Evaluation Criteria for the Scholarship of Engagement

These criteria are used by the National Review Board to assess and evaluate the Scholarship of Engagement. Drawing from the criteria presented in *Scholarship Assessed: A Special Report on Faculty Evaluation*, (Glassick, Huber & Maeroff, 1997), they have been adapted to more closely reflect the unique fit with the Scholarship of Engagement.

The Scholarship of Engagement is a term that captures scholarship in the areas of teaching, research, and/or service. It engages faculty in academically relevant work that simultaneously meets campus mission and goals as well as community needs. In essence, it is a scholarly agenda that integrates community issues. In this definition, community is broadly defined to include audiences external to the campus that are part of a collaborative process to contribute to the public good.

In applying these criteria, the National Review Board for the Scholarship of Engagement is mindful of the variation in institutional contexts, the breadth of faculty work, and individual promotion and tenure guidelines.

**Goals/Questions**

- Does the scholar state the basic purpose of the work and its value for public good?
- Is there an “academic fit” with the scholar’s role, departmental and university mission?
- Does the scholar define objectives that are realistic and achievable?
- Does the scholar identify intellectual and significant questions in the discipline and in the community?

**Context of theory, literature, “best practices”**

- Does the scholar show an understanding of relevant existing scholarship?
- Does the scholar bring the necessary skills to the collaboration?
- Does the scholar make significant contributions to the work?
- Is the work intellectually compelling?

**Methods**

- Does the scholar use methods appropriate to the goals, questions and context of the work?
- Does the scholar describe rationale for election of methods in relation to context and issue?
- Does the scholar apply effectively the methods selected?
- Does the scholar modify procedures in response to changing circumstances?

**Results**

- Does the scholar achieve the goals?
- Does the scholar’s work add consequentially to the discipline and to the community?
- Does the scholar’s work open additional areas for further exploration and collaboration?
- Does the scholar’s work achieve impact or change? Are those outcomes evaluated and by whom?

**Communication/Dissemination**

- Does the scholar use a suitable style and effective organization to present the work?
- Does the scholar communicate/disseminate to appropriate academic and public audiences consistent with the mission of the institution?
- Does the scholar use appropriate forums for communicating work to the intended audience?
- Does the scholar present information with clarity and integrity?

**Reflective Critique**

- Does the scholar critically evaluate the work?
- What are the sources of evidence informing the critique?
- Does the scholar bring an appropriate breadth of evidence to the critique?
- In what way has the community perspective informed the critique?
- Does the scholar use evaluation to learn from the work and to direct future work?
- Is the scholar involved in a local, state and national dialogue related to the work?
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This qualitative study includes focus group research involving 99 experienced community partners across eight California communities using community-based research techniques to capture community voices about their service-learning partnerships with different colleges and universities. Partners commented on their perspectives regarding motivations, benefits to the academic institution and to their own organization, impacts on student learning, and areas for improