Deepening the Institutionalization of Service-Learning: The Added Value of Assessing the Social Return of Investment

Kathleen Stanton-Nichols, Julie Hatcher, and Amanda Cecil

Abstract

Strategies to institutionalize service-learning are well documented (Furco 1996; Holland, 2000). Using Kecskes (2009) Community-Engaged Department Rubric we evaluated service-learning institutionalization within a school at a metropolitan campus. As a result, we propose adding an additional dimension, social return on investment. This added dimension helps academic leaders to understand the benefits, for a variety of stakeholders, of investing in service-learning and more broadly in campus-community partnerships. Implications and recommendations are offered to replicate this analysis.

Over the past two decades, American higher education has come to value service-learning as an effective high impact teaching strategy (Finley n.d.), and this teaching strategy is now considered a core component of community engagement (Reich 2014). There is solid evidence of the steady growth of this pedagogy across institutional types (Fitzgerald 2010) and disciplines over the past twenty years (Campus Compact 2012). In the United States, this growth is perhaps best captured through the Carnegie Elective Classification for Community Engagement (Driscoll 2008). Yet, similar growth has occurred internationally, and understanding the variations of how this teaching strategy is institutionalized in higher education is an emerging area of comparative study (Gelmon et al. 2004).

As noted by Holland (2000), the degree to which universities, schools, and departments are engaged in service-learning varies based on institutional leadership, type, mission, and resources. Understanding the mechanisms that support the growth and institutionalization of service-learning at the campus level is well documented (Bringle and Hatcher 1996; Furco 1996; Holland 2000). There is less clarity as to the implications of growth at the departmental or school level. Building primarily upon the work of Furco's conceptualization of institutional change, Kecskes developed a rubric for evaluating departmental support structures for service-learning (Kecskes, 2009).

The current case study uses the Community-Engaged Department Rubric (CEDR) (Kecskes, 2009) to assess the level of institutionalization of service-learning within the School of Physical Education and Tourism Management (PETM) at Indiana University-

Purdue University Indianapolis (IUPUI). Our initial goal was to assess our strengths, identify gaps, and make recommendations as to how to improve our work as a faculty going forward. However, with success and growth in service-learning in PETM, there are new challenges and opportunities that we face. There is heightened emphasis on our campus (thus, in our school) to serve as an anchor institution to facilitate both community and economic development (Taylor and Luter 2013). Decline in state funding has, in part, contributed to a stagnate budget to support community engagement at both the campus and school level, and within our school, we have limited faculty and staff resources to support service-learning. Increasingly, we work within a context of increased emphasis on faculty research productivity. Many faculty remain dedicated to using service-learning, yet we wonder to what extent our investment is producing returns for all stakeholders (e.g., students, faculty, administration, and community). Prior to this analysis, we asked ourselves a set of fundamental and somewhat "nagging" questions:

- How do we track and know the scope of what our faculty is doing in terms of service-learning specifically and community partnerships more broadly?
- How well are we currently doing, and what do we need to collectively do as faculty to improve our practice going forward?
- Has our investment in service-learning generated sufficient returns in terms of benefits for various stakeholders (e.g., student learning, faculty scholarship, school mission, alumni support, community partners)?

Utilizing Kecskes' (2009) CEDR, we examined school-based evidence to assess service-learning institutionalization levels in our school. CEDR contains six dimensions: 1) mission and culture, 2) faculty support, 3) community partner support, 4) student support, 5) organizational support, and 6) leadership support. This rubric was previously utilized in other departmental analysis (Beere, Votruba, and Wells 2011) and provided meaningful and accurate dimensions for evaluation. A further discussion of the CEDR is provided in later sections of this article. Characteristics within each dimension guided our assessment and helped identify steps to deepen our practice. Subsequently, we discovered a critical gap in the CEDR: no dimension existed within CEDR to assess the "social return on investment" of service-learning, particularly from a campus-community partnership perspective.

In developing the social return on investment (SROI), we specifically examined work done in Canada which will be discussed in detail in the later part of the article (http://www.sroi-canada.ca). The proposed dimension includes five components (i.e., community cohesion, quality of life, social networks and capacity building, social inclusion, health). We recommend that this new dimension be added to the Kecskes' framework, arguing its necessity, particularly in the context of competing demands for faculty time and increased community engagement. This case study presents an example of how schools can assess the institutionalization of service-learning as well as examine social return on investment.

Campus Context for Community Engagement

The School of Physical Education and Tourism Management is located on a campus that is highly engaged and recognized for its practice and scholarship on service-

learning. Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis (IUPUI) is a metropolitan campus and this urban location affords opportunity for an array of campus-community partnerships. The campus is comprised of twenty-one different schools and includes a strong tradition of practice-based education across the professions. The campus has been recognized nationally (e.g., Carnegie Elective Classification for Community Engagement, Presidential Honor Roll for Community Engagement, *U.S. News & World Report*) for its commitment to service-learning and community engagement. The campus mission of civic engagement, current strategic plan, annual performance indicators, and goals for undergraduate learning are well aligned with community-based learning strategies.

The Center for Service and Learning (CSL), now in its twenty-second year, is the centralized unit charged with cultivating a campus culture of community engagement among students, faculty, staff, and alumni. The CSL now reports to the Vice Chancellor for Community Engagement and is comprised of nine full-time staff as well as graduate students to support program implementation, research, and scholarship. CSL staff support the development of service-learning courses at the undergraduate and graduate level by working with faculty, academic staff, and instructional teams from each of the schools on campus. Consultations with instructors focus on course design, assessment, reflection strategies, partnerships, and the scholarship of teaching and learning. Consultations with teams of faculty focus on curricular change and sequencing courses within the program or major to reach targeted academic and civic outcomes. CSL faculty development programs include workshops, faculty learning communities (e.g., Boyer Scholars, Community Partner Scholars, Public Scholars), the Engaged Department Initiative, and the Engaged Scholars Roundtable Series. CSL conducts research on service-learning, civic outcomes, and partnerships, and each summer hosts the IUPUI Service Learning Research Academy to support scholarship and research on service-learning and community engagement (see www.csl.iupui.edu for further information).

The CSL offers a variety of funding streams to support faculty. These include curriculum development grants, travel stipends to support attendance and presentations at national conferences, and scholarship funds for Service Learning Assistants through the Sam H. Jones Community Service Scholarship Program. Faculty can apply for a Service Learning Assistant to support them in implementing service-learning courses, conducting community-based research, or providing professional service to a community organization (see http://csl.iupui.edu for further information about these various programs).

CSL also manages the Community-Based Learning Inventory, and annually instructors are asked to upload information about their service-learning courses. This inventory provides important data about service-learning for both the campus and for each school (http://csl. iupui.edu/about/campus-reports/index.shtml). This data is used for annual reports and for understanding organizational capacity for service-learning. The inventory asks faculty to provide information on a) service-learning courses (e.g., number of students, service hours contributed, required vs. optional service component), b) community partners (e.g., name of organizations, types of services provided, zip codes), and c) instructional design and

implementation (e.g., faculty appointment type, reflection components, patterns of communication with community partners). Annual report data from the Community-Based Learning Inventory was used to evaluate school-based institutionalization.

The use of service-learning as a high impact teaching practice (Finley n.d.) varies among faculty in each of the schools on campus, with the highest participation rates in the School(s) of Business, Liberal Arts, and Physical Education and Tourism Management *(http://csl.iupui.edu/doc/annual%20report/2012-13-highlights.pdf)*. According to campus data gathered through the National Survey of Student Engagement, our students report higher participation rates than both our peer institutions and the national average (Hahn and Hatcher 2013). For freshmen at IUPUI, 56 percent report participating in service-learning compared to the national average of 41percent; for seniors 58 percent report participating compared to the national average of 48 percent.

School Context for Service-Learning

The School of Physical Education and Tourism Management (PETM) is comprised of two departments, Kinesiology and Tourism Conventions and Event Management (TCEM). The school has approximately 1,246 undergraduates with 944 in kinesiology and 302 in TCEM. As students matriculate through the curriculum, they have multiple service-learning, community-based research, and scholarship of engagement experiences. As evidenced by data in the CSL Annual Dean's Report, the school has considerable breadth and depth in service-learning courses and community-based participatory research (Table 1). For example, in 2011-2012, kinesiology and TCEM taught thirty-four and twenty-six service-learning courses respectively, students contributed over 40,000 hours to the community, and courses ranged from entry to pre-graduation levels with the majority of service-learning courses offered at the 200 level (for most students their second year of coursework). Approximately sixteen faculty, representing 53 percent of faculty in the school (e.g., tenured, tenure-lined, lecturers, clinical) teach service-learning courses. Faculty engaged with a diverse range of community partners and within a diverse range of community-based settings including public schools, nonprofit organizations, local businesses, and on-campus community programs.

Table 1. School of Physical Education and Tourism Management Service-Learning Course by Level.

Class Level	# of Classes	Service Hours
100	2	290
200	26	28,513
300	17	2,680
400	15	9,642
Grad	n/a	n/a

Data for Table 1 and the following tables was provided by the CSL annual dean's report, 2011-12. Additional data collected for reaccreditation and program reviews in

2008 and 2011 was used in this analysis. Data from these reports indicate that there is general consensus among our faculty that service-learning has improved student professional competencies, and the concept of service-learning "fits" well within both fields of kinesiology and tourism management. Both kinesiology and TCEM could be considered "service-oriented" fields to some degree. Although broad in scope, aspects of each discipline align well with community engagement to support student learning. As an essential dimension to enact the mission and vision of the school, service-learning is a routine part of a larger discussion regarding student-learning outcomes and an ongoing aspect of curriculum planning. Faculty members receive administrative support (e.g., graduate students) or funding for service-learning related projects. Summarily, the dean and department chairs recognize the contribution that service-learning offers.

Kinesiology. Kinesiology is a broad term meaning the study of human movement and is represented by disciplines such as physical education, teacher education, adapted physical activity, biomechanics, exercise physiology, and motor development. Kinesiology majors seek degrees in teacher education or pursue post-graduation training in physical therapy, occupational therapy, sports medicine, or personal training. All kinesiology fields require specific clinical skills (e.g., exercise prescription, teacher competency) and many students are required to pass disciplinary certifications to pursue their chosen field.

The kinesiology department offers on average seven service-learning courses per semester. These courses allow faculty to assess student knowledge, skills, abilities, and dispositions that are measured as part of their professional competencies. Physical education teacher education students are evaluated on six professional standards while participating in service-learning, and those seeking a degree in exercise science must pass specific American College of Sports Medicine knowledge, skills, and abilities competencies. Community-engaged learning settings allow kinesiology students to apply clinical skills (e.g., teaching, exercise testing) to a specific population and allows for broader measures such as disposition, instructional delivery, and cultural competence (Peterson, Judge, and Pierce 2012; Domangue and Carson 2008). The ability to develop specific clinical skills is vital to kinesiology students' career success. The Department of Kinesiology has worked with local public schools, family and children with disabilities, health care providers, and after-school programs.

Tourism, Conventions and Event Management. "Service" in the hospitality, tourism, and event professions is a common term, typically used to refer to an interaction between a guest/attendee and service provider (e.g., hotel front desk worker, restaurant server, cab driver). Providing good service is a trained process that combines technical and interpersonal skills to ensure the visitor has a positive and memorable experience (Powers and Barrows 2003). According to Koppel, Kavanaugh, and Van Dyke (2004) the overall goal of service-learning is to broaden students' understanding of the community and industry role in making any community a better place to live and visit beyond their immediate work environment. The Department of TCEM also aspires that students exhibit competencies that focus on problem-solving, teamwork, and conflict resolution (Christou 2002). This requires that future professionals demonstrate, at a high-level, the ability to work with people of different races, ethnicities, and religions

and work within the context of local, national, and international societies. Notably, while existing forms of experiential education put an emphasis on the technical preparation of students, service-learning adds a broader set of educational goals that are focused on the professional's civic orientation to their work and lives. The Department of TCEM partners with the Indiana State Museum, Indiana Senior Games, and other small destinations, event organizers, and groups bringing event tourism to Indianapolis.

Community-Engaged Department Rubric

Academic leaders are essential to advancing curricular change, but the buy-in from faculty within departments is fundamental to sustaining initiatives across time (Langseth, Plater, and Dillon 2004). Campus Compact, a coalition of more than 1,100 colleges and universities, endorses the idea of departments as a critical force in institutionalization. Through resources such as the Engaged Department Toolkit (Battistoni et al. 2003) and Engaged Department Institutes sponsored by national and state Campus Compacts (e.g., California, Indiana, Maine, Michigan, New Hampshire, Vermont), there was a shift in strategy and focus from individual faculty as change agents to the collective action of faculty through departmental change initiatives (Kecskes 2006). The Community-Engaged Department Rubric (CEDR) was designed to assess department level community engagement (Kecskes 2009). The CEDR has six dimensions abbreviated as mission, faculty support, community partner support, student support, organizational support, and leadership support. The six dimensions outline specific characteristics that articulate and define each dimension. Four stages of the rubric (i.e., Awareness Building, Critical Mass Building, Quality Building, Institutionalization) allow for each dimension to be assessed along a continuum.

The CEDR is designed as a tool for teams of faculty to collectively assess present level engagement and to identify action steps to deepen the integration of service-learning into the curriculum. There are many examples of how others have used the CEDR in both assessment and research. Chadwick and Pawlowski (2007) utilized this departmental rubric to study Creighton University's context and growth in service-learning courses. Beere, Votruba, and Wells (2011) gave examples of how the rubric was used to measure faculty productivity, department engagement, and student progress. Recently, Eddy, Randall, and Schmalstig (2014) published a three-year report on service-learning effectiveness in STEM fields at California State University (CSU). Using Kecskes' rubric, the CSU campuses reported cross-campus integration of service-learning effectiveness highlighting course development, faculty research and presentations, and departmental grants. We found the rubric to be compelling for our use in evaluation of our school, in part, because of its previous utilization, but perhaps more importantly its holistic measurement of community engagement (e.g., community partners).

Evaluation of data took place within the framework of the school level. Two authors are faculty in the school, and they were primarily involved in collecting, assessing, and evaluating service-learning efforts and data, although certain examples will be department specific. The two faculty are highly-engaged in service-learning pedagogy, were both Boyer Scholars through the Center for Service and Learning (CSL), and each

has been instrumental in navigating school and departmental curriculum changes to address community engagement. One has developed and administered two community-engaged clinical programs for the past twenty years and also serves as a senior scholar at the CSL. The third author works at the campus level as executive director of the CSL.

The authors used a relatively unhampered operationalization procedure gathering and condensing existing data and generating new data for this analysis. Data collected from a 2008 and 2011 program review were used as well as existing course, faculty, and community partner data from the CSL Inventory. All data were initially relevant whether the number of courses labeled as service-learning courses or the number of faculty-reported community partners. The authors also utilized existing resources, such as CSL annual reports as well as collecting new evidence (e.g., student focus groups, administrator interviews). Each CEDR dimension included relative examples that schools could consider as evidence of meeting specific levels of the dimension. The authors examined evidence holistically before considering specific dimensional attributes and then discussed examples to determine where or if the evidence supported CEDR dimensions and, if so, at what level. This process was repeated several times before coming to consensus on the final evaluation.

Social Return on Investment

As we evaluated the school's service-learning institutionalization, we noted that there were some aspects of campus-community partnerships not captured in the CEDR. From our perspective, to capture community engagement benefits or mutually beneficial outcomes, the CEDR needed an added dimension. Strong partnerships with community organizations are the bedrock for effective service-learning (Jacoby 2014). A full range of partnerships provides an essential network between students, faculty, administrators, community organizations, and residents to support and sustain good service-learning practice (Bringle, Clayton, and Price 2009). Like relationships, partnerships have a range of qualities, from transactional to transformative, yet working toward mutually beneficial outcomes is part of best practice in service-learning course design (Bringle and Hatcher 2002).

To capture the added and reciprocal value derived from campus-community partnerships through service-learning, we initially explored the concept of return on investment. Return on investment (ROI) is a metric used to evaluate the financial consequences of investments. In business, ROI typically measures profitability by asking the questions, "What does a business receive in relation to what it spends?" or "Do the returns and profits justify the costs and investments?" However, valuation metrics that are purely monetary in nature may not be the best measure for service-learning investment because these values communicate cost versus value. For example, the CSL currently uses the independent sector estimate for the value of an hour of volunteering, currently $23.07 per hour (Independent Sector 2014) to estimate the economic contribution of hours contributed through service-learning courses. While this is a useful proxy for economic value, it does not attempt to capture how the program adds value to the community organization.

We propose that a more useful metric for service-learning that captures added value is *social return on investment* (SROI). In the nonprofit sector, SROI is used to determine social, environmental, and economic impacts that an organization has on its community. According to the Roberts Foundation (http://redf.org/what-we-do/invest/), SROI analysis measures community changes that result from investment that are subsequently valued by organizations and people. What is markedly different about SROI compared to ROI is the definition of return. Emerson, Wachowicz, and Chun (Unite for Sight n.d.) state that social value or return cannot be reduced simply to economic or socio-economic terms; rather returns are defined through their intrinsic value. Social value is created when "resources, inputs, processes or policies are combined to generate improvements in the lives of individuals or society as a whole" (http://hbswk.hbs.edu/archive/1957.html). Improvements include products (e.g., community garden, tutoring program, website design) but is also about outcomes such as a community's cultural identity, improvement in quality of life, and residential access to services where none was previously available.

Metrics of SROI are not easily reduced to economic value associated with investment. In fact, measuring SROI proves to be quite complicated. Previous metrics of SROI focused on social entrepreneurship that focused on resource creation or processes that result in cost savings for public systems. Others, like the New Economics Foundation (http://www.neweconomics.org/issues/entry/social-return-on-investment) have proposed examining an investment over a period of time in relation to capital structure that is developed to support the investment. This idea can be analyzed further considering cost-savings or value-added approaches (e.g., service being provided that only exists as a result of the social investment). Driscoll, Holland, Gelmon, and Kerrigan (1996) stated returns can also be university-based such as increased enrollment, better graduate placement, improved learning and scholarship, and increased media attention. Although the metrics of SROI might be complicated, the lesser approach to not considering the added intrinsic value or improvement resulting from investment is equally unattractive. We argue that SROI is a useful metric for evaluating the level of school engagement and how service-learning contributes to social value and quality of life, and provides services in community-based settings that would not otherwise exist.

SROI as a New CEDR Dimension

Social return on investment capitalizes on added value; change that when added is valued by stakeholders. It is a stakeholder driven form of evaluation and, therefore, evaluation metrics may vary. However, several resources emphasize stakeholder involvement, mapping outcomes, and establishing impact (http://socialventures.com.au/assets/SROI-Lessons-learned-in-Australia.pdf). Because SROI is not currently considered in the CEDR we propose adding this important dimension. Our literature review on SROI surfaced many different metrics used to evaluate SROI, however, one stood out containing metrics for both campus and community engagement.

SROI Canada (http://sroi-canada.ca) identifies seven elements by which social return on investment can be measured: community cohesion, graduation rates, job placement, quality of life, expanded social networks, social inclusion, and improved health. After

careful consideration of these elements, we found replication amongst the observable metrics and condensed seven dimensions into the five dimensions described below (see Table 4 for further information). For example, it seemed rather reductionist to consider only graduation rates in a single dimension when rates could be related to quality of life. Similar to the approach taken by Kecskes (2009) in the CEDR, we identified characteristics that are representative of each SROI dimension. We have defined and described these elements below and Table 4 describes elemental characteristics along the continuum.

Community cohesion represents the idea that people from different backgrounds can live together peacefully with decreased conflict and increased sense of community (http://www.cohesioninstitute.org.uk/Resources/Toolkits/Health/TheNatureof CommunityCohesion). Schools or departments could measure how they assist community strategic development such as building community vision or relationships that are developed in the workplace, schools, and neighborhoods. Schools could consider evidence such as faculty who sit on community advisory boards and use their expertise to facilitate decision-making. Also included could be community-based participatory research projects whose purpose is increased cohesion.

Quality of life (QOL) is defined as the general well-being of individuals and societies that can include social, emotional, as well as physical health parameters (http://www. healthypeople.gov/2020/about/foundation-health-measures/Health-Related-Quality-of-Life-and-Well-Being). Characteristics of QOL could include community programs that focus on mental health services or exercise programs that focus on physical well-being. As a metric, we argue that the Canadian elements of graduation rates and job placement should be collapsed into QOL. One could argue that community well-being is a direct result of individual well-being. Schools could evaluate departmental community-engaged programs from an aspect of QOL (e.g., medical students provide new outpatient services at community-based free clinics, health indicators of community residents improve as a result of a service-learning program), but could also report on more simple measures such as number of patients served or change in community health indicators.

The third characteristic of SROI is expanded social networks. Perhaps the most unique SROI characteristic, expanded social network capitalizes on helping communities build their social network profile. This may include website development, capitalizing on social networks to build advertising profiles, or helping increase awareness through social media campaigns. Each of these possibilities may enhance the community's ability to build their "capacity" through new relationships, social ties, or service growth. Added to the CEDR, schools may be able to identify substantial product measures to demonstrate expanded community networks (e.g., website development, social profiles, marketing materials, etc.).

Characteristic four, social inclusion, stresses individual inclusivity. According to Cappo (2005), "inclusive society is defined as one where all people feel valued, their differences are respected, and their basic needs are met so they can live in dignity"

(http://www.healthyplaces.org.au/userfiles/file/Social%20Inclusion%20June09.pdf).
The opposite of social inclusion is being excluded from social, economic, political,
and cultural systems. Social inclusion is fundamentally based the education of those
less powerful (e.g., minorities, people with disabilities). We argue that social inclusion
is linked to but distinct from QOL measures. Service-learning courses done in
partnership with community organizations would focus on empowerment or addressing
disparity issues. We propose that social inclusion has both input and output measures
to reflect institutionalization. Schools could help communities identify areas where
social inclusion is lacking and build out partnerships to address such issues.

The last element in the SROI dimension is health. For the sake of this proposed
dimension, health relates to communities and individuals (e.g., global and specific). As
with other dimensions of SROI, health has links to quality of life and capacity
building. However, as a measure of social return, we propose that health be linked to
disparities encountered by communities and individuals who benefit from campus-
community partnerships.

Assessing Institutionalization of Service-Learning

To determine our school's level of service-learning institutionalization we used
Kecskes (2009) Community-Engaged Department Rubric (CEDR). Assessment of
institutionalization using the CEDR occurs by evaluating evidence across four
different stages or ratings: 1) Awareness Building, 2) Critical Mass Building, 3)
Quality Building, and 4) Institutionalization. Awareness Building represents the initial
stages of community engagement. Faculty may be thinking about how best to conduct
community engagement, but there is little to no departmental support (faculty,
institutional, partnerships) for implementation. Awareness Building also suggests
departments are not collecting community engagement data nor are they actively
engaged in monitoring or assessing student engagement. Faculty leadership is neither
present nor represented in departmental review processes (e.g., tenure and promotion)
and "influential faculty" (as noted in the rubric) are not involved in community
engagement at this stage.

Stage two, Critical Mass Building, is characterized by "movement towards"
understanding of community engagement. For example, mission and culture
characteristics suggest departments have a generally accepted notion of community-
engaged teaching and service but not an articulate definition. A small number of
faculty are involved in community engagement, and partnerships are building but not
sustained. Involved faculty have leadership roles within the unit and may also be
involved in other national activities.

As departments move toward stage three of institutionalization described as Quality
Building, a distinct jump from "some to many" is noticeable. Department mission
directly mentions community engagement, faculty are involved in assessing

community-engaged activity and are also supported through funding sources and/or sabbaticals to perform community-engaged research. Community partners are involved in departmental decision-making regarding community-engaged work (e.g., student involvement and assessment). Lastly, Quality Building is also recognized in academic promotion and review. Department promotion and tenure documentation explicitly states scholarship of teaching and learning or public scholarship, and there are well-recognized leaders among the faculty.

Institutionalization represents departments that have a sustained level of engagement and involvement. Departments at this fourth stage have a well-accepted definition of community engagement, and faculty, regardless of their personal involvement in community engagement, know and understand the benefits. Promotion and tenure processes allow for advancement in community engagement, and systematic assessment and evaluation efforts regarding community engagement are continuous. Institutionalization also represents efforts that are long-standing and supported by administration. The department highlights its community engagement in marketing materials and is celebrated for its engagement. Students are involved at many different curricular levels and are recognized for their involvement in community-engaged activities. Students may also be assisting faculty in research. At this stage, community partners can be provided incentives for involvement. Finally, community-engaged faculty are advocates for their work, nationally known, and serve as leaders within the university or their field.

We examined multiple pieces of evidence to evaluate the level of institutionalization across seven dimensions within the School of Physical Education and Tourism Management (PETM). We reviewed campus data provided by the CSL, data collected for reaccreditation and program reviews over the past seven years, information derived from two student focus groups, information from community-participant-focus-group data, interviews of ten engaged faculty, and an interview with the dean (see Table 6 for sample questions). Kecskes (2009) does not provide specific evaluation criteria for each ranking but rather gives examples of category content. Therefore, we considered examples of not only campus-community involvement but partnership length, regularity of student involvement, length of student involvement, as well as other factors such as social capital and cultural capital generated through service-learning courses (Flora and Flora 2005).

The following section summarizes our findings. As we examined our school's community-engaged work, determination of the stage of institutionalization was based upon clear examples of a majority characteristics (or lack thereof). For each of the CEDR dimensions (including the proposed addition of SROI), we provide evidentiary examples as well as recommended next steps to improve our community engagement practice.

Table 2. Estimated Economic Contribution by Students in Service-Learning Courses by Department.

Department	Sections	Enrollment	Service Hours	Service Hours in Dollars
Kinesiology	34	796	12,980	$282,834.20
TCEM	26	883	28,145	$613,279.55
Total	60	1679	41,125	$896,113.75

Dimension I: Mission and Culture. Based on the evidence reviewed, we evaluate this aspect of our school to be, overall, in the *quality building* phase of institutionalization. According to Kecskes (2009), dimension one of an engaged department involves mission and culture supporting community engagement. Based on the evidence, we concurred that our school's mission statement and culture are indicative of a high level of institutionalization as evidenced by the following:

> "The IU School of Physical Education and Tourism Management capitalizes on its rich history and unique location in downtown Indianapolis to prepare future leaders in kinesiology and tourism by translating theory into practice. The school's distinct culture and unique combination of disciplines foster innovative research, learning opportunities, and civic engagement that enhance quality of life and economic development of local, national and global communities."

However, specific definitions of community-engaged teaching, research, and service have not yet been established within the school. Although there is a campus definition of service-learning (Bringle and Hatcher 1996), the lack of a well understood definition of service-learning within the school has been an issue in course alignment with campus course coding policy (http://due.iupui.edu/center-for-coordinated-initiatives/iupui-rise-program). Taking the time to come to consensus on our definition could also centralize or highlight the school's context of service-learning such that faculty engage with the same understanding of service-learning.

The weakest component of our school's mission and culture is collective self-awareness and action. Institutionalization would suggest that our faculty collectively assess and evaluate engaged teaching, research, and service. Assessment and evaluation of engagement is currently done individually or when needed for an outside body (e.g., program evaluation, reaccreditation). These types of assessments are not systematic or collective within our school. To move our school closer to institutionalization, our school would benefit from formal annual assessment of service-learning outcomes. With a clear school-based definition of service-learning, outcomes could not only be course-based but also mission-based.

Dimension II: Faculty Support and Community Engagement. From the evidence under review, we rated this dimension overall as moving towards *institutionalization*. From faculty knowledge to involvement of tenured/tenure-track faculty, our school is

deeply committed to service-learning. Our school promotion and tenure guidelines include service-learning (e.g., course development or program implementation) as part of teaching excellence. As a result of participation in several campus initiatives (e.g., grants, faculty development workshops) faculty are knowledgeable about service-learning and community-engagement opportunities. Five faculty members have participated in the CSL Boyer Scholars Program and both kinesiology and TECM have involved teams of faculty in the Engaged Department Institute. These opportunities have translated into scholarly presentations on campus and at disciplinary conferences as well as academic publications (Judge et al. 2011; Wang, Fu, Cecil, and Avgoustis 2006). Many faculty have received funding for Service Learning Assistants and have successfully secured external grants to support service-learning programs and community-engaged research.

Dimension III: Community Partner and Partnership Support. From the evidence under review, we rated this dimension overall as *awareness building* in some characteristics or simply "not done" in others. Examination of community partnerships and community support yielded an uncomfortable awareness that while we have numerous partners, we do not collaborate in terms of community voice, access to resources, and incentives. Our partnerships, in some cases, are much more structural (e.g., placement) than they are collaborative, and, therefore, may not yield partners SROI in terms of cohesion, quality of life, and perhaps other factors as well. Partnership voice, shared resources, and recognition are not norms within our school. Evaluation for awareness building and beyond suggests that engaged departments routinely recognize partners as well as form advisory committees that help shape and grow partnerships.

While our school lacks formal recognition of community partners, many faculty are engaged in capacity building to support partners. For example, three community-engaged programs focused on disability and activity have formed an advisory committee that consists of community partners, faculty, and persons with disabilities. In this example, the committee is focused on increasing community programs and building funding sources. As a faculty, we need to focus our efforts on giving our partners more voice in terms of leadership and recognition. While individual faculty members collaborate, the school as a whole does not. Our school could benefit from a continuous assessment and evaluation of community partnerships such as having a staff member that regularly assesses our numerous service-learning programs or forming an advisory committee that routinely meets with our dean to provide guidance and voice to our community engagement.

Dimension IV: Student Support and Community Engagement. We evaluate student involvement, leadership, incentives, and recognition to be *institutionalized* in our school. Faculty commitment to service-learning provides students multiple opportunities (no less than one course per semester, typically in kinesiology) throughout their course curriculum. Students can also receive undergraduate research grants to assist faculty with community-based participatory research. Further incentives include Sam H. Jones Community Service Scholarships and campus recognition and awards (e.g., IUPUI Top 100 Students, William M. Plater Medallion for Civic Engagement).

