

Community Service-Learning 2006-07 Departmental Review

**Final Report Submitted by Rich Harris, Director
June 22, 2007**

Overview

Eric Nickel, Director, University Recreation served as the Coordinator of the Program Review (CPR). Eric met with the Community Service-Learning (CS-L) staff twice in June and July 2006 to get background information and to develop the review process. Based on these meetings it was determined that the goal of the review would be to survey the CS-L constituents, (JMU faculty, JMU students and local community partner agencies) to determine their perceptions of CS-L and how CS-L could more effectively serve them. This information would be gathered through surveys, focus groups, interviews with JMU Vice Presidents and a visit from an outside consultant. The information was to be gathered during the fall 2006 semester and the information analyzed in January and February 2007. An outside consultant was scheduled to review CS-L in February 2007. The final report was to be completed in March 2007. The original review plan is found as an appendix at the end of this report.

The original review plan proved to be overly ambitious. The challenges faced with the plan will be addressed in the methodology section below. In spite of the original review plan being modified, useful information has been gathered through the review process and recommendation have been developed that will advance CS-L's future development.

Methodologies

- 1. Surveys** – There was confusion as to which JMU department would support the survey process. In September 2006 Eric Nickel, CPR and Rich Harris, Director, CS-L met with Sara Finney, Assistant Assessment Specialist in The Center for Assessment and Research Studies (CARS). In this meeting they were instructed that CARS only supports surveys that addresses learning outcomes. Perception surveys are the responsibility of the Office of Intuitional Research (OIR). In October 2006 Frank Doherty, Director, OIR, was consulted to support the design and dissemination of the faculty and student web based perception surveys. For both the student and faculty survey, potential respondents were contacted three times by email between October 30 and November 13, 2006. For the student survey, 596 of the 2,500 students in the initial sample responded. This is a 24% response rate (596/2,500). For the faculty survey, 381 of the 831 faculty members in the initial sample responded. This is a 46% response rate (381/831). During the spring semester 2007 Peter De Michael,

Assistant Director, OIR, provided analyses for the completed surveys. While this analysis took much longer than expected, it proved to be invaluable.

2. **Focus Groups** – The facilitation of the focus groups proved to be a challenge. Originally Eric Nickel, CPR, secured the services of Claire Bolfig, JMU School of Business, to facilitate three separate focus groups; one each for students, faculty and community agencies selected by the CS-L staff. After several planning meetings in September and October, Claire withdrew from the process in November. No other facilitators could be secured. Based on this development, it was decided to convene only a community agency focus group as student and faculty information could be collected from the surveys. Eric Nickel facilitated the community agency focus group on January 3, 2007.
3. **Outside Consultant** – Rich Harris was assigned the responsibility of securing an outside consultant. In November 2006 he contacted the Campus Compact Consulting Corps to contract with a nationally recognized outside consultant. As an institutional member of Campus Compact, JMU was eligible for reduced consulting fees. After several weeks of communication with Jennifer Meeropol, Consulting Corps Program Manager, two consultants were recommended as the best qualified to perform the CS-L outside review. The recommended consultants were Andy Furco, University of Berkeley and Sherril Gelmon, Portland State University. Each consultant was contacted by Ms. Meeropol to inquire about a consulting agreement for a JMU visit in February 2007. After repeated contacts, neither consultant responded by January 11, 2007. At that time it was recommended by Ms. Meeropol to send out a new consulting proposal to all of the Consulting Corps members. This proposal was sent out on January 19. On February 9, Ms. Meeropol responded that only Tim Stanton, Stanford University, had responded. He could only come to JMU on February 20. JMU faculty, CS-L student and professional staff and community members were contacted to see if they could attend meetings with the consultant on this date. Most people contacted could not meet on February 20. After consultation with Eric Nickel, CPR, Al Menard, Associate Vice President for University Planning and Analysis and Randy Mitchell, Associate Vice President for Student Success, the outside consultant visit was canceled. It will not be rescheduled as a part of the departmental review. An outside consultant will be scheduled at a later date. The information and recommendations from this review will be shared with the consultant to help them prepare for their visit.
4. **Meeting with JMU Senior Leadership** – This methodology was the least defined at the beginning of the review process. Initially, Rich Harris was to meet with and interview each JMU Vice President. In subsequent meetings during the fall 2006 semester with Al Menard and Eric Nickel, this was determined not to be an effective use of time. The suggestion was made to meet with the academic department heads, but this was also determined to be too time intensive. In January 2007 the plan was again modified. This modification called for Rich Harris and Randy Mitchell to meet with Doug Brown, Provost for Academic Affairs and Mark Warner, Senior Vice President for Student Affairs and University Planning, for the purpose of sharing the preliminary results of the surveys, focus groups and outside consultant. As the specified information was incomplete until June 2007, this meeting was abandoned.

The final review report will be sent to both Dr. Warner and Dr. Brown for their review and recommendations.

- 5. Departmental Staff Retreat** – This was not originally part of the review plan. At the November 2006 meeting with Al Menard and Eric Nickel the decision was made to add a CS-L staff retreat for the purpose of identifying the issues the CS-L staff would like to address in the coming year. A staff survey was distributed to the CS-L staff on December 4, 2006. Frank Doherty compiled the results on December 8. Based on the results, Eric Nickel developed and facilitated the retreat on December 15, 2006.

