

Voices from the Trenches: Faculty Perspectives on Support for Sustaining Service-Learning

Kristina T. Lambricht and Allison F. Alden

Abstract

Using data collected from three colleges, the authors examine how faculty members view the level of support for service-learning at their respective institutions. There is variation among the institutions in perceived instructor and administrator support for service-learning, availability of support services, and attitudes regarding consideration of service-learning in personnel review processes. The authors also explored the degree to which individual instructors have been able to create and sustain service-learning opportunities for their students and found important differences among the colleges. The findings have implications for efforts to sustain service-learning at both faculty and institutional levels.

Introduction

Several scholars have highlighted the crucial role that faculty play in implementing and sustaining service-learning at colleges and universities (Bringle & Hatcher, 1995, 1996; Driscoll, 2000; Furco, 2002a; Holland, 1999). Because implementation of service-learning involves curricular reform, success of efforts to sustain service-learning largely depends on individual instructors (Billig, 2002; Bringle, Hatcher, & Games, 1997). In fact, a key measure used to determine the degree of service-learning institutionalization within a college or university is whether a critical number of faculty members choose to integrate service-learning into their courses (Furco, 2002b; Holland, 2006). There has been considerable interest in studying efforts to sustain service-learning programs at colleges and universities. Research has specifically examined institutional commitment to service (Ward, 1996), models for institutionalization (Bringle & Hatcher, 1996; Casey & Springer, 2006; Mercer & Brungardt, 2007), mechanisms for institutionalization and their impact on community partners (Stater & Fotheringham, 2009; Stoecker & Tryon, 2009)

tion of service-learning (Bringle & Hatcher, 2000; Holland, 1997). Faculty members' views on service-learning sustainability, however, are not as well understood.

Using data from three colleges, the authors build on existing research and offer insights on faculty perspectives regarding service-learning's sustainability. This investigation examined how faculty members view the level of support for service-learning at their institutions. Also explored is the degree to which individual instructors at the three colleges have been able to create and sustain service-learning. Finally, the implications of the investigation's findings for efforts to sustain service-learning at the institutional and faculty levels are considered.

Service-Learning Sustainability and Innovation Adoption

The term "sustainability" has been used extensively within the literature on service-learning. The service-learning literature offers few attempts to define sustainability either conceptually or operationally; however, according to Billig

frequently believe this innovation improves student learning, benefits the community, and helps them fulfill their professional responsibilities (Abes, Jackson, & Jones, 2002; Banerjee & Hausafus, 2007; McKay & Rozee, 2004). Faculty identify student learning outcomes as the most important reason among these beliefs motivating them to adopt service-learning (Abes et al., 2002; Banerjee & Hausafus, 2007).

Corresponding to the third characteristic of instructional innovations identified by Kozma (1985), time and support are needed in order to effectively implement service-learning. Barriers hindering faculty efforts to implement and sustain service-learning include concerns relating to time, logistics, and funding (Abes et al., 2002; Banerjee & Hausafus, 2007; Holland, 1999; Stanton, 1994; Ward, 1996). Faculty must spend considerable time forming community partnerships, recruiting

J7, logis316(n)7(do)12(n5(g)12(t)-f)-8cg oner4(es)ac.50J6l

Levine, 1994)

using service-learning as a teaching technique. In total, 52 service-learning instructors were identified: 31 at College A, 15 at College B, and 6 at College C. In the first electronic survey wave at Colleges A and B, instructors in the service-learning sample were asked to provide the names of other instructors they knew were currently teaching or had taught service-learning courses. Instructors in the service-learning sample at College C were not asked to do this because all six of College C's full-time instructors were identified as using service-learning. An additional seven instructors were identified as using service-learning at College A through this snowball sampling technique, and they were sent surveys. The survey was also sent to 92 randomly selected instructors at Colleges A and B in order to assess whether more instructors were using service-learning than were initially identified.

In total, 151 surveys were distributed via e-mail, and 84 usable surveys were received (46 from the service-learning sample and 38 from the random sample), representing an overall response rate of 56%. Seven instructors in the random sample at College A and four instructors in the random sample from College B indicated that they had taught at least one course with a service-learning component. The responses of these 11 instructors were added to the service-learning instructors sample for data analysis. The responses of the other instructors from the random sample were excluded. In summary, data analysis was based on characteristics of 57 survey respondents.