Moving forward we could consider deepening our involvement by engaging more students in community-engaged research. This would align with the campus-wide community engagement Urban Health and Wellness Grand Challenges Research Initiative. Student involvement could be supported through undergraduate research funds or a new use of Service Learning Assistants focused on community-engaged research. Our school could also consider funding student research that assesses and evaluates programmatic outcomes of service-learning.

Dimension V: Organizational Support for Community Engagement. From the evidence under review, we rated this dimension overall as *quality building*. Institutional support for community engagement work is readily available for faculty and evidence of this support is visible in the school. The dean, associate dean, and program directors provide monetary support, space allocation and/or assistance with community space, and course development. Service-learning faculty are often supported by the dean and department chairs via course "buy-outs" and by graduate assistants for course and program management. Where our school is lacking in organizational efforts is in the areas of assessment and evaluation, long-term engagement planning, continued faculty involvement, scholarship, and dissemination of engagement efforts.

Our weakness, in part, is due to lack of long-term planning. Our community engagement perhaps superseded intention for these efforts. For example, engaged faculty report use of service-learning to enhance student learning and clinical skills but also see community connection necessary to build reciprocal learning relationships (Bringle and Hatcher 1996). As these relationships and learning opportunities expanded, neither faculty nor school administration developed plans for assessing and evaluating our long-term engagement as a school. We would benefit from strategic planning to develop specific goals and objectives as well as measurement criteria. Faculty could also consider specific student learning outcomes that reflected engagement as related to our school's mission.

Dimension VI: Leadership Support for Community Engagement. Based on review of the data, our school is *institutionalized* in department level leadership, yet we have not yet extended that leadership to the national level. Faculty find it difficult to extend their reach via campus and national work as teaching a service-learning course can be a time-consuming endeavor. Service-learning faculty are very familiar with publishing within their discipline, however, they lack the literature base within the field of community-engaged scholarship. The transition from disciplinary-based scholarship to scholarship on engagement can be very challenging. Our faculty may also find it difficult to feel confident using their community-engaged activities to seek promotion, however, this is less of a school-based issue than a campus understanding of "promotable community engagement." What is needed to encourage faculty leadership outside their discipline is the security that community engagement (or public scholarship) is supported by advancement (e.g., tenure and promotion) not just at the school level but at the campus level as well.

There is currently discussion and assessment at the campus-level relative to promotion and tenure guidelines. A new faculty learning community for public scholarship has been convened by CSL and academic affairs to examine how public scholarship can be more

entrenched in the tenure and promotion process rather than on the fray activities done by faculty but not considered worthy of scholarship. Our school does support and encourage faculty advancement in community engagement but could offer more structured mentorship to encourage faculty to seek advancement in community-engaged scholarship.

Dimension VII: Social Return on Investment. We rated this dimension overall as *critical mass building* with yet another emphasis on lack of formalized evidence/assessment processes to articulate our progress. However, our school does have several positive indicators of SROI specifically related to community cohesion, quality of life, and health.

Community cohesion, job prospects, social inclusion and improved health: Kinesiology has partnered with three public schools providing physical fitness assessment and training for the local community. The success of this partnership resulted in investment from both school districts and outside funding to purchase fitness equipment. The success of the partnership also moved the school to hire a coordinator to organize partnership efforts. Kinesiology will also celebrate twenty years of offering quality physical activity programming for individuals and families of individuals with disabilities. Such programming has impacted over 1,500 individuals.

Our school also has two centers that will centralize some of our community engagement efforts. The kinesiology center is focused on public health issues addressing the continued need for affordable activity options and the TCEM center is focused on building sports tourism in our local community. If realized in terms of community partners, research, and engagement efforts, both centers may enhance cohesion, network, and health as related to community returns.

Improved education levels: Professional development has extended to student preparation as well. Recently the Department of Kinesiology adopted a service-learning-based physical education curriculum. This newly formatted curriculum relies on service-learning programs and courses to build student disposition, content knowledge, and skills across the curriculum. The Department of TCEM also added a program outcome focused on civic engagement and tracking student growth in service-learning courses across the curriculum.

Conclusion

Conducting this analysis of the level of institutionalization of service-learning within our school was an invaluable process and will certainly impact the future of our school's community engagement. The utility of Kecskes' rubric was instrumental in our understanding of engagement in terms of our accomplishments to date and our future direction. We used the six dimensions of the Community Engaged Department Rubric (CEDR) to frame our analysis, in combination with the new dimension of *social return on investment*. Together, this yielded very practical guidance for what we need to do to deepen and improve our practice in service-learning and community engagement in the future. We would recommend, if replicated, consideration of all types of data – qualitative, quantitative, and informal. Curricular mapping and interviews of community partners are also highly recommended as significant data points. An undertaking of such

evaluation does require significant contribution from those involved but use of CEDR provides an excellent framework for understanding, evaluation, and analysis.

As we examined our investment in service-learning using the CEDR, the question remained: Did the investment yield value-added social returns? The answer is a resounding yes. Our school has made significant long-term fiscal investments and because of the school's service-learning commitment, our faculty, students, and community partners have benefitted. We have helped shaped institutional and community changes and have profoundly altered how to market our school and reward faculty.

Implications of this type of school analysis also exist for centralized units such as the Center for Service and Learning (CSL). Oftentimes, a centralized unit is charged to advance campus culture for community engagement. Rather than working one-on-one with faculty, a stronger organizational change approach would be tailor-made approaches for each school. As evidenced by this case study, a centralized inventory of community-based learning is one means to gather school-based data on courses, faculty, and community partners. This type of information is helpful to schools in terms of having output data readily available for reports, program review, grants, or scholarship. In addition, once a school has undertaken this type of intensive analysis, in partnership with the CSL and our administration, we could more effectively identify targeted programs and initiatives to address identified gaps.

The CEDR (Kecskes 2009) offers departments and schools generous criteria for service-learning and civic engagement evaluation. We found the rubric to be a very useful tool to assess service-learning investment and identify next steps for deepening engagement. In examining our own school, it was apparent our partnership investment had garnered returns difficult to evaluate with the CEDR, yet when measured considering SROI, we found considerable investment with regard to cohesion and impact. Perhaps measures of SROI effectiveness are reflective of our school discipline and culture. Highly engaged schools and departments should consider CEDR as an effective tool for evaluation, however, as written, CEDR lacks the means for assessing social return on investment. Engaged departments and schools may find SROI to be a useful additional means for thinking about investment and return when reporting on community engagement to various stakeholders.

Table 1.* School Service-Learning Course Offerings by Level

Class Level	# of Classes	Service Hours
100	2	290
200	26	28,513
300	17	2,680
400	15	9,642
Grad	n/a	n/a

*Data for following tables was provided by the CSL *Annual Dean's Report*, 2011-12.

