise of the innovation leaves them feeling more efficacious and more competent as teachers [10] and when the investments to achieve these outcomes are modest. Therefore, effective faculty development must include presenting a clear understanding of service learning, the expected benefits from service learning for the faculty and student, and the requisite investments of time.

In addition, ways can be found to involve faculty in activities that are related to service learning but fall short of developing a new course.

TABLE 3

Examples of Faculty Activities

	Faculty
Planning	• Survey faculty interest and service learning courses currently offered • Identify faculty for service learning planning group and advisory committee
Awareness	• Distribute information on service learning (e.g., brochures, newsletters, and articles) • Identify a faculty liaison in each academic unit
Prototype	• Identify *or* develop prototype course(s)
Resources	• Identify interested faculty and faculty mentors • Maintain syllabus file by discipline • Compile library collection on service learning • Secure faculty development funds for expansion • Identify existing resources that can support faculty development in service learning • Establish a faculty award that recognizes service

Expansion	• Offer faculty development *workshops* • Arrange one-on-one consultations • Discuss service learning with departments and schools • Provide course development stipends and grants to support service learning • Focus efforts on underrepresented schools • Develop faculty mentoring program • Promote development of general education, sequential, and interdisciplinary service learning courses
Recognition	• Publicize faculty accomplishments • Include service learning activities on faculty Annual Report forms • Involve faculty in professional activities (e.g., publications, workshops, conferences, forums) • Publicize recipients of the faculty service award
Monitoring	• Collect data on faculty involvement (e.g., number of faculty involved in faculty development activities, number of faculty offering service learning courses)
Evaluation	• Provide assessment methods and designs to faculty (e.g., peer review, portfolios) • Evaluate course outcomes (e.g., student satisfaction, student learning)
Research	• Facilitate faculty research on service learning • Conduct research on faculty involvement in service learning
Institutionalization	• Service learning is part of personnel decisions (e.g., hiring, annual review, promotion and tenure) • Service learning is a permanent feature of course descriptions and the curriculum • Service learning is an integral part of the professional development of faculty

For example, faculty can be asked to conduct reflection sessions for student groups who have completed service projects. This provides the opportunity for faculty to observe and guide some of the lessons learned from the students' service experience. Faculty can also be asked to par ticipate in short-term community service projects so that they become more familiar with opportunities for learning from service in the community. Also, faculty can be asked to team -teach in an existing service learning course.

The office of service learning can also develop a program of faculty development in service learning. One such curriculum for faculty [6] offers a series of workshops on the general nature of service learning, reflection, building community partnerships, student supervision and assessment,, and course assessment and research. These seminars can be presented over a semester, an academic year, a summer, or during an intensive period of instruction (for example, a week). Faculty development workshops can also be coupled with extrinsic incentives (for example, course development stipends) and support (for example, grants for student assistants, experienced faculty who serve as mentors) to overcome obstacles. Faculty are also sensitive to

the value of enhancing student learning and satisfaction, recognition during personnel review, and publication of articles in scholarly journals about their work on service learning. Therefore, an office of service learning should help faculty to achieve these professional goals.

Our belief is that faculty respond best to these initiatives when the office reports directly to an academic officer (for example, academic dean, academic vice president) because such an arrangement provides academic leadership and academic integrity to service learning. However, regardless of the administrative arrangement, collaboration with an active student volunteer program within Student Affairs can facilitate the development of service learning. The successes of the Haas Center at Stanford, the Center for Social Concern at Notre Dame, and the Swearer Center at Brown University reflect the benefits of having both efforts (that is, service learning and student volunteer services) housed together in a central location.

An office of service learning will also be in a position to collect information that monitors faculty activities and the resulting growth in service learning courses on campus. As a service learning program matures, it will develop the means through which it can collect evaluation data that detail student and faculty outcomes resulting from service learning courses. The work by Barber [2] and Giles and Eyler [14] to develop scales specifically designed for service learning courses is an extremely important step in the evolution of research on service learning. Determining why particular outcomes occur requires, in addition to adequate outcome measures, sophisticated experimental designs and data analysis procedures.