Observations

Faculty Survey

Listed below are the characteristics, as defined by statistically significant correlations, for faculty who **HAVE** participated in at least one CS-L program (Faculty Correlation Summary, p 30-33).

Participated in at least one of the CS-L programs	Significant Correlations
Participated in service learning course (among those who have participated in at least one of the CS-L programs)	0.781**
Found out about the CS-L program participated in through a friend or colleague	0.586**
Participated in alternative spring break (among those who have participated in at least one of the CS-L programs)	0.573**
Found out about the CS-L program participated in through Discussions with CS-L staff	0.53**
Does know where the Community Service-Learning (CS-L) office is located	0.492**
Found out about the CS-L program participated in through an informal meeting	0.468**
Found out about the CS-L program participated in through a Department meeting	0.417**
Found out about the CS-L program participated in through Email	0.399**
Aware of JMU's CSL office, and it was influential or very influential in the decision to work at JMU	0.32**
Found out about the CS-L program participated in through visit to CS-L	0.317**
Participated in Hurricane Katrina relief (among those who have participated in at least one of the CS-L programs)	0.293**
Found out about the CS-L program participated in through the JMU website	0.293**
Respondent is affiliated with the college of Education	0.283**
Participated in other programs (among those who have participated in at least one of the CS-L programs)	0.267**
Found out about the CS-L program participated in through the CS-L website	0.238**
Occasionally or regularly participates in community service	0.201**
Participate thru JMU department for community service	0.18**
Found out about the CS-L program participated in through the Breeze	0.168**
Is female	0.157**
Ranked Breeze advertisement at or above the median (0) as the best way to advertise programs to faculty	0.15**
Ranked From an informational meeting~ below the median (0) as the best way to advertise programs to faculty	0.144**
Indicated that funding to attend conferences would make the CS-L programs	0.135**

Participated in at least one of the CS-L programs	Significant Correlations
more attractive to faculty members	
Participate thru JMU club or organization for community service	0.131*
Ranked From the CS-L web site at or above the median (0) as the best way to advertise programs to faculty	0.126*
Thinks lack JMU support prevents faculty from participating in CS-L programs	0.124*
Thinks no rewards prevents faculty from participating in CS-L programs	0.116*
Respondent is affiliated with the college of CISAT	0.108*
Ranked E-mail at or above the median (0) as the best way to advertise programs to faculty	0.106*

* - a finding that is so unlikely to happen by chance that it would happen by chance only 5 times in 100 tries.

** - a finding that is so unlikely to happen by chance that it would happen by chance only 1 time in 100 tries

Based on this information the faculty user of CS-L programs has the following profile:

- Receives their information about CS-L through personal contact with a colleague, departmental meeting or CS-L staff. Other significant information sources include e-mail, the JMU and CS-L websites and *The Breeze*.
- Participates in personal community service.
- Knows where the CS-L office is located.
- Was influenced by JMU's active service-learning program in their decision to work at JMU.
- Is affiliated with the Colleges of Education or CISAT.
- Is female.
- Indicated that funding to attend conferences would make CS-L programs more attractive.
- Indicated that lack of JMU support and lack of rewards are obstacles to faculty participating in CS-L programs.

Further analysis of faculty who participate in specific CS-L programs, shows the following additional statistically significant correlations (Faculty Correlation Summary, p 34-36):

- Those faculty that taught a service-learning course:
 - Also participated in an Alternative Spring Break (ASB) trip (.214 correlation)
 - Reward in the tenure process would make CS-L programs more attractive (.136 correlation)
- Those faculty that participated in an ASB trip:
 - Also taught a service-learning course (.214 correlation)

Listed below are the characteristics, as defined by statistically significant correlations, for faculty who **HAVE NOT** participated in at least one CS-L program (Faculty Correlation Summary, p 32).

Did NOT participate in at least one of the CS-L programs	Significant Correlations
Does NOT know where the Community Service-Learning (CS-L) office is located	0.492**
Have NOT participated in at least one of the CS-L programs and email is an effective source of information about CS-L programs	0.353**
Aware of JMU's CSL office, but it was little or no influence in the decision to work at JMU	0.32**
Have NOT participated in at least one of the CS-L programs and thinks the JMU website is an effective source of information about CS-L programs	0.318**
Have NOT participated in at least one of the CS-L programs and thinks a friend or colleague is an effective source of information about CS-L programs	0.277**
Have NOT participated in at least one of the CS-L programs and thinks the Breeze is an effective source of information about CS-L programs	0.267**
Have NOT participated in at least one of the CS-L programs and thinks departmental meetings are an effective source of information about CS-L programs	0.221**
Rarely or never participates in community service	0.201**
Have NOT participated in at least one of the CS-L programs and thinks formal meetings are an effective source of information about CS-L programs	0.163**
Have NOT participated in at least one of the CS-L programs and thinks a flyer is an effective source of information about CS-L programs	0.157**
Is male	0.157**
Ranked Breeze advertisement below the median (0) as the best way to advertise programs to faculty	0.15**
Respondent is affiliated with the college of Science and Math	0.144**
Ranked From an informational meeting~ at or above the median (0) as the best way to advertise programs to faculty	0.144**
Have NOT participated in at least one of the CS-L programs and thinks the CS-L website is an effective source of information about CS-L programs	0.132**
Have NOT participated in at least one of the CS-L programs and thinks CS_L staff are an effective source of information about CS-L programs	0.13*
Thinks lack of time prevents faculty from participating in CS-L programs	0.127*
Ranked From the CS-L web site below the median (0) as the best way to advertise programs to faculty	0.126*
Respondent is affiliated with the College of Visual and Performing arts	0.117*
Ranked E-mail below the median (0) as the best way to advertise programs to faculty	0.106*

* - a finding that is so unlikely to happen by chance that it would happen by chance only 5 times in 100 tries.

