

Academic Service-Learning Courses

AZUSA PACIFIC UNIVERSITY CENTER FOR ACADEMIC SERVICE-LEARNING HIGH-IMPACT PRACTICE TAXONOMY

ATTRIBUTE	HIGH IMPACT	HIGHER IMPACT	HIGHEST IMPACT
ACADEMIC: Service-learning (SL) activities align with course learning outcomes and assignments and are integrated into course design.	The instructor includes SL activities as added components of the course. The syllabus conveys this information.	The instructor utilizes the SL activities to provide additional insight into student understanding of academic content and ability to complete assignments. The syllabus describes the relationship of the SL activities to learning outcomes.	The instructor integrates the SL activities and relevant issues as critical dimensions for student understanding of academic content and ability to complete assignments. The syllabus provides a strong rationale for the relationship of the SL activities and learning outcomes.
ACADEMIC: Critical reflection is well integrated into student learning.	The instructor asks students to create reflective products about the SL activities at the completion of the project.	The instructor structures reflection activities and products about the SL activities that connect the experience to academic content, require moderate analysis, lead to new action, and provide ongoing feedback to the student throughout the semester.	The instructor builds student capacity to critically reflect and develop products that explore the relevance of the experience to academic content, use critical thinking to analyze social issues, recognize systems of power, and lead to new action. The instructor provides ongoing feedback to the student throughout the semester.
RECIPROCAL: Active partnerships and processes shape the SL activities, course design, and community needs/outcomes.	The community partner is provided with a brief overview of the course (e.g. learning outcomes, syllabus, instructor contact info) and the purposes of the SL activities.	The instructor meets with the community partner(s) to discuss the course (e.g. preparation/orientation of students, learning outcomes, syllabus), and to identify how the SL activities can enrich student learning and benefit the community partner.	The instructor collaborates with and learns from the community partner(s) as co-educators in various aspects of course planning and design (e.g. learning outcomes, readings, preparation/orientation for students, reflection, assessment) and together they identify how the SL activities can enrich student learning and add to the capacity of the community.
RECIPROCAL: Outcomes of the SL activities are evidenced through impact on the community.	The community partner articulates community outcomes and provides anecdotal feedback of impact.	The community partner articulates community outcomes, collects evidence (e.g. stories, feedback, data) and is invited to share impact with students.	The community partner and instructor articulate community outcomes, collect evidence (e.g. stories, feedback, data), share impact with students, and utilize results in future course design and SL activities.
RECIPROCAL: Outcomes of the SL activities are evidenced through assessment of student learning and development.	The instructor articulates the student learning outcomes to the class and utilizes existing means to assess at the end of the course (e.g. IDEA evaluations, SL Project Student Evaluations).	The instructor articulates the learning outcomes to the class and uses a measurement tool to assess the SL component of the particular course (e.g. Pre/Post Assessment tool, student survey, etc.).	The instructor and community partner(s) articulate the student learning outcomes to the class and use measurement tools to assess the SL component of the course and utilize results in future course design and SL activities.
MAKING A DIFFERENCE: Civic competencies (e.g. knowledge, skills, disposition, behavior) are well integrated into student learning outcomes.	The instructor focuses on discipline-based content with some attention given to civic learning or development of civic competencies.	The instructor focuses on discipline-based content and connects to civic learning and civic competencies when relevant to the SL activities.	The instructor focuses on the integration of discipline-based content with civic learning and civic competencies and emphasizes the relevance of the community activities to the public purposes of the discipline in society.
MAKING A DIFFERENCE: Dialogue with others across difference (e.g. racial, ethnic, social economic status, religion, etc.) occurs regularly.	The instructor, the course, and the SL activities offer students opportunities for interaction and dialogue with diverse others.	The instructor, the course, and the SL activities engage students in periodic interaction and dialogue with diverse others, as well as interactions and dialogue with peers across a range of experiences and diverse perspectives.	The instructor, the course, and the SL activities engage students in frequent interaction and dialogue with diverse others, as well as interactions and dialogue with peers across a range of experiences and diverse perspectives.
MAKING A DIFFERENCE: Topics of faith and worldview are well integrated into course and SL activities.	The instructor introduces some faith application into course content and SL activities (e.g. reflective assignment, class dialogue, etc.).	The instructor engages students in critical thought related to course content and SL activities (e.g. readings, reflective assignments, etc.).	The instructor guides students in critical thought in articulating an integrated understanding of faith and learning in action (e.g. related readings, reflective assignments, action plan for application, etc.).
MAKING A DIFFERENCE: Relationship to planned vocation is well integrated into student learning.	Students are introduced to SL activities connection to future vocation through existing means (e.g. SL orientation, SL Project Student Evaluations).	The instructor engages students in how course content and SL activities may relate to planned vocation (e.g. class discussions, reflective assignments, etc.).	The instructor and community partner(s) actively engage students in holistic discovery, considering how course content and SL activities provide practical experience, opportunity to demonstrate essential skills related to professional development and future vocation, and depth of focus related to future goals.