Academically, service learning that is an integral part of the curriculum and is not dependent upon a small group of faculty reflects institutionalization. Administratively, institutionalization of faculty commitment to service learning is demonstrated when service learning is recognized and used in personnel decisions (hiring, promotion and tenure, merit reviews).

Students

Students are in a paradoxical position with regard to service activities. On the one hand, some students are involved in voluntary service through campus organizations. Campus Compact provides ample evidence of the vigor that student-initiated and student-led service programs can display. Furthermore, students may be actively involved in their communities independent of the campus, particularly nontraditional students at urban campuses. On the other hand, students are dependent upon others for service learning opportunities. Service learning typically occurs only if a faculty member develops a service learning course, the course is approved, the course is offered, and the course is appropriate for a student (for example, meets degree requirements, pre requisites). Faculty are also dependent upon students in that a service learning course will be successful and repeated if students enroll in the course and if it results in a successful educational experience.

Astin's [I] research shows a sharp decline in student volunteer activities between high school and college. Furthermore, in comparison to residential campuses, nonresidential urban universities are learning environments that are disproportionately classroom oriented, with fewer campus activities occurring outside the classroom. As Schuh, Andreas, and Strange [29] note about urban universities that are commuter campuses, "People can- come and go so freely that it is difficult for the institution to develop traditions, bonds with students, and a sense of belonging" (p. 67). Our research [32] found that, for our commuting students, academic credit related to service activities increased the attractiveness of students getting involved in service. Thus, service learning, with the incentive of academic credit for service associated with the

classroom, provides an important means for increasing student participation in community service and enhancing the community service experiences for those already involved. Furthermore, service learning can provide an important function for students at urban universities by integrating their multi le life role a us and in the community [18] with support services and academic credit.

As Schuh Andreas, and Strange [29] point out, universities that "promote students' involvement in out-of-class experiences that are educationally purposeful" (p. 66) create a powerful learning environment and a greater sense of belonging. This is particularly important to a commuter campus, which can too easily regard students impersonally. Successful service programs, including both voluntary service and service learning, can build a greater sense of community on campus. This is consistent with Astin's [1] finding that rates of peer interactions and faculty/ student interactions were both strongly related to participation in volunteer work.

It is important in planning a service learning program to know the nature of the student climate and culture, including student attitudes toward voluntary service activities (individual or through student groups) and student attitudes toward service learning course development (for example, Is service learning more attractive in freshman courses, in the major, only in certain disciplines, only for additional credit?). In addition it is valuable to have students involved in planning activities (for example, as members of service learning advisory committees, writing grant proposals) in order to develop campus wide support (see Table 4).

Although service learning is becoming more prevalent in K-12 curricula, many students, and particularly nontraditional students, do not know about service learning. On small campuses, formal and informal communication can quickly and effectively solve this problem. However, at large universities, informing students about the nature of service learning courses is much more difficult. Providing information about course offerings to counselors, descriptions in course schedules, articles in school newspapers, and using students from past service learning classes as advocates can help inform others. As students become more experienced with service learning, some can assume leadership roles in courses as student assistants and site coordinators and participate in the design and execution of action research that focuses on needs assessment, program evaluation, and advocacy. Recognition of students' involvement in voluntary service and service learning is important. This recognition should start with designing effective service learning courses so that students have successful experiences that result in enhanced learning. In addition, recognition can include internal and external publicity, scholarships that reward past service or include a service requirement, nominations for regional and national service awards, and co-curricular transcripts that summarize service and service learning experiences that typically are not recorded on academic transcripts.

The office of service learning should collect information that reflects growth in enrollment in service learning and its impact on students. In

TABLE 4

Examples of Student Activities

	Students
Planning	• Survey student involvement in service activities (e.g., individuals and student groups) • Survey student attitudes toward service and service learning • Identify students for service learning planning group and advisory committee