** - a finding that is so unlikely to happen by chance that it would happen by chance only 1 time in 100 tries

Based on this information the faculty non user of CS-L programs has the following profile:

- Does not know where the CS-L office is located.
- Rarely or never participates in personal community service.
- Is male.

- Is affiliated with the Colleges of Math and Science or Visual and Performing Arts.
- Indicated that lack of time is an obstacle to participating in CS-L programs.

Additional Observation and Details From the Faculty Survey

- There is a positive correlation between faculty's personal service to the community and involvement in CS-L programs. Eighty three percent (83%) of the faculty involved in CS-L programs are also involved in personal service to the community, while only fifty six percent (56%) of the faculty not involved in CS-L programs are involved in community service (CS-L Faculty Summary Report, p 13). Further analysis shows there is a significant correlation of .202 for faculty teaching service-learning courses and .102 for faculty participating in Hurricane Katrina trips and involvement in personal community service (Faculty Survey Correlations, p 2).
- Ninety eight percent (98%) of faculty surveyed believe service-learning can contribute to the learning of students (CS-L Faculty Summary Report, p 25). Faculty ranked the most important learning in the following percentages (CS-L Faculty Summary Report, p 28):
 - Personal understanding and development – 24%
 - Understanding and empathy of others – 23%
 - Opportunities to apply what students are learning in the classroom – 18%
 - Developing a lifelong commitment to service – 12%
 - Developing workplace skills – 7%
 - Developing positive alternatives to alcohol related activities – 1%
 - The percentages above are similar for both faculty who have and who have not participated in CS-L programs. The one exception was, *Opportunities to apply what students are learning in the classroom*. This was the top reason given by 23% of participating faculty while only 16% of non participating faculty listed this as their top reason (CS-L Faculty Summary Report, p 29).
- Eighty two percent (82%) of all faculty surveyed did not know where the CS-L office was located, yet seventy eight percent (78%) of those faculty participating in CS-L programs did (CS-L Faculty Summary Report, p 30 and 31).
- Fifty four percent (54%) of CS-L participating faculty reported that JMU's active service learning program in some way influenced their decision to work at JMU while this was an influence for only seventeen percent (17%) of non participating CS-L faculty (CS-L Faculty Summary Report, p 39). There was a statistically significant correlation between JMU's active service learning program as an being influential or very influential part of choosing JMU for faculty that (Faculty Survey Correlations, p 28):
 - Have taught a service-learning course (.328)
 - Have been an ASB learning partner (.257)
 - Have participated in a Hurricane Katrina relief trip (.235)
- Quantifying the open ended responses of the personal benefits for faculty who participated in CS-L programs was difficult. This information will be most helpful in future CS-L promotional information and presentations. A sampling of responses include (CS-L Faculty Summary Report, p 54):

- Learning how to "teach" and "reflect" about service; learning how to facilitate service opportunities; witnessing how it affects students and faculty.
- Provided students with the opportunity to successfully apply classroom knowledge. This reinforced what I was teaching.
- Witnessing my students own enjoyment of the learning process. One student stated that she learned more from the class than she had in any other course because she was able to practice what was being taught in class.
- Engaging with students in a departmental way to influence their learning through service and to learn myself about a new environment and how students see service.
- Learning more about the world~ realizing people everywhere are the same and have the same issues~ stepping out of my comfort zone.
- The primary learning benefits for teaching a service-learning course were easier to quantify. The responses were grouped into the follow categories with corresponding response percentage. Multiple responses were allowed, which accounts for the percentages being over 100% (CS-L Faculty Summary Report, p 73):
 - Real world experiences for students – 62%
 - Learning benefits – 38%
 - Service to the community – 18%
 - Additionally the open ended response can be used in future CS-L presentations.
- Direct personal contact was the primary means that faculty participating in CS-L programs received information about CS-L. Listed below are the ways faculty received information (CS-L Faculty Summary Report, p 59):
 - From a colleague – 40%
 - From a CS-L staff member – 33%
 - From a CS-L informational meeting – 26%
 - In a departmental meeting – 21%
 - CS-L e-mail – 19%
 - Visit to the CS-L office – 12%
 - From the JMU website – 10%
 - From the CS-L website – 10%
 - From *The Breeze* – 4 %
- The majority of JMU faculty teaching service learning courses have done so for three or less semesters. Sixty two percent (62%) have taught three or less semesters compared to thirty eight percent (38%) who have taught four or more semesters (CS-L Faculty Summary Report, p 67-70).
- The table below shows that the mean number of semesters faculty reported teaching a service learning course was 3.46. This ranged from 1.2 semesters for instructors to 4.86 semesters for full professors (Community Service Learning Faculty Survey – Rank and Teaching Data).