Table 2. Economic Impact for Service-learning Courses by Department

Department	Sections	Enrollment	Service Hours	Service Hours in Dollars
Kinesiology	34	796	12,980	$282,834.20
TCEM	26	883	28,145	$613,279.55
Total	60	1679	41,125	$896,113.75

Table 3. Evaluation of School Engagement

Dimension I: Mission and Culture

Dimensions	School Evidence	Stage
Mission	Engagement is included in school's mission and vision.	Institutionalization
Definition of Community-Engaged Teaching	Service-learning (SL) is included in teaching excellence but not defined as community-engaged teaching. School/faculty use SL definition as provided by center.	Quality Building
Definition of Community-Engaged Research	CBPR is not specifically designed but recognized as a research option, especially related to grant production.	Critical Mass Building
Definition of Community-Engaged Service	Community-engaged service is not defined in our school; however, as a practice is supported for service allocation in promotion and tenure.	Critical Mass Building
Climate and Culture	SL is supported by campus and school.	Institutionalization
Collective Self-Awareness and Action	Involved faculty utilized SL to assess pedagogical effectiveness, but the unit/school does not engage in a "regular" practice.	Quality Building

Dimension II: Faculty Support & Community Engagement

Dimensions	School Evidence	Stage
Faculty Knowledge	Faculty are well-informed.	Institutionalization
Faculty Involvement and Support	Faculty at all ranks engage. Support is available via scholarships or other incentives.	Quality Building
Curricular Engagement	SL is infused throughout the curriculum.	Institutionalization
Faculty Incentives	Incentives are available through the university. Administrative support is available.	Institutionalization

Promotion & Tenure Integration	SL is criteria in teaching excellence. Recognition of faculty involvement is not well recognized at the university level.	Quality Building
Tenure-Track Faculty	Eight tenure-track or tenured faculty are involved in service-learning.	Institutionalization

Dimension III: Community Partner and Partnership Support and Community Engagement

Dimensions	School Evidence	Stage
Placement and Partnership Awareness	Multiple community agencies with long-term agreements and partnerships; well-established	Institutionalization
Mutual Understanding and Commitment	Multiple partnership agreements – some formalized and long-term, others less formal	Critical Mass Building
Community Partner Voice	We do not have any formal recognition of community partner voice.	n/a
Community Partner Leadership	Improving with center development and implementation of advisory committee	Critical Mass Building
Community Partner Access to Resources	It is unclear that community partners have access to our school resources.	n/a
Community Partner Incentives and Recognition	We currently do not have any formal mechanism for recognizing our community partners.	n/a

Dimension IV: Student Support and Community Engagement

Dimensions	School Examples	Stage
Student Opportunities	Because of multiple partners, students can volunteer or be involved at any time. Students often assist faculty with CBPR research.	Institutionalization
Student Awareness	Awareness begins before entrance (summer bridge courses); introductory courses are also used to introduce importance of service-learning.	Institutionalization
Student Incentives and Recognition	University has taken lead on recognition, and while faculty are encouraged to nominate students for university awards/recognition, the department does not have formal recognition.	Critical Mass Building
Student Voice, Leadership, and Departmental Governance	Strongest examples are the SLA scholarships available which allow for leadership; student SLA's are seen as leaders by faculty, peers, and community organizations	Institutionalization

Dimension V: Organizational Support for Community Engagement

Dimensions	School Examples	Stage
Administrative Support	Dean, associate dean, and department coordinators are fully supportive of community engagement endeavors	Institutionalization
Facilitating Entity	The university CSL provides formal structures to facilitate service-learning; language across university is universal	Institutionalization
Evaluation & Assessment	Due to the amount of service-learning and student/faculty involvement, this process is beginning.	Assessment and Awareness Building
Departmental Planning	Efforts have begun toward thinking about short- and long-range goals regarding engagement.	Critical Mass Building
Faculty Recruitment and Orientation	For as strongly involved and committed as we are to engagement, this is not used to recruit faculty.	n/a
Marketing	Recruitment materials, website, and visits all capitalize on our engagement.	Institutionalization
Dissemination of Community and Engagement Results	Most faculty utilize their engagement for scholarship or speaking to communities about engagement opportunities.	Quality Building
Budgetary Allocation	Support given to faculty through graduate assistant support; support given to faculty through Center of Service and Learning	Institutionalization

Dimension VI: Leadership Support for Community Engagement

Dimensions	School Examples	Stage
Department Level Leadership	Because we have evidence of faculty promotion and faculty have been promoted based upon their work, engagement is influential but remains hard to create a space with a changing university mission.	Institutionalization
Campus Level Leadership from Departmental Faculty	At least three tenured faculty engage in leadership positions within the university and within their discipline.	Critical Mass Building
National Level Leadership from Departmental Faculty	Discipline specific examples exist but unclear if this furthers "service" or service-learning	Awareness Building

Table 4. Proposed Dimension VII: Social Return on Investment

	Stage One Awareness Building	Stage Two Critical Mass Building	Stage Three Quality Building	Stage Four Institutional-ization
Community Cohesion	Campus-community partnerships (CCP) intend to develop, but have not yet, a set of agreed upon community ideals that are valued.	CCP have allowed for strategic mission and vision planning within the community, and efforts have help shaped sense of community	CCP have structures in place to measure community cohesion.	CCP have substantially increased community cohesion as recognized by existing relationships in neighborhoods, workplaces, and schools
Quality of Life Indicators (economic, social, physical)	CCP have begun discussions regarding specific QOL indicators (e.g., job placement, graduation rates).	Partners have identified specific QOL issues that need to be addressed and evaluated as result of partnership	CCP are regularly assessing QOL as part of the partnership agreement.	Evidence exists that QOL has improved as a direct result of partnership
Social Networks and Capacity Building	Structure is not in place to network and build capacity as a result of partnership.	CCP is building structure to identify significant barriers to capacity building	CCP have identified and begun to assess ways to improve capacity building that can result from partnership.	As a result of CCP investment and partnership, both community and department have increased capacity to serve constituents
Social Inclusion	Social disparities exist within the community and have been identified by CCP.	CCP have identified issues related to social inclusion that affect community	CCP report less disparity in services as result of partnership	CCP can identify specific social inclusion measures that have improved as a result of partnership

Health	Health-related issues are not yet identified by CCP.	Health-related issues have been identified by CCP and are related to health disparities within the community or individuals	Health (as defined by partners) is significantly improved (e.g., economic, physical, psychosocial) and can be attributed to partnership	CCP can identify specific health improvements that are attributed to partnership

Table 5. School Examples of SROI

Dimension VII: Social Return on Investment

Dimensions	School Examples	Stage
Increased Community Cohesion	• infused community or school-based/ university-based programs • long-term benefits identified by community partners • campus-community partnerships repeated and well established	Critical Mass Building
Improved Quality of Life	• documentation of established programs and work placement • long-standing programs have evidence of QOL changes with regard to physical activity patterns and engagement (length) • research on tourism and participants affect QOL	Critical Mass Building and Quality Building
Expanded Social Networks and Capacity Building	• long-standing partnerships have resulted in community coming to our school to engage • "numbers" include both number of engaged students, faculty, and partnerships	Institutionalization
Social Inclusion	• partnerships have resulted in increased activity or tourism-related opportunity that have repeated demonstrated increases in QOL	Quality Building
Health	• research/assessment has demonstrated by participating in CCP programs, participants have improved health (specifically physical) as a result • CCP programs have "physical parameter" assessments which demonstrate that by engaging in partnership, changes are seen in health patterns	Quality Building and Institutionalization

Table 6. Sample Student Focus Group Questions

1. Tell us about your service-learning experience in the school.

2. What was meaningful to you about your service-learning experiences?

3. In what ways do you find service-learning helpful to your learning?

4. What could the school do differently to enhance your learning and service-learning?

5. Is there anything more you would like to tell us about your service-learning experiences in the school?

Table 7. Sample Interview Questions with the Dean

1. How do you feel our community engagement has benefited our school?

2. Are you supportive of continued growth of community engagement?

3. What do you see as future growth opportunities and potential weaknesses in our community engagement?

4. In what ways do you envision school administrative support of community engagement (this referenced need for comprehensive assessment and evaluation of on-going programs)?

References

Abes, Elisa S., Golden Jackson, and Susan R. Jones. 2002. "Factors that Motivate and Deter Faculty Use of Service-Learning." *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning* 9 (1): 5-17.