Awareness	• Distribute information about service learning (e.g., newspaper articles, posters, brochures, student orientation) • Inform counselors about service learning • Arrange presentations to student organizations
Prototype	• Recruit students for prototype course(s)
Resources	• Publicize service learning courses (e.g., class schedule, counselors) • Establish service learning scholarships • Secure money for service learning course assistants and site coordinators
Expansion	• Establish a broad offering of service learning courses, including required general education courses, sequential courses, and interdisciplinary courses • Include past students from service learning courses in the recruitment of new students • Create course assistant and site coordinator positions for students • Develop 4th credit option for students to design "independent" service learning components • Offer service learning minor • Involve students in the development of service learning courses and related activities (e.g., workshops, focus groups, state organizations, conferences)
Recognition	• Publicize recipients of student scholarships that recognize service • Write letters of recommendation for students involved in service • Nominate students for local, regional, and national recognitions and awards • Create co-curricular transcript
Monitoring	• Collect data on student involvement (e.g., enrollment, withdrawal rates)
Evaluation	• Evaluate service learning courses (e.g., student satisfaction, learning outcomes, retention)
Research	• Conduct research on student service learning experiences • Promote student involvement in action research
Institutionalization	• Consistently high enrollment in service learning courses • Widespread use of 4th credit option • Service learning is part of student culture

addition, research may also be directed at student outcomes (for example, cognitive, affective, behavioral, social) that document the impact of service learning.

One effective means for expansion of service learning is the "4th credit option" implemented at Georgetown University and the Lowell Bennion Center at the University of Utah. This allows students to propose a contract with any instructor to do service learning for additional academic credit on an individual basis. This option empowers students to initiate service learning experiences and encourages faculty to experiment with service learning on a small scale.

Delve, Mintz,, and Stewart [11] provide an example of a student development model that identifies the following five phases of involvement in service learning: (a) exploration (naive excitement), (b) clarification (values clarification), (c) realization (insight into the meaning of service), (d) activation (participation and advocacy), and (e) internalization (the service experience influences career and life choices). A mature service learning curriculum will promote this type of student development through coordinated course sequences and assessment of student outcomes

Institutionalization of service learning for students is reflected in extensive use of the 4th credit option, widespread faculty interest in service learning and student enrollment in service learning classes, curricula integrated around service learning, student assessment related to service learning activities, service learning that is part of the institution's general education curriculum [22], student recruitment to the campus because of service learning curricula, increased retention of students due to service learning, and a student culture that accepts and promotes service and service

Community

Although interactions between the university and their communities are integral to any university [9, 25], building these interactions into partnerships is a matter of time and commitment of resources [12]. According to Ruch and Trani [27], three characteristics identify effective university-community relationships: (a) the interaction is mutually beneficial to the university and the community, (b) the interaction is guided by institutional choice and strategy, and (c) the interaction is one of value and import to both partners. Universities must provide strong leadership, articulate clear goals, and maintain supportive institutional policies to develop these partnerships

Community representatives need to be involved in planning service learning programs (see Table 5). However, representation is difficult because it prompts such questions as, "Who should be represented? Which communities? Agencies? Funding sources? Clients? Neighborhoods? Government?" The appropriate constituencies may not be identifiable prior to program and course development. Under these circumstances, those who are planning service learning programs must

TABLE 5	
Examples of Community Activities	
	Community

Planning	• Survey existing university/ community partnerships • Identify community representatives for service learning planning group and advisory committee
Awareness	• Distribute information on service learning (e.g., newsletter, brochure) • Initiate meetings and site visits with agency personnel • Educate agency personnel on differences between voluntary service and service learning
Prototype	• Collaborate with agency personnel to develop prototype course(s)
Resources	• Compile list of agencies interested in service learning • Compile community needs assessments (e.g., United Way community needs assessment) • Secure money for site-based student coordinators • Write a community agency resource manual on the universities policies and procedures for service learning courses
Expansion	• Initiate community workshops and discussions on service learning • Increase involvement of agency personnel in course design and universitylevel service learning activities • Explore new service learning opportunities • Collaborate with community agencies on programming, grant proposals, and conferences
Recognition	• Sponsor recognition events for agencies and agency personnel • Publicize community partnerships in local media
Monitoring	• Monitor training and supervision of students at agency • Maintain records of student and faculty involvement at agency
Evaluation	• Assess impact of service learning activities on meeting agency and client needs
Research	• Collaborate with agencies on action research projects
Institutionalization	• Faculty are formally involved with agency (e.g., consultant, board of directors) • Agency personnel are formally involved with university (e.g., team teach course, campus committees) • Agencies allocate additional resources to support and train student volunteers

their best approximation at representation and acknowledge that adjustments may be necessary as the program evolves. Staff from agencies with extensive volunteer support programs and with

experience in service learning (for example, prototype course) may be good choices. Agency staff are assumed to be adequate representatives of the communities and clients served by that agency. However, if only agency personnel are represented, an additional concern is that there may not be adequate representation from clients and community members.