Q26. Your rank at JMU:	Mean	Median	N
Instructor/lecturer	1.20	2.00	10
Assistant professor	2.67	2.00	15
Associate professor	4.20	5.00	20
Full professor	4.86	2.00	14

Q26. Your rank at JMU:	Mean	Median	N
Total	3.46	2.00	59

- The table below crosstabs faculty rank with service learning teaching experience. Of particular interest is the right hand column. It lists by rank all faculty who reported teaching a service learning course. Note that 42% (Instructors and Assistant Professors) do not have tenure (Community Service Learning Faculty Survey – Rank and Teaching Data).

Q26. Your rank at JMU:	Q12. Please select the number of semesters that you have taught a class											
	None		1-3		4-6		7 -9		10 or more		Total	
	Cou nt	%	Cou nt	%	Cou nt	%	Cou nt	%	Cou nt	%	Cou nt	%
Instructor/ lecturer	4.0	26.7	6.0	27.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	10.0	16.9
Assistant professor	5.0	33.3	5.0	22.7	4.0	40.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	14.3	15.0	25.4
Associate professor	4.0	26.7	5.0	22.7	6.0	60.0	3.0	60.0	2.0	28.6	20.0	33.9
Full professor	2.0	13.3	6.0	27.3	0.0	0.0	2.0	40.0	4.0	57.1	14.0	23.7
Total	15.0	100.0	22.0	100.0	10.0	100.0	5.0	100.0	7.0	100.0	59.0	100.0

- ASB was reported as the CS-L program faculty were most aware of (CS-L Faculty Summary Report, p 83-93).

CS-L Program	Aware	Not aware
Service-Learning courses	45%	56%
Alternative Spring Break	93%	7%
Hurricane Katrina relief trips	82%	19%

- For both faculty users and non users the greatest obstacles to participating in CS-L programs were (CS-L Faculty Summary Report, p 104):

Obstacle - Multiple responses allowed.	User	Non User
Lack of time	71%	85%
Teaching conflicts	48%	51%
No rewards	49%	34%
Lack of service-learning understanding	34%	28%
Lack of incentives	29%	26%
Did not know program existed	19%	25%
Lack of research opportunities	12%	19%
Lack of JMU support	17%	7%
Lack of departmental support	14%	11%
Lack of training	12%	6%

Several interesting observations can be found in these responses.

1. Both users and non users ranked the obstacles in the same order.
2. Lack of time is a larger obstacle for non users than for users. This correlation had a statistical significance of .127 (Faculty Correlation Summary, p 32).
3. Lack of rewards and lack of JMU support are larger obstacles for users than non users. This correlation had a statistical significance of .124 and .116 respectively (Faculty Correlation Summary, p 30).

- For both faculty users and non users the greatest incentives to participating in CS-L programs were (CS-L Faculty Summary Report, p 111).

Incentive - Multiple responses allowed.	User	Non User
Reward in the tenure process	67%	55%
Financial Incentives	40%	39%
Recognition from the department head	38%	35%
More research and publishing opportunities	35%	32%
Funding to attend service-learning conferences	45%	28%
Service-Learning training provided	33%	23%
Membership in an active service-learning faculty group	25%	24%

Several interesting observations can be found in these responses.

1. Both users and non users ranked the incentives in the same order.
2. Reward in the tenure process, funding to attend service-learning conferences and service-learning training were greater incentives for faculty users than to non users. Only the funding for service learning conferences showed a statistically significant correlation of .135 (Faculty Correlation Summary, p 30).

Student Survey

Listed below are the characteristics, as defined by statistically significant correlations, for students who **HAVE** participated in at least one CS-L program (Students Correlations Summary, p 29-30).

Have participated in at least one of the CS-L programs	Significant Correlations
Found out about the CS-L program participated in through a JMU class or professor	0.715**
Does know where the Community Service-Learning (CS-L) office is located	0.607**
Participated in service learning course (among those who have participated in at least one of the CS-L programs)	0.601**
Participated in Personal community service	0.595**

Have participated in at least one of the CS-L programs	Significant Correlations
placement through the CS-L office (among those who have participated in at least one of the CS-L programs)	
Found out about the CS-L program participated in through a friend or colleague	0.505**
Participated in alternative spring break (among those who have participated in at least one of the CS-L programs)	0.449**
Found out about the CS-L program participated in through the JMU website	0.342**
Found out about the CS-L program participated in through Email	0.342**
Found out about the CS-L program participated in through discussions with CS-L staff	0.323**
Found out about the CS-L program participated in through visit to CS-L	0.323**
Participated in Hurricane Katrina relief (among those who have participated in at least one of the CS-L programs)	0.303**
Found out about the CS-L program participated in through the CS-L website	0.303**
Found out about the CS-L program participated in through an informal meeting	0.303**
Participated in federal work study of America Reads (among those who have participated in at least one of the CS-L programs)	0.22**
Found out about the CS-L program participated in through <i>The Breeze</i>	0.22**
Found out about the CS-L program participated in through a flyer	0.22**
Occasionally or regularly participates in community service through JMU, a civic organization, religious organization or other organization	0.204**
Is a Junior or Senior	0.17**
Female	0.163**
Felt lack of transportation was an obstacle that prevented students from participating in CS-L programs.	0.15**
Would be somewhat or very likely to register for courses with a CS-L component if they knew which courses offered it.	0.145**