Andrews, Jeannette O., Susan D. Newman, Otha Meadows, Melissa J. Cox, and Shelia Bunting. 2012. "Partnership Readiness for Community-Based Participatory Research." *Health Education Research* 27 (4): 555-571.

Ash, Sarah L., and Patti H. Clayton. 2009. "Generating, Deepening, and Documenting Learning: The Power of Critical Reflection in Applied Learning." *Journal of Applied Learning in Higher Education* 1 (Fall 2009): 25-48.

Ash, Sarah L., Patti H. Clayton, and Myra G. Moses. 2009. *Learning through Critical Reflection: A Tutorial for Service-Learning Students.* Raleigh, NC: PHC Ventures.

Astin, Alexander W., and Linda J. Sax. 1998. "How Undergraduates are Affected by Service Participation." *Service Participation* 39 (3): 251.

Astin, Alexander W., Lori J. Vogelgesang, Elaine K. Ikeda, and Jennifer A. Yee. 2000. *How Service-Learning Affects Students.* Los Angeles: UCLA, Higher Education Research Institute.

Battistoni, Richard M. 2002. *Civic Engagement across the Curriculum: A Resource Book for Service-Learning Faculty in all Disciplines.* Providence, RI: Campus Compact.

Battistoni, R. M., S. B. Gelmon, J. Saltmarsh, J. Wergin, and E. Zlotkowski. Forthcoming. "Research on Civic Learning of Students in Service Learning." In *Service Learning Research: Conceptual Models and Assessment*, edited by P. H. Clayton, R. G. Bringle, and J. A. Hatcher. Sterling, VA: Stylus Publishing.

Bernacki, Matthew, and Frank Bernt. 2007. "Service-Learning as a Transformative Experience: An Analysis of the Impact of Service-Learning on Student Attitudes and Behaviors after Two Years of College." In *From Passion to Objectivity: International and Cross-Disciplinary Perspectives on Service-Learning Research*, edited by Sherril B. Gelmon and Shelley Billig, 111-134. Charlotte, NC: Info Age.

Beere, Carole A., James C. Votruba, and Gail W. Wells. 2011. *Becoming an Engaged Campus: A Practical Guide for Institutionalizing Public Engagement.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Bringle, Robert G., Patti H. Clayton, and Mary F. Price. 2009. "Partnerships in Service-Learning and Civic Engagement." *Partnerships: A Journal of Service-Learning and Civic Engagement* 1(1): 1-20.

Bringle, Robert G., and Julie A. Hatcher. 1996. "Implementing Service-Learning in Higher Education." *The Journal of Higher Education* 67 (22): 221-239.

Bringle, Robert G., and Julie A. Hatcher. 2002. "Campus–Community Partnerships: The Terms of Engagement." *Journal of Social Issues* 58 (3): 503-516.

Brownell, Jayne Elise, and Lynn Ellen Swaner. 2010. *Five High-Impact Practices: Research on Learning Outcomes, Completion, and Quality*, monograph. Washington, DC: Association of American Colleges and Universities.

Byer, T. A. 2014. *Higher Education beyond Job Creation: Universities, Citizenship, and Community.* Lanham, MD: Lexington Books.

Cappo, Monsignor D. 2005. "Social Inclusion as a Determinant of Mental Health and WellBeing." VicHealth Research Summary 2. https://www.vichealth.vic.gov.au/media-and-resources/publications/social-inclusion-as-a-determinant-of-mental-health-and-wellbeing

Cecil, Amanda. 2012. "A Framework for Service-Learning in Hospitality and Tourism Management Education." *Journal of Teaching in Travel & Tourism* 12 (4): 313-331.

Campus Compact. 2012. "Creating a Culture of Assessment: 2012 Campus Compact Annual Member Survey." Boston, MA: Campus Compact.

Chadwick, S. A., and D. R. Pawlowski. 2007. Assessing Institutional Support for Service-Learning: A Case Study of Organizational Sense-making. *Michigan Journal of*

Community Service Learning 13 (2): 31-39. http://jces.ua.edu/community-engagement-grants-assessing-the-impact-of-university-funding-and-engagements/

Christou, E. 2002. "Revisiting Competencies for Hospitality Management." *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Education* 14 (1): 25-32.

Cruz, Nadinne I., and Dwayne Giles. 2000. "Where's the Community in Service-Learning Research." *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning* 7 (1): 28-34.
Cutforth, Nicholas J. 2000. "Connecting School Physical Education to the Community through Service-Learning." *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation & Dance* 71 (2): 39-45.

Dees, J. Gregory, and Beth Battle Anderson. 2006. "Framing a Theory of Social Entrepreneurship: Building on Two Schools of Practice and Thought." In *Research on Social Entrepreneurship: Understanding and Contributing to an Emerging Field*, by Association for Research on Nonprofit Organizations and Voluntary Action (ARNOVA), 1 (3): 39-66. Indianapolis, IN.

DiFronzo, Nicola C. 2002. "The Academic Dean." Last modified April 4, 2014. http://www.newfoundations.com/OrgTheory/DiFronzo721b.html.

Domangue, Elizabeth, and Russell Lee Carson. 2008. "Preparing Culturally Competent Teachers: Service-Learning and Physical Education Teacher Education." *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education* 27 (3): 347-367.

Driscoll, Amy. 2008. "Carnegie's Community-Engagement Classification: Intentions and Insights." *Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning* 40 (1): 38-41.

Driscoll, Amy, Barbara Holland, Sherril Gelmon, and Seanna Kerrigan. 1996. "An Assessment Model for Service-Learning: Comprehensive Case Studies of Impact on Faculty, Students, Community, and Institution." *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning* 3 (1): 66-71.

Eddy, Rebecca M., Erika Randall, and Mariana Schmalstig. 2014. *Service Learning Transforming Educational Models in Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics: (STEM). 2. Year Three Evaluation Final Report.* California State University. https://www.calstate.edu/cce/stem/documents/STEM-Year-Three-Evaluation-Final-Report.pdf

Eyler, Janet, Dwight E. Giles, Jr., and John Braxton. 1997. "The Impact of Service-Learning on College Students." *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning* 4 (1): 5-15.

Eyler, Janet, Dwight E. Giles, Jr., Christine M. Stenson, and Charlene J. Gray. 2001. "At a Glance: What We Know about the Effects of Service-Learning on College

Students, Faculty, Institutions, and Communities, 1993-2000," 3rd edition. *Higher Education* Netherlands: Springer.

Finley, Ashley. n.d. "Civic Learning and Democratic Engagements: A Review of the Literature on Civic Post-Secondary Education." Unpublished paper. Accessed March 12, 2011.

Fitzgerald, Hiram E., ed. 2010. *Across the Higher Education Landscape.* East Lansing: Michigan State University.

Flora, Cornelia B., and Jay L. Flora. 2005. "Creating Social Capital." In *The Earthscan Reader in Sustainable Agriculture*, edited by J. Pretty, 39-63. London and Sterling, VA: Earthscan.

Furco, Andrew. 1996. "Service-Learning: A Balanced Approach to Experiential Education." In *Expanding Boundaries: Serving and Learning*, edited by B. Taylor and Corporation for National Service, 2-6. Washington, DC: Corporation for National Service.

Gelmon, Sherril B., Barbara A. Holland, Sarena D. Seifer, Anu Shinnamon, and Kara Connors. 1998. "Community-University Partnerships for Mutual Learning." *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning* 5 (1): 97-107.