The survey revealed several key characteristics of the respondents who had taught at least one service-learning course:

- t 63% were female;
- t 77% were Caucasian;
- t 53% were tenured, 33% were untenured and not on a tenure track, and the remaining 14% were untenured and on a tenure track;
- t the respondents had been teaching in higher education for an average of 16 years; and
- t nearly 30% belonged to a department within the social and behavioral sciences; the remainder (approximately 70%) taught in other disciplines.

Interviews with campus administrators and instructors.

Two sets of interviews were conducted. First, key individuals who had administrative responsibilities and were familiar with service-learning structures, practices, and policies at their

the role of their community partners in their service-learning projects; and their plans to use service-learning in the future.

The interview process.

At the beginning of the 45-minute interviews, confidentiality was guaranteed. The interviews were audio recorded, transcribed, and coded. Initial codes were developed based on the questions included in the two interview protocols. This list of codes was then revised and augmented through an inductive process based on analysis of the interview transcripts. Detailed definitions of each code were developed in order to ensure consistent usage. Coded interview data was analyzed using QSR NVivo v. 7.0. Both memoing (*Miles & Huberman, 1994*) and pattern-matching (*Yin, 2009*) were used as part of the data analysis process.

Document analysis.

A document analysis was conducted on print and electronic documents at the three colleges. Documents were collected through searches of each institution's website. Interviewers also asked participants in the first set of interviews to identify documents and websites that provided information about service-learning and other forms of experiential education at their respective campuses. Examples of documents reviewed included strategic plans, mission statements, annual reports, committee descriptions and minutes, personnel review process guidelines, and personnel procedures.

The authors used the documents to assess the extent to which the three colleges had formal policies specific to service-learning or formalized plans for achieving campus-wide goals related to service-learning.

Findings

The findings examine how faculty members view the level of support for service-learning at their respective institutions and explore the extent to which service-learning has been sustained at the three colleges. According to the findings, the level of support for service-learning activities as perceived by faculty was quite similar in some respects across the campuses, but differed in others. On all three campuses, there were minimal financial incentives and limited opportunities for course releases. On the other hand, perceptions regarding instructor support, administrative support, availability of support services, and the value placed on service-learning in personnel review processes varied. There was

also variation in the extent to which service-learning had been sustained at the three colleges. This section begins with descriptions of the institutional contexts for service-learning at all three institutions. Following this, the perceived level of support for service-learning activities at each institution is detailed in the following areas: incentives for using service-learning, instructor support, administrative support, availability of support services, and the value of service-learning in personnel review processes.

This section concludes by discussing the extent to which individual faculty members at the three institutions have been able to create and sustain service-learning opportunities for their students. The key findings are summarized in Table 3. Both the survey and interview data were considered when making the rating determinations in Table 3.

The institutional context.

College A is a publicly funded doctoral research university with approximately 11,500 undergraduate and 3,000 graduate students. It was the only institution with considerable research expectations for tenure-track and tenured faculty. Service-learning had been implemented for several years, but only a small number of instructors had used it. In a f(er)-29(w)-3(in)8(g a)9(r)13(e)-6(a580i)k./6alundeBDC B

Based on the size of the sample for this study's survey, approximately 5% of instructors were involved in service-learning at College A. However, the percentage of instructors who were involved in service-learning may have been higher, given that 7 out of the 26 respondents in the randomly selected non-service-learning sample indicated that they had taught at least one semester-long course with a service-learning component.

A handful of campus staff performed some tasks supporting instructor service-learning efforts, in addition to their other responsibilities. These staff worked for different programs in various campus locations, and there was little coordination among these programs. As described by one interviewee,

There's no official rule that everybody has to go through this person, and I would say there are pieces of this [service-learning] all over campus. Like there's a person that's supposed to coordinate service-learning, there's a person that coordinates volunteer efforts, there's a person that coordinates internships, there's a person with a title that is coordinator of experiential education. And they're all in different departments and they all do a specific piece.