Have participated in at least one of the CS-L programs	Significant Correlations
Thinks community service can contribute very much or somewhat to overall JMU learning experience.	0.133**
Frequently or Somewhat Frequently channels community service at JMU through Service Clubs	0.12**
JMU's CSL program was influential or very influential in the decision to attend JMU	0.119**
Rated from the JMU web site above the median (0) best way to advertise	0.115**
Frequently or Somewhat Frequently channels community service at JMU through other JMU Clubs - Organizations	0.11**
Service participation recorded on my JMU records would make CS-L programs more attractive to students.	0.099*
Rated <i>Breeze</i> advertisement median or below (1) best way to advertise	0.096*
Rated E-mail median or below (1) best way to advertise	0.094*
Rated flyer median or below (0) best way to advertise	0.088*
Rated JMU class or professor above the median (0) best way to advertise	0.086*

* - a finding that is so unlikely to happen by chance that it would happen by chance only 5 times in 100 tries.

** - a finding that is so unlikely to happen by chance that it would happen by chance only 1 time in 100 tries

- Based on this information the student users of CS-L programs have the following profile:
 - Among these students indicating transportation was an obstacle they also indicated that funds provided to help cover service expenses would make CS-L programs more attractive to students
 - Found out about the CS-L program participated in through a JMU class or professor
 - Participated in service learning course (among those who have participated in at least one of the CS-L programs)
 - Does know where the Community Service-Learning office is located
 - JMU's CS-L program was influential or very influential in the decision to attend JMU
 - Is a Junior or Senior
 - Female

- Would be somewhat or very likely to register for courses with a CS-L component if they knew which courses offered it
- Felt lack of transportation was an obstacle that prevented students from participating in CS-L programs
- Further analysis of student participation in specific CS-L programs, shows the following additional statistically significant correlations (Students Correlations Summary, p 33-34). Students who participated in service learning course:
 - Found out about the CS-L program they participated in through a JMU class or professor
 - Tended to participate in personal community service placement through the CS-L office
 - Felt lack of transportation was an obstacle that prevented students from participating in CS-L programs
 - Indicated that Transportation provided to service sites would make CS-L programs more attractive to students
 - Among these students indicating transportation was an obstacle they also indicated that funds provided to help cover service expenses would make CS-L programs more attractive to students
- Listed below are the characteristics, as defined by statistically significant correlations, for students who **HAVE NOT** participated in at least one CS-L program (Students Correlations Summary, p 31-32).

Have NOT participated in at least one of the CS-L programs	Significant Correlations
Does NOT know where the Community Service-Learning (CS-L) office is located	0.607**
Have NOT participated in at least one of the CS-L programs and email is an useful source of information about CS-L programs	0.431**
Have NOT participated in at least one of the CS-L programs and thinks <i>The Breeze</i> is a useful source of information about CS-L programs	0.421**
Have NOT participated in at least one of the CS-L programs and thinks a friend or colleague is an useful source of information about CS-L programs	0.341**
Have NOT participated in at least one of the CS-L programs and thinks a JMU class or professor is a useful source of information about CS-L programs	0.324**
Have NOT participated in at least one of the CS-L programs and thinks the JMU website is a useful source of information about CS-L programs	0.302**
Have NOT participated in at least one of the	0.265**

Have NOT participated in at least one of the CS-L programs	Significant Correlations
CS-L programs and thinks a flyer is an useful source of information about CS-L programs	
Rarely or never participates in community service through JMU, a civic organization, religious organization or other organization	0.204**
Is a Freshman or Sophomore	0.175**
Male	0.163**
Would be very unlikely, or not at all interested in registering for courses with a CS-L component if they knew which courses offered it	0.145**
Have NOT participated in at least one of the CS-L programs and thinks an informational meeting or presentation is a useful source of information about CS-L programs	0.137**
Have NOT participated in at least one of the CS-L programs and thinks the CS-L website is a useful source of information about CS-L programs	0.135**
Has no basis to judge if community service can contribute to overall JMU learning experience.	0.124**
Rated from the JMU web site median or below (0) best way to advertise	0.115**
Have NOT participated in at least one of the CS-L programs and thinks talking to a CS-L staff member is a useful source of information about CS-L programs	0.109**
Rated <i>Breeze</i> advertisement Above the median (1) best way to advertise	0.096*
Felt not being able to afford (the cost) was an obstacle that prevented students from participating in CS-L programs	0.095*
Have NOT participated in at least one of the CS-L programs and thinks visiting CS-L is an useful source of information about CS-L programs	0.094*
Rated E-mail above the median (1) best way to advertise	0.094*
Very Little or Not at all channels community service at JMU through other JMU Clubs - Organizations	0.089*
Funds provided to help cover service expenses would make CS-L programs more attractive to	0.089*

Have NOT participated in at least one of the CS-L programs	Significant Correlations
students	
Rated flyer above the median (0) best way to advertise	0.088*
Rated JMU class or professor median or below (0) best way to advertise	0.086*

* - a finding that is so unlikely to happen by chance that it would happen by chance only 5 times in 100 tries.