Even community agencies that have extensive experience with volunteers may not know about the nature of service learning and how the differences between service learning and voluntary service are important to their responsibilities. Thus, formal and informal education about service learning is important for site supervisors, directors of volunteer services, and agency directors.

Communities need to participate in guiding the identification of service activities at a macro level (for example, United Way community needs assessment) and a micro level (for example, a particular course). An office of service learning provides an important function of cataloging and linking constituencies and resources as service learning courses are developed. In turn, the office should monitor and evaluate community placements. As previously mentioned, the aspiration is that the university and segments of the community develop partnerships. Evidence that a stable, meaningful, and mature partnership is evolving would include continuity in the relationships across time, consensus that mutual needs are being met, collaboration in advocacy and grant proposals, formal and informal participation by the agency staff in the university context (for example, team teaching), and formal and informal participation by the faculty, alumni, and students in the agency (for example, advocacy, board of directors,

Conclusions

Virtually all universities are interested in committing their resources to develop effective citizenship among their students, to address complex needs in their communities through the application of knowledge, and to form creative partnerships between the university and the community. Service learning provides one means through which students, faculty, and administrators can strive toward these aspirations.

The Comprehensive Action Plan for Service Learning (CAPSL) provides a heuristic for guiding the development of a service learning program in higher. education. It does so by concentrating efforts on four constituencies that must be considered in implementing a service learning program and by providing a means for developing strategic plans that address each constituency. In addition, CAPSL provides a means for assessing) for each constituency, the developmental status of a service learning program. Although this agenda may appear daunting, assembling a team from the constituencies and prioritizing objectives can make the work more manageable.

As a general guide, CAPSL only specifies the goal at each step (for example, increase awareness among students). This is both an advantage and a disadvantage of the model. On the positive side, it is general enough that the execution of each cell can be tailored to local conditions. Unfortunately, for the same reason, it is not possible to detail how each step can be successfully accomplished at a particular university, although some suggestions and examples are provided. It is possible to take the sequence of activities from the whole CAPSL model (that is, planning through institutionalization) and apply it to any cell in the matrix (for exam le research by faculty). Regardless of how CAPSL is used it does provide guidance for planned development and evaluation of service learning programs.

Notes

'Campus Compact, c/o Brown University, Box 1975, Providence, Rhode Island 02912 (401) 863-1119.

References

1. Astin, A. W. "Student Involvement in Community Service: Institutional Commitment and the Campus Compact." Paper presented at the meeting of the California Campus Compact, Los Angeles, December 1990.

2. Barber, B. R. "A Mandate for Liberty: Requiring Education-based Community Service." *The Responsive Community (Spring 1991).*

3. Barber, B. R., and R. M. Battistoni (Eds.). *Educating for Democracy.* Dubuque, Iowa: Kendall/ Hunt, 1994.

4. Boss, J. A. "The Effect of Community Service Work on the Moral Development of College Ethics Students." *Journal of Moral Education,* forthcoming.

5. Boyer, E. "Creating the New American College." *Chronicle of Higher Education, 9* March 1994, A48.

6. Bringle, R. G., and J. A. Hatcher. "A Service-Learning Curriculum for Faculty." *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning,* forthcoming.

7. Bringle, R. G.-and J. F. Kremer. "An Evaluation of an Intergenerational ServiceLearning Project for Undergraduates." *Educational Gerontologist, 19 (1993), 407*416.

8. Cohen, J., and D. Kinsey. '.,,Doing Good' and Scholarship: A Service-Learning Study." *Journalism Educator* (Winter 1994), 4-14.