Interviewees indicated that a significant percentage of campus service-learning activities were not filtered through any of the campus programs tasked with supporting instructor service-learning efforts. This is consistent with our observation in the sampling process that service-learning leaders at College A appear to be unaware of a significant portion of the faculty using service-learning on their campus. Interviewees also reported that staff charged with some responsibility to support service-learning had very little, if any, authority to influence the advancement of service-learning on the campus.

Serving over 6,000 students, College B is a community college. As at College A, instructors had been using service-learning for several years, and there were small pockets of faculty involved in service-learning scattered throughout the campus. In the words of one administrator, "They're very individually committed people. But they're all over our campus." Based on the size of the sample for this study's survey, approximately 4% of instructors were involved in service-learning at College B. However, the percentage of instructors who were involved in service-learning may have been higher, given that 4 out of the 12 respondents in the randomly selected

non-service-learning sample indicated that they had taught at least one semester-long course with a service-learning component.

There was minimal coordination of campus service-learning activities. One faculty member received 6 hours of release time per week to coordinate civic engagement activities. He still taught nine credit hours per semester and spent just 5% to 10% of his time coordinating service-learning and other community engagement activities. Otherwise, there was no campus coordinating agent or support staff for service-learning at College B.

College C is a prement

Although only limited funding and release time was available, more than three- fourths of the survey respondents at each institution indicated that both of these incentives would encourage them to continue to use service-learning, as shown in Table 5. Survey respondents were asked to rate the level of their agreement with statements describing different factors that would encourage them to continue to use service-learning. The results to this series of questions are reported in Table 5 and, as in Table 4, response information is broken down by institution.

Table 5. Survey Results Regarding Perceptions of Current Supports for Service-Learning Efforts by Institution

	College A	College B	College C
Funding to support service-learning activities.			
% (number) disagree/strongly disagree	5.6% (2)	12.6% (2)	0% (0)
% (number) neither agree nor disagree	16.7% (6)	18.8% (3)	0% (0)
% (number) agree/strongly agree	77.8% (28)	68.8% (11)	100% (5)
	99.1% total	100.2% total	
Release time to support service-learning activities.			
% (number) disagree/strongly disagree	8.3% (3)	20.0% (3)	0% (0)
% (number) neither agree nor disagree	30.6% (11)	13.3% (2)	0% (0)
% (number) agree/strongly agree	61.1% (22)	66.7% (10)	100% (3)
Support from other instructors in my department.			
% (number) disagree/strongly disagree	5.6% (2)	0% (0)	0% (0)
% (number) neither agree nor disagree	33.3% (12)	56.3% (9)	40.0% (2)
% (number) agree/strongly agree	61.1% (22)		

Instead of initially being motivated by financial incentives or release time, 10 of the interviewees reported that instructors became involved in service-learning because of its educational value. Instructors believed that their students benefit from the opportunity to apply course knowledge in a real-life setting. As described by one instructor,

I think it's [service-learning is] so valuable for the students. In any service based profession it is one thing to have knowledge, but to have the skills and disposition to be good at it and to sustain it is something that I don't believe they can learn in a classroom. I think they have

Instructor support.

Instructors at Colleges B and C generally felt other instructors supported their service-learning activities. Attitudes were more mixed at College A, as shown in Table 4. More than three-^{ths} of survey respondents at each institution believed that instructors within their departments were supportive of service-learning. Slightly more than 60% of instructors surveyed at College B and all instructors surveyed at College C believed that instructors outside their department were supportive of service-learning. On the other hand, less than 40% of instructors surveyed at College A viewed instructors outside their departments as supportive. According to one instructor from College A,

I don't think we have a real good infrastructure for faculty to really . . . share ideas about what works and what doesn't work. So I haven't had any formal contact or informal contact really, with other faculty about the service-learning projects outside of our college [in the university]. Within the college, yes, but not beyond [to the university].

Small Campus Compact grants helped facilitate the development of informal mentoring systems among instructors at Colleges B and C, which were sustained even after grant funding ended. These mentoring systems provided instructors new to service-learning the opportunity to learn about this method, receive advice on how to structure projects, and brainstorm solutions to problems they were experiencing. Furthermore, one interviewee at College C indicated that the informal mentoring system helped facilitate the spread of service-learning on his campus. As described by this instructor, "I think from colleague to colleague we've talked about how we've implemented these ideas . . . so it [service-learning] just has spread because we've shared in these discussions together." In contrast, though mentors were also assigned to interested faculty at College A, a comparable sustained informal mentoring system did not develop as a result of Campus Compact funding.