** - a finding that is so unlikely to happen by chance that it would happen by chance only 1 time in 100 tries

- Based on this information the student non users of CS-L programs have the following profile:
 - Does NOT know where the Community Service-Learning (CS-L) office is located
 - Rarely or never participates in community service through JMU, a civic organization, religious organization or other organization
 - Male
 - Freshman or Sophomore
 - Felt not being able to afford (the cost) was an obstacle that prevented students from participating in CS-L programs
- These results may show that the acclimation period during the freshman and sophomore years during which students are learning about JMU and are adapting to the academic environment may play some part in obstacles to knowing of, or participating in the CS-L program or other programs like it.

Additional Observation and Details from the Student Survey

- There is a positive correlation between regular participation in community service through JMU, a civic organization, religious organization or other organization and involvement in CS-L programs. Ninety-seven percent (97%) of the students involved in CS-L programs are also involved in personal service to the community, while eighty percent (80%) of the students not involved in CS-L programs are involved in community service (CS-L Students Summary Report, p 8).
- Eighty-three percent (83%) of students surveyed believe service-learning can contribute somewhat or very much and eighty-nine percent (89%) said somewhat, very much, or very little to the learning of students (CS-L Student Summary Report, p 65). Students ranked the following most important personal benefits of participation.
 - Learning/ New Experience 31%
 - Job/Skill Related 20%
 - Personal satisfaction 18%
 - Interpersonal 13%
 - Personal growth 10%
 - Other 6%
 - Class assignment/class credit 4%

- Sixty-seven percent (67%) of all students surveyed did not know where the CS-L office was located, yet eighty-seven percent (87%) of those students participating in CS-L programs did (CS-L Students Summary Report, p 78 and 80).
- There was very little difference between students who were CS-L participants and those who were CS-L non-participants in their ratings about whether the community service program in some way influenced their decision to attend JMU (48% and 40%, respectively).
- Students indicated that the benefit to the JMU community of having programs that are offered by CS-L was:
 - Helps the community and individuals/ give back to community 35%
 - Community awareness/ Social awareness/ World awareness 26%
 - Involvement/ Enhances college experience 24%
 - Connects JMU to community/ Creates positive reputation 18%
 - Student growth/ well-rounded students/ Student more likely to do service 12%
 - Develop relationships 8%
 - Internal gratification 8%
 - Gain job-related experience/life-skill 4%
 - Other 3%
- Students also indicated the following characteristics they felt best described students who participated in CS-L programs:
 - Cares about the community and people/ socially-aware/altruistic/religious 58%
 - Involved/ambitious/challenges self 22%
 - No certain type 15%
 - Manage free time/does not have to work/ can afford it 13%
 - Certain majors 9%
 - Want to learn/academic 6%
 - Other 5%
 - Knows about programs 3%
 - Has done service before coming to JMU 2%
- The primary challenges in participating in the program were (from open responses):
 - Time/Scheduling conflicts 49%
 - No motivation/Commitment 19%
 - Process oriented 15%
 - Transportation 13%
 - Other 9%
 - Experience did not meet expectations/ hard work 8%
 - Expenses 2%
- For both student users and non users the greatest obstacles to participating in CS-L programs were (CS-L Student Summary Report, p 194):

Q14. From the following list please select the obstacles or challenges that you feel prevent students from participating in CS-L programs.	User (n=129)	Non-User (n=462)	Total (n=591)
Lack of time	89%	84%	85%
Conflicted with other activities I am involved in	64%	56%	58%
Did not know the programs existed	53%	57%	56%
Conflicted with my work schedule	53%	47%	48%

Could not afford it	24%	35%	32%
No incentives	27%	33%	31%
Lack of transportation	45%	28%	31%
Not interested in service	28%	22%	23%
Uncomfortable with the people I would interact with in CS-L programs	11%	10%	10%
Other	2%	1%	2%

- Several interesting observations can be found in these responses.
 - Both users and non users ranked the obstacles in nearly the same order
 - Users do list lack of transportation more highly than non-users
- JMU class or professor was the primary means that students participating in CS-L programs received information about CS-L. Listed below are the ways students received information (CS-L Student Summary Report, p 112):
 - JMU class or professor 58.6%
 - From a friend, teacher, or colleague 31.3%
 - From the JMU web site 14.8%
 - E-mail 14.8%
 - Talking to a CS-L staff member 13.3%
 - Visiting the CS-L office 13.3%
 - From the CS-L web site 11.7%
 - From an informational meeting or presentation 1.7%
 - *Breeze* advertisement 6.3%
 - Flyer 6.3%
 - Other 3.9%
- ASB was reported as the CS-L program students were most aware of (CS-L Student Summary Report, p 171):
 - Alternative Spring Break trip 71.5%
 - Hurricane Katrina relief trip 62.9%
 - Community federal work study of America Reads 23.4%
 - Personal community service placement through the CS-L office 19.9%
 - Service-learning course 19.0%
 - Other 2.4%
- For students the greatest incentives to participating in CS-L programs were academic credit for non-users and a record of service participation for users (CS-L Student Summary Report, p 209). This shows that the overall top three incentives (academic credit, scholarship, and record of service) are distributed differently depending on participation. These incentives may hint at the same “reward” oriented pressures among students as appeared among faculty. Those who don’t participate may have a more narrow focus on academics.