References

- Bradley, B. (1995). America's challenge. Revitalizing our national community. *National Civic Review*, 84(2), 94-100.
- Bringle, R. G. & Hatcher, J. A. (2009). Innovative practices in service-learning and curricular engagement. In Sandmann, L.R. , Thornton, C. H. & Jaeger, A. J. (Eds.), *Institutionalizing community engagement in higher education: The first wave of Carnegie classified institutions*. New Directions for Higher Education (pp. 37-46). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass/Wiley Publishing.
- Bringle, R. G. & Hatcher, J. A. (1995). "A Service-Learning Curriculum for Faculty." *Michigan Journal of Community Service-Learning*, 2, 112-122.
- Bringle, R. G. & Clayton, P. H. (2012). Civic education through service-learning: What, how, and why? In L. McIlraith, A. Lyons, & R. Munck (Eds.). *Higher education and civic engagement: Comparative perspectives* (pp. 101-124). New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Bringle, R. G., Clayton, P., & Bringle, K. E. (2015). From teaching democratic thinking to developing democratic civic identity. *Partnerships: A Journal of Service-Learning and Community Engagement*, 6(1), 51-76.
- Gazley, B., Littlepage, L., & Bennett, T. A. (2012). What about the host agency? Nonprofit perspectives on community-based student learning and volunteering. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 41(6), 1029-1050.
- Giles, D. E. & Eyler, J. (2013). Review Essay: The endless quest for scholarly respectability in service-learning research. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 20(1), 53-64.
- Jacoby, B. (2015). *Service-learning essentials*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Hahn, T. W. & Hatcher, J. A. (2015, September 30). What about service-learning matters? Using a taxonomy to identify variables to improve research and practice [Webinar]. In IARSLCE Webinar Series. Retrieved from <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=O3W27s3-XTw>.
- Mabry, J. B. (1998). Pedagogical variations in service-learning and student outcomes: How time, contact and reflection matter. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 5, 32-47.
- Mitchell, T. D. (2015). Using a critical service-learning approach to facilitate civic identity development. *Theory Into Practice*. 54, 20-28.
- Pigza, J. & Troppe, M. (2003). Developing an infrastructure for service-learning and community engagement. In B. Jacoby & Associates, *Building partnerships for service-learning* (pp. 106-130). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Smith, M. B., Nowacek, R. S., & Berstein, J. L. (Eds.). (2010). *Citizenship across the curriculum*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.
- Stokamer, S. T. (2011). Pedagogical catalysts of civic competence: The development of a critical epistemological model for community-based learning. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement*, 17, 113-121.
- Terry, J. D., Smith, B. H., & McQuilla, J. D. (2014). Teaching evidence-based practice in service-learning: A model for education and service. *Journal on Excellence in College Teaching*, 25(1), 55-69.