Four interviewees indicated that having a mentor would be extremely valuable for instructors new to service-learning. One instructor commented,

I think the best advice I could give was have somebody experienced there to help you problem solve

along the way. I think it [implementing service-learning for the first time] can seem overwhelming. . . . a lot of it is just putting the pieces together. And once it's in place, I think you find the success with it.

While having a mentor was highlighted in many interviews as useful for new service-learning instructors, instructor support, particularly from those outside the department, may not necessarily play a critical role in encouraging instructors to continue to use service-learning. At College B, less than a third of survey respondents indicated that support from other instructors in their department would encourage them to sustain service-learning efforts, as shown in Table 5. In addition, less than 40% of respondents at Colleges A and B agreed that support from instructors outside their department would encourage them to continue to use service-learning.

Administrative support.

Perceptions of administrative support for service-learning varied across the three campuses. College C administrators were perceived as the most supportive. Reflecting this, all College C survey respondents either agreed or strongly agreed that campus administrators were supportive of service-learning, as indicated in Table 4. In addition to interviewees' general belief that there was administrative support, one senior administrator in particular was viewed as a champion for service-learning at College C. He initiated College C's involvement with Colleges A and B on the Campus Compact projects. He also individually recruited and strongly encouraged instructors to try service-learning, providing personalized encouragement and initial guidance. According to another administrator from College C, this senior administrator "has been the driving force behind all this [service-learning]."

Perceptions of administrative support for service-learning were more moderate at College A. Reflecting this, approximately 60% of College A survey respondents indicated that campus administrators were supportive of service-learning, as illustrated in Table 4. Several interviewees reported that senior administrators were publicly supportive of service-learning activities and had given service recognition awards for these activities. In addition, a question on service-learning had recently been added to the provost's annual faculty report. However, a number of interviewees also noted that sustaining service-learning efforts had not been a high priority for

senior administrators. In the words of one senior administrator, this reflects

the ambivalence [senior administrators] feel about pulling faculty away from their primary research obligations. To the extent that we were using our resources to lure our faculty away from their research activities . . . if we were rewarding them financially or any other way, course reductions or whatever, for doing service-learning . . . [senior administrators] fear that they would then not get tenure or if they were already tenured that they would cease to be making the desired . . . contribution to our mission as a research university.

College B administrators were perceived as the least supportive. According to Table 4, only 44% of College B survey respondents agreed that campus administrators were supportive of service-learning. Although a few past and current administrators were verbally supportive, there had not been any successful administrative efforts to sustain service-learning at College B. Adding to uncertainty about administrator priorities, several high-level administrators had left College B recently, and the individuals filling these positions had been appointed on an interim basis. In describing the current environment at College B, one interviewee commented,

Some of the deans are in interim positions. And they're saying, "How can we do anything until things are clear?" . . . Some people who are in an interim position . . . believe in it [service-learning] but they also have to find out what's going to happen once the new administration is in place.

Although the level of administrative support varied by institution, there was general agreement that support from campus administrators can serve as a key source of encouragement for fac-

that service-learning results in instructors having less time to spend on research, which discourages instructors at College A from getting involved in service-learning activities. According to one instructor at College A,

faculty sustain service-learning efforts. As shown in Table 5, a majority of those surveyed from all three institutions indicated that consideration of service-learning in personnel review processes would encourage them to continue using service-learning.

Service-learning sustainability.

Community partners played a sustained, vibrant role in service-learning at all three institutions. More than 75% of survey respondents at each institution indicated that community partners have had input in the development and implementation of their service-learning projects. Based on the interviews, the specific responsibilities of community partners varied according to the service-learning project's content. For example, one of the interviewees had her students serve as mentors to at-risk youth. In this case, the community partner identified the at-risk youth, helped match the youth with mentors, and developed a schedule for the mentors. Another interviewee who taught management classes had her students act as consultants to different community organizations. Community partners involved in these initiatives helped the student consultant teams with project selection and oversaw the teams. The majority of survey respondents at each institution also indicated that community partners have provided them with feedback about their projects and that they have maintained communication with community partners following project completion.