Q16. What incentives would make the CS-L programs more attractive to students?	User (n=130)	Non-User (n=457)	Total (n=587)
Academic credit given for non class service experiences	68.5%	67.4%	67.6%

Scholarships awarded for service	54.6%	63.9%	61.8%
Service participation would be recorded on my JMU records	69.2%	58.0%	60.5%
Funds provided to help cover service expenses	43.8%	55.1%	52.6%
Transportation provided to service sites	50.8%	46.0%	47.0%
More of my friends participated	41.5%	45.1%	44.3%
Awards given for service	35.4%	41.8%	40.4%
Recognition given for a certain level of service participation	36.9%	32.4%	33.4%
Other	2.3%	2.0%	2.0%

Community Focus Group - written by Eric Nickel focus group facilitator

Findings:

- Three of the agencies first became aware of CS-L programs program though a letter sent by the CS-L Office.
- Many agencies first started their relationship with CS-L as a way to get volunteers in their organization. In some cases large numbers of volunteers were needed. The availability of work-study students was also a big help, as JMU paid for the students wages.
- To a person it was clear that the offices represented were very thankful for the relationship with CS-L and many sited that they could not complete their mission without CS-L students.
- It appears that very positive and mutually beneficial relationships are formed between JMU students and their agency mentors facilitated through their CS-L assignments.

Strengths of the program:

- Enthusiasm and dependability of the students
- The fact that CS-L does a pre-screening and ‘weeds out’ volunteers
- The responsiveness of the CS-L office. If the agency needs to update our needs or have a question, they are there
- The overall quality of students and their skills/abilities

Things that could be improved:

- Getting students to commit for longer time periods (more than one semester and during the May – August period)
- Turnover in the CS-L student Service Coordinator staff causes some challenges Their first semester they are not always familiar with the agency and there can be a steep learning curve
- Clear guidelines as to how/when to report a student who does not show up or do the job
- Occasional problems with expectations for things like dress code

CS-L Departmental Staff Retreat

The following departmental issues were identified at the December 15, 2006 staff retreat facilitated by Eric Nickel.

1. Improved communication
 - a. Exploring intentions and building trust
 - b. Being more direct with expressing ideas and feelings on work related issues
 - c. Being more comfortable with conflict and developing more conflict resolution skills
 - d. Getting to know each staff member better
2. Defining the CS-L culture
 - a. Defining the culture
 - b. Writing down the culture to be shared with others
 - c. Identifying if any part of the culture is a roadblock to success; if so addressing this
 - d. Defining organizational values and how they are developed
3. Reviewing the current mission statement, vision statement and values from above.
 - a. Determining if they are current or need to be updated
 - b. Create understanding and buy in for all involved in CS-L
4. Develop departmental procedures for:
 - a. Programs
 - b. Departmental operation procedures
5. Develop on going CS-L planning processes and procedures for:
 - a. CS-L development
 - b. Tying CS-L development to JMU goals
 - c. Tying CS-L development to SAUP and Academic Affairs Goals

Recommendations

Based on the information collected during the review process the following recommendations were developed.

Faculty Development

1. Reduced teaching loads should be considered to attract more faculty to teach service-learning courses. Time and teaching conflicts were the greatest obstacles to teaching service-learning courses reported by the JMU faculty surveyed. This was reported by a majority of all faculty surveyed. Faculty report a reduced teaching load is particularly important when developing new service-learning courses.
2. Consistently rewarding service-learning in the JMU tenure process. Rewarding service-learning in the tenure process was reported as the most important incentive to faculty to teach service-learning courses. This was reported by a majority of all faculty surveyed.

3. Create a visible and formalized JMU service-learning faculty development program. This should include the incentives listed in #1 and #2 above and a formalized training and development program. Community Service-Learning and the Center for Faculty Innovation have begun the process of researching a JMU service-learning structure and needed resources.

Student Involvement

1. Explore ways to formally give credit for student's service experiences. The majority of all students surveyed reported time and conflicts with other activities (class, work, co-curricular activities) as the greatest obstacle to their participation in service activities. Additionally the majority of students surveyed reported some form of credit for service (academic credit, scholarships, notation on their JMU records) as the most desired incentive for becoming engaged in service activities. It seems other activities are being seen by students as more valuable than service experiences for the majority of the JMU student's busy time.
2. Get JMU students involved in service earlier in their JMU career. The majority of students surveyed get involved in service as junior and seniors. More attention should be paid to programs that will get students involved in service as freshman and sophomores. This will allow students more time (chronologically and developmentally) to engage in deeper and more sophisticated service-learning experiences.
3. Explore ways to provide student transportation to academic service-learning sites. Both faculty and students report lack of transportation to service sites as a growing obstacle in service-learning courses. Transportation would also address #2 above as it is often younger JMU students who do not have their own transportation at JMU.