9. Colon, M., M. Kennedy, and M. Stone. "A Metropolitan University and Community Development.'" *Metropolitan Universities, 1 (1990-91), 61-74.*

10. Deci, E. L., and R. M. Ryan. "Intrinsic Motivation to Teach: Possibilities and Obstacles in Our Colleges and Universities." In *Motivating Professors to Teach Effectively,* edited by J. L. Bess, PP. 27-35. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1982.

11. Delve, C. I., S. D. Mintz, and G. M. Stewart. "Promoting Values Development through Community Service: A Design." *In Community Service as Values Educa*tion, edited by C. I. Delve, S. D. Mintz, and G. M. Stewart, pp. 7-29. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1990.

12. Dore, J. "A City and Its Universities: A Mayor's Perspective." *Metropolitan Universities, 1* (1990), 29-35.

13. Farmer, D. W. "Strategies for Change." *In Managing Change in Higher Educa*tion, edited by D. W. Steeples, pp. 7-17. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1990.

14. Giles, D., Jr. "National Service-Learning Research Project." *National Society for Experiential Education Quarterly* (Spring 1994), 11.

15. Giles, D. E., Jr., and J. Eyler. "The Impact of a College Community Service Laboratory on Students' Personal, Social, and Cognitive Outcomes." *Journal of Adolescence, 17 (1994), 327- 339.*

16. Giles, D., E. P. Honnet, and S. Migliore (Eds.). *Research Agenda for Combining Service and Learning in the 1990s.* Raleigh, N.C.: National Society for Internships and Experiential Education, *199 1.*

17. Golden, D. C, B. 0. Pregliasco, and M. J. Clemons. "Community Service: New Challenges for a Metropolitan University." *Metro olitan Universities, 4 (1993), p* 61-70.

18. Jacoby, B. "Adapting the Institution to Meet the Needs of Commuter Students." *Metropolitan Universities, 1 (1990), 61-71.*

19. Keller, G. *Academic Strategy: The Management Revolution in Higher Education.* Baltimore, Md.: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1983.

20. Kupiec, T. Y. (Ed.). *Rethinking Tradition: Integrating Service with Academic Study on College Campuses.* Denver, Colo.: Education Commission of the States, *1993.*

2 1. Markus, G. B., J. P. F. Howard, and D. C. King. "Integrating Community Service and Classroom Instruction Enhances Learning: Results from an Experiment." Ed*ucational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 15 (1993), 410-419.*

22. Mentkowski, M., and G. Rogers. "Connecting Education, Work, and Citizenship." *Metropolitan Universities, 4 (1993), 34-46.*

23. Muse, W. V. "A Catalyst for Economic Development." *Metropolitan Universities, 1 (1990), 79- 88.*

24. O'Brien, E. M. "Outside the Classroom: Students as Employees, Volunteers, and Interns." *Research Brief, 4 (1993), 1-12.*

25. Perlman, D. H. "Diverse Communities: Diverse Involvements." *Metropolitan Universities, 1 (1990), 89-100.*

26. Rubin, S. G. "Community Service and Metropolitan Universities." *Metropolitan Universities, 2 (1991), 47-57.*

27. Ruch, C. P., and E. P. Trani. "Scope and Limitations of Community Interactions." *Metropolitan Universities, 1 (1990-91), 27-39.*

28. Schmidtlein, F. A. "Responding to Diverse Institutional Issues: Adapting Strategic Planning Concepts. " In *Adapting Strategic Planning to Campus Realities,* edited by F. A. Schmidtlein and B. H. Milton (pp. 83-93). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1990.

29. Schuh, J. H., R. E. Andreas, and C. C. Strange. "Students at Metropolitan Universities." *Metropolitan Universities, 2* (1991), 64-74.

30. Steeples, D. *W. Successful Strategic Planning: Case Studies. San* Francisco: JosseyBass, 1988.

31. Tierney, W. G. (Ed.). *Assessing Academic Climates and Cultures.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1990.

32. Velo, P. M., and R. G. Bringle. "Matching Empathy with Concrete and Abstract Reasons to Promote Volunteerism." Paper presented at the 13th Mid-American Undergraduate Psychology Research Conference, Evansville, Ind., April 1994.

33. Wood, R. J. "Changing the Educational Program." In *Managing Change in Higher Education,* edited by D. W. Steeples (pp. 51-58). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, *1990.*