Although most survey respondents reported that community partners participated in the service-learning projects, community partners were not necessarily closely involved in course instruction. The level of involvement of community partners as course instructors varied considerably across the three institutions. At College C, many respondents at each institution

Two other interviewees reported that they would like to develop more formalized mechanisms for community partners to provide feedback about their experiences with service-learning projects in order to deepen the partners' involvement.

In addition to providing information on the role community partners play in service-learning projects, the survey offers insights into the depth of instructor involvement in service-learning activities at the three institutions. Although only a small percentage of all faculty members were currently involved in service-learning at Colleges A and B, the survey results indicated that these individual instructors have demonstrated a sustained commitment to service-learning. The majority of survey respondents from Colleges A and B had taught a semester-long class with a service-learning component four or more times and had partnered with at least four community organizations as part of their service-learning activities. Moreover, roughly 61% of College A survey respondents and 38% of College B survey respondents had been involved in projects that lasted two or more semesters. Reflecting the fact that service-learning is relatively new at College C, only one survey respondent from this institution had taught four or more service-learning courses. However, given the strong support for service-learning among instructors and administrators at College C, there was also potential for a sustained commitment at this institution in the future.

Discussion

Using a case study approach, we assessed service-learning's sustainability at three colleges from the perspective of faculty members. We specifically investigated instructors' views on support for service-learning at their respective institutions and the extent to which individual faculty members have demonstrated a sustained commitment to service-learning. At all three institutions, there were limited financial incentives for instructors to adopt service-learning, and the few available financial incentives were primarily funded by external sources, rather than through institutional resources. In addition, the three colleges offered minimal opportunities for course releases. There was greater variation among institutions, however, in perceived faculty and administrative support, as well as in the availability of support services. Perceived faculty and administrator support for service-learning was strong at College C but more moderate at Colleges A and B. On the other hand, Colleges A and B had a moderate level of support services, while support services were more limited at College C. Views on

the value of service-learning in personnel review processes also varied. The attitudes of instructors at College A regarding consideration of service-learning in personnel review processes were more negative than those at Colleges B and C. Finally, there were differences in the extent of instructors' success in creating and sustaining service-learning opportunities for their students. Service-learning was a relatively new instructional tool at College C. In contrast, a small number of instructors at both Colleges A and B had used service-learning for a number of years. Although service-learning was not a widespread practice at either College A or B, the individual instructors with service-learning experience demonstrated a sustained commitment to this pedagogical approach.

This study's research design offers some important advantages.

The mixed methods approach yielded rich qualitative data that provided insights into the survey findings. The interview format may have made it easier to discuss some sensitive issues involved in this study because interviewers could personally guarantee informants' confidentiality.

Limitations of the Study

Although this study's research design has some benefits, it also has limitations. The generalizability of the findings may be limited because the study focused solely on service-learning's sustainability at three institutions located in the same geographic region. However, since the three colleges serve very different populations, concerns about external validity may be minimized.

Implications for Future Research

The study findings have several important implications. First, the case studies are consistent with other research and illustrate that context matters. Religious institutions may be particularly receptive to service-learning due to the emphasis many of these institutions place on service. This may help explain the rapid diffusion of service-learning among full-time faculty at College C. At religious institutions, service-learning may be one of many mechanisms used to help students serve surrounding communities. These findings are consistent with research by Holland (1997) indicating that institutions with a religious affiliation demonstrate higher levels of institutional commitment to service more quickly than their secular counterparts. College C's small size may have also helped facilitate the rapid diffusion of service-learning on this campus. Future research should continue to explore the impact that

both religious affiliation and institutional size may have on service-learning implementation.

In addition, context matters when considering how faculty view the value placed on service-learning activities in personnel review processes. College A was the only institution where a large percentage of instructors disagreed that service-learning was valued in personnel review processes. It was also the only institution where faculty had substantial research expectations. These findings, which correspond with conclusions by Abes et al. (2002), suggest that personnel review processes may more likely be viewed as a barrier to sustaining service-learning efforts at institutions where research productivity is prioritized. More research is needed on whether the extent to which personnel review processes are viewed as a barrier to service-learning varies across different types of institutions. According to Bloomgarden and O'Meara (2007), it will be easier for faculty who link community-based projects with their research and teaching to sustain their community activities. Research universities interested in promoting service-learning may want to assist faculty in integrating service-learning with their research agenda, so that these activities ultimately lead to publication. Institutions that implement different strategies encouraging faculty to incorporate service-learning into their research should carefully track the efficacy of these strategies and publish the results on this research in order to enhance knowledge about best practices.