Community Agency Development

1. Continue to grow and develop community partnerships with JMU service-learning courses. Community agencies continue to want more assistance and reciprocal partnerships with JMU. This aids in the development of community resources and addresses community needs. This community involvement helps the community view JMU as a community partner rather than "an ivory tower." If JMU is to expand its service-learning programming (both academic and co-curricular) it cannot do so without active and expanded partnerships with local, domestic and international community partners.
2. Collaborate with key agencies to create a 'best practices' academic service-learning manual to help agencies supervise their JMU students, promote student learning and guide students civic development.
3. Allow CS-L local community agencies the opportunity to offer an orientation to new CS-L student Service Coordinator staff, to lessen the learning curve for them in assigning students to the agency.

CS-L Organizational Development

1. Developing a formalized process to strengthen CS-L communication and trust among the professional staff. – This recommendation has been addressed in the following ways:
 - a. A CS-L professional staff communication retreat facilitated by David Onestak, Director of the JMU Counseling Center, on March 7, 2007.
 - b. The CS-L professional staff followed up with work sessions on March 26, May 31 and June 7.
 - c. Written departmental staff expectations were developed as was a procedure for identifying and resolving conflict.
 - d. Staff report increased trust and comfort in effective communication within the department.
2. Reviewing the current mission statement, vision statement and values to see if they need to be updated. Scheduled for 2007-08.
3. Defining and writing down the CS-L culture. Scheduled for 2007-08.
4. Updating and developing written program manuals and departmental operational procedures – In progress with a completion date of May 2008
5. Continuing to seek the outside review of CS-L by a service-learning expert originally planned for this review process.

Recommendations for a future departmental review

1. More clearly identify the roles and responsibilities of the Departmental Director, Coordinator of the Program Review (CPR), Office of Institutional Research and the Associate Vice President for University Planning and Analysis.
2. More clearly identify the specifics and expectations of the review process. The following would be helpful for a future review:
 - a. An orientation to include the review process, expectations, roles, support services, resources, best practices from past reviews, format for the final report, examples of past review reports and comments from directors of departments recently reviewed.
 - b. Departmental SWOT analysis facilitated by a trained facilitator before the review begins.
 - c. An outline for the departmental review planning process. This document should outline what is expected to be in the review plan, guidelines for review goals, resources required to implement the review plan, who is responsible for supporting the component parts of the plan, and who approves the plan.
 - d. Guidelines for implementation of the plan – should a literature or best practice review be completed, monitoring and support of information collection and analysis, departmental review bench marks, supervision, support, guidance and reporting of implementation plan, determining what happens when things go wrong, and monitoring/support of writing the draft and final reports.
3. Clearly identifying what resources, support services and expertise are available to support the departmental review process.

Appendix

Community Service- Learning Self-Study Original Goals and Timeline September 8, 2006

Goal - to determine the perceptions of Community Service-Learning (CS-L) constituents, (JMU faculty, JMU students and local community partner agencies) and how CS-L can more effectively serve them.

Methodology

1. Surveys and focus groups with faculty, students and community partners on current perceptions, strengths and weaknesses and ideas for future CS-L services and direction.
2. Interviews with JMU senior leadership to collect their suggestions on CS-L's future development at JMU.
3. Review of CS-L by an outside expert to make observations on CS-L strengths and weaknesses and to recommend steps for future improvements.

Timeline

September 2006	Development of faculty survey instrument (Rich, Sara Finney, Frank Doherty) Intended Outcome: discover faculty awareness/perceptions of CSL
	Development of student survey instrument (Lorelei, Sara Finney, Frank Doherty) Intended Outcome: discover student awareness/perceptions of CSL
October 2006	Schedule focus group with Community Agencies (Walt, Claire Bolfig) Intended Outcome: Conduct a SWOT analysis with current CA participants
	Schedule focus group with Current Faculty participants (Rich, Claire Bolfig) Intended Outcome: Conduct a SWOT analysis with current faculty participants
	Schedule focus group(s) with student participants (Lorelei, Claire, Bolfig) Intended Outcome: Conduct a SWOT analysis with current student participants

Compile and analyze data from surveys (Debbie and CS-L Staff)

Schedule focus group with CS-L student employees (Eric)

- November 2006 Conduct Interviews with Administration –President and VP’s (Rich)
Intended Outcome: gauge current knowledge/value of CS-L, ideas/opportunities to meet institutional goals in future. Alignment of outcomes with resources.
- Analyze data and establish consensus where possible from focus groups (Rich, Walt, Lorelei, Eric). Intended Outcome: Examine data from four focus groups, and identify commonalities and new ideas for inclusion in the report.
- December 2006 Prepare first draft of report for review by entire committee. (Rich and other CS-L staff)
Intended Outcome: Read over holidays, make edits/changes.
- January 2007 Prepare final draft of report to be shared with committee and outside consultant.
- Bring in outside consultant (Rich invites)
Intended Outcome: Reviewer to examine internal report, organizational structure, resources, and operations from an outside perspective with applicable expertise.
- February 2007 Receive outside consultant report, share with committee, attach to final report.
Intended Outcome: Make key recommendations that will be followed up on and become part of the departmental plan for the future.
- March 2007 Share report with Senior VP, and AVP. Share key recommendations with SA Directors and enter appropriate components into planning database for 07-08.