Gelmon, S., S. D. Seifer, J. Kauper-Brown, and M. Mikkelsen. 2004. *Community-Engaged Scholarship for Health Collaborative: Institutional Self-Assessment.* Seattle, WA: Community-Campus Partnerships for Health. Retrieved December 2, 2011. http://depts.washington.edu/ccph/pdf_files/self-assessment-copyright.pdf

Gelmon, Sherril B., Ann Sherman, Marla Gaudent, Carol Mitchell, and Kirsten Trotter. 2002. "Institutionalizing Service-Learning across the University: International Comparisons." In *New Perspectives in Service-Learning: Research to Advance the Field*, edited by Marshall Welch and Shelley Billig, 195-217. Greenwich, CT: Information Age.

Goodspeed, Tim, E. Lawlor, E. Neitzert, and J. Nicholls. 2009. *A Guide to Social Return on Investment.* London: New Economics Foundation. www.neweconomics.org/publications/entry/a-guide-to-social-return-on-investment.

Hahn, Tom, and Julie Adele Hatcher. 2013. "Service-Learning and Deep Learning." Research Brief, no.1. Center for Service and Learning, IUPUI. http://csl.iupui.edu/doc/research-brief-sept-2013.pdf.

"Health Related Quality of Life." Accessed April 4, 2015. http://www.healthypeople.gov/2020/about/foundation-health-measures/Health-Related-Quality-of-Life-and-Well-Being

Hidayat, D., S. Pratsch, and R. Stoecker. 2009. "Principles for Success in Service-Learning – The Three Cs." In *The Unheard Voices: Community Organizations and Service-Learning*, edited by Randy Stoeker and Elizabeth A. Tryon with Amy Hilgendorf, 147-161. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Holland, Barbara A. 2000. "Institutional Impacts and Organizational Issues Related to Service-Learning." *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning* Special Volume (1): 52-60.

Independent Sector. 2014. "The Value of Volunteer Time." Accessed June 6, 2015. https://www.independentsector.org/volunteer_time.

Institute of Community Cohesion (iCoCo). n.d. "The Nature of Community Cohesion." Accessed January 30, 2014. http://www.cohesioninstitute.org.uk/ Resources/Toolkits/Health/TheNatureOfCommunityCohesion.

Jacoby, Barbara. 2014. *Service-Learning Essentials: Questions, Answers, and Lessons Learned.* John Wiley & Sons.

Judge, Lawrence W., David Pierce, Jeffrey Petersen, David Bellar, Elizabeth Wanless, Erin Gilreath, and Laura Simon. 2011. "Engaging Experiential Service-Learning through a Co-Curricular Club: The Chase Charlie Races." *ICHPER-SD Journal of Research* 6 (2): 30-38.

Kecskes, Kevin, ed. 2006. *Engaging Departments: Moving Faculty Culture from Private to Public, Individual to Collective Focus for the Common Good.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Kecskes, Kevin. 2009. "Creating Community-Engaged Departments: Self-Assessment Rubric for the Institutionalization of Community Engagement in Academic Departments." Last modified 2009. http://www.pdx.edu/sites/www.pdx.edu.cae/files/ Engaged%20Department%20RUBRIC%20-%20Kecskes%202009-paginated.pdf.

Koppel, J., R. Kavanaugh, and T. Van Dyke, eds. 2004. *Hospitality with a Heart: Concepts and Models for Service-Learning in Lodging, Foodservice, and Tourism.* Sterling, VA: Stylus Publishing.

Langseth, Mark, William M. Plater, and Scott Dillon, eds. 2004. *Public Work and the Academy: An Academic Administrator's Guide to Civic Engagement and Service-Learning.* Vol. 46. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Lattanzi, Jill Black, Sandra L. Campbell, Robin L. Dole, and Kerstin M. Palombaro. 2011. "Students Mentoring Students in a Service-Learning Clinical Supervision Experience: An Educational Case Report." *Physical Therapy* 91 (10): 1513-1524.

Miller, Marybeth. 2012. "The Role of Service-Learning to Promote Early Childhood Physical Education While Examining its Influence upon the Vocational Call to Teach." *Physical Education & Sport Pedagogy* 17 (1): 61-77.

Petersen, Jeffrey C., Lawrence Judge, and David A. Pierce. 2012. "Conducting a Community-Based Experiential-Learning Project to Address Youth Fitness." *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation & Dance* 83 (6): 30-36.

Powers, T., and C. Barrows. 2003. *Introduction to Management in the Hospitality Industry*, 7th ed. New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons.

Reich, Jill N., ed. 2014. *Civic Engagement, Civic Development, and Higher Education*, monograph. Washington, DC: Bringing Theory to Practice.

Roper, Emily A., and J. Santiago. 2014. "Influence of Service-Learning on Kinesiology Students' Attitudes toward P-12 Students with Disabilities." *Adapted Physical Activity Quarterly* (APAQ) 31 (2): 162-180.

Sherrill, C. 2006. "Service-Learning, Practicums, Internships: Issues in Professional Preparation." *Palaestra* 22 (1): 55-56.

Social Ventures Australia Consulting. 2012. "Social Return on Investment: Lessons Learned in Australia." Last modified February 2012. http://socialventures.com.au/assets/SROI-Lessons-learned-in-Australia.pdf.

Strage, Amy. 2004. "Long-Term Academic Benefits of Service-Learning: When and Where Do They Manifest Themselves?" *College Student Journal* 38 (2): 257.

Stukas, Jr., Arthur A., E. Gil Clary, and Mark Snyder. 1999. "Service-Learning: Who Benefits and Why." *Social Policy Report* 13 (4).

Taylor, Jr., H. L., and Gavin Luter. 2013. *Anchor Institutions: An Interpretive Review Essay.* New York: Marga Inc. for Anchor Institutions Task Force.

Unite for Sight. n.d. "Module 7: Social Investing and Social Return on Investment." New Haven, CT: Unite for Sight. http://www.uniteforsight.org/social-entrepreneurship-course/module7

Wang, Suosheng, Yao-Yi Fu, Amanda K. Cecil, and Sotiris H. Avgoustis. 2006. "Residents' Perceptions of Cultural Tourism and Quality of Life – A Longitudinal Approach." *Tourism Today* Fall 2006 (6): 47-61.

Whitley, Meredith A., and David S. Walsh. 2014. "A Framework for the Design and Implementation of Service-Learning Courses." *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation and Dance* 85 (4): 34-39.

Author Information

Dr. Stanton-Nichols is an associate professor in the department of kinesiology. Since 1996 she has organized two community-engaged physical activity programs to service families and children with disabilities. She is currently a senior scholar with the Center of Service and Learning at Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis (IUPUI).

Dr. Julie A. Hatcher is executive director of the Center for Service and Learning and associate professor of philanthropic studies in the Lilly Family School of Philanthropy at Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis (IUPUI). Her scholarship and research relates to community engagement in higher education, and she has responsibilities for leading this work of CSL as a campus Signature Center.

Dr. Cecil is an associate professor and chair of the Department of Tourism Conventions and Event Management at Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis (IUPUI). She is currently involved in overseeing the department's community-engaged efforts.

Kathleen Stanton-Nichols
Department of Kinesiology
Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis
901 West New York Street
Indianapolis, IN 46069
Email: kstanton@iupui.edu
Telephone: 317-345-3429

Julie Hatcher
Executive Director
Center for Service and Learning
Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis
Hine Hall, Suite 243
Email: jhatcher@iupui.edu
Telephone: 317-278-3499

Amanda Cecil
Department of Tourism Conventions and Event Management
Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis
901 West New York Street
Indianapolis, IN 46069
Email: akcecil@iupui.edu
Telephone/Main Office: 317-274-2248
Telephone/Direct Line: 317-278-8569