Faculty-Level Recommendations

Also based on this study's findings, institutions may want to encourage mentoring relationships to provide support to instructors new to service-learning. While none of the institutions in this study had an effective campus-wide coordination mechanism, informal mentoring networks among instructors had developed at both Colleges B and C. Many interviewees indicated that mentors can serve as valuable information resources and help with problem solving. Scholars have emphasized the importance of having a centralized office for coordinating service-learning activities (Bringle & Hatcher, 1996, 2000; Bringle et al., 1997). However, supporting an effective centralized coordinating unit requires a substantial institutional monetary investment. When institutional resources are not available for centralized coordination, these findings suggest that informal support, such as the development of mentoring relation

service-learning could be strengthened in a variety of areas at Colleges A and B. Nonetheless, the vast majority of survey respondents at these two institutions believed that service-learning offers valuable educational benefits and that it is important for colleges to work with communities to help them solve problems. Reflecting their ideological support for service-learning, many instructors among the small cadre of faculty who use service-learning at Colleges A and B had taught several service-learning courses and had been involved in service-learning projects that lasted multiple semesters. Many instructors had also worked closely with community partners to design and implement service-learning projects.

Among instructors using service-learning at Colleges A and B, the lack of institutional support did not seem to inhibit their sustained commitment to this innovation. However, it is unknown how many other instructors at these two institutions had been discouraged from using service-learning at least partially due to the lack of institutional support. In the future, will more faculty become involved with service-learning at these institutions, or will instructor involvement plateau without the influx of additional resources and support? More research is needed on how individual instructor commitment to service-learning can be translated into strong commitment at an institutional level. A greater understanding of these processes will be valuable to institutions interested in creating environments conducive to sustaining service-learning.

Conclusion

This article presents the results of an examination of faculty views of support for service-learning at their respective institutions. Past research on service-learning institutionalization has tended to focus on larger research universities. The institutions included in this study varied in their size, mission, and culture. This article suggests that organizational characteristics can influence faculty members' experiences with service-learning. Specifically, religious affiliation, institutional size, and institutional emphasis on research may influence efforts to sustain service-learning. Findings also suggest that informal support such as mentoring faculty new to service-learning can complement more formalized forms of institutional support. Finally, our findings highlight the critical role that individual instructor commitment can play in sustaining service-learning.

References

- Abes, E. S., Jackson, G., & Jones, S. R. (2002). Factors that motivate and deter faculty use of service-learning. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning, 9*, 5–17.
- Banerjee, M., & Hausafus, C. O. (2007). Faculty use of service-learning: Perceptions, motivations, and impediments for the human sciences. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning, 14*, 32–45.
- Billig, S. H. (2002). Adoption, implementation, and sustainability of K-12 service-learning. In A. Furco & S. H. Billig (Eds.), *Service-learning: the essence of the pedagogy* (pp. 245–267). Greenwich, CT: Information Age Publishing.
- Bloomgarden, A. H., & O'Meara, K. A. (2007). Faculty role integration and community engagement: Harmony or cacophony? *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning, 13*, 5–18.
- Bringle, R., & Hatcher, J. (1995). A service-learning curriculum for faculty. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning, 2*, 112–122.
- Bringle, R., & Hatcher, J. (1996). Implementing service learning in higher education. *Journal of Higher Education, 67*, 221–239.

Appendix 1. Survey Instrument

For the purposes of this survey, service-learning is defined as:

A form of experiential education characterized by the following conditions: student participation in an ORGANIZED SERVICE ACTIVITY that meets identified OFF-CAMPUS COMMUNITY NEEDS and is connected to COURSE CONTENT and SPECIFIC LEARNING OUTCOMES with STRUCTURED REFLECTION DURING CLASS TIME (modified definition from Abes, Jackson, and Jones, 2002).

For questions 1–10, please indicate the extent to which you agree with the statement below using the following scale:

- 1 = Strongly disagree
- 2 = Disagree
- 3 = Neither agree nor disagree
- 4 = Agree
- 5 = Strongly agree

For all survey respondents.

1. Service-learning is a valuable pedagogical tool.	1	2	3	4	5
2. It is important for students ON THIS CAMPUS to participate in service-learning.	1	2	3	4	5
3. It is important for students IN MY DISCIPLINE to participate in service-learning as part of their training.	1	2	3	4	5
4. It is important for colleges and universities to work with community to help them solve problems.	1	2	3	4	5
5. Other instructors IN MY DEPARTMENT are supportive of service-learning.	1	2	3	4	5
6. Instructors OUTSIDE MY DEPARTMENT are supportive of service-learning.	1	2	3	4	5
7. Campus administrators are supportive of service-learning.	1	2	3	4	5
8.					

12. How many times have you taught a semester-long class with a service-learning component?

- 0
- 1-3
- 4-6
- 7-9
- 10 or more

13. What is your faculty rank?

- Full professor
- Associate professor
- Assistant professor
- Adjunct professor
- Lecturer/instructor

14. What is your tenure status?

- Tenured
- Untenured, on tenure track
- Untenured, not on tenure track

15. In which academic discipline do you currently teach?

- Humanities
- Social & behavioral sciences
- Physical & biological sciences
- Math, engineering, computer science, technology
- Business
- Social work, education, human ecology, agriculture
- Arts
- Health professions
- Religious instruction
- Other

16. At which institution do you currently teach?

- College A
- College B
- College C

17. How many years have you been teaching at the college/university level _____

23. What funding have you received to support your service-learning activities? Please check all that apply.

- I have never received funding to support my service-learning activities.
- College/university funding
- External funding

24. Have you received release time to support your service-learning activities?

- Yes
- No

For questions 25–29, please indicate the extent to which you agree with the statements below using the following scale:

- 1 = Strongly disagree
- 2 = Disagree
- 3 = Neither agree nor disagree
- 4 = Agree
- 5 = Strongly agree

25. My community partners have had input in the DEVELOPMENT of my service-learning projects.	1	2	3	4	5
26. My community partners have had input in the IMPLEMENTATION of my service-learning projects.	1	2	3	4	5
27. I regard my community partners as co-instructors in my courses with a service-learning component.	1	2	3	4	5
28. My community partners have provided me with feedback about my service-learning projects following project completion.	1	2	3	4	5
29. I have maintained communication with my community partners following completion of the service-learning projects in which the partners were involved.	1	2	3	4	5

Faculty Implementation

1. How widespread is the practice of service-learning among the faculty on this campus? Provide specific examples.
2. Which faculty members provide leadership for service-learning on the campus?

Faculty Incentives

3. In what ways are faculty encouraged and/or rewarded by the campus for engaging in service-learning?
4. How seriously are community-based learning and service-learning activities considered in the review, promotion, and tenure or performance/contract reviews of faculty? Provide specific examples.
5. To what extent do "official" campus policies for promotion, review, and tenure or performance/contract reviews address service-learning?

Centralized Support Capacity

6. What is the coordinating agent for service-learning on the campus?
7. What percentage of all service-learning activities on the campus are coordinated, monitored, and/or filtered through this coordinating agent?
8. In terms of the status of their position, how much authority does the ~~service~~ ^{training} staff have to influence the advancement and institutionalization of ~~service~~ ^{training} on the campus?
9. What formal policies exist on your campus regarding ~~service~~ ^{training}? Provide specific examples.

Macro-Level Anchors

10. What are the primary components of the strategic plan for advancing ~~service~~ ^{training} learning on this campus?
11. What are the short- and long-range goals for service-learning on this campus?
12. With which campus-wide efforts is service-learning connected?

Institutionalization of Service-Learning

13. How is service-learning financially supported on this campus? What are the sources of funding (hard money, soft money, etc.)?
14. How have the chief administrators supported the advancement and/or institutionalization of service-learning on this campus? Provide specific examples.
15. How is the quality of this campus's service-learning activities monitored?

Follow-up for Document Analysis

What documents, websites, or other sources can you recommend that provide some explanations and details that may pertain to ~~service~~ ^{training} learning on your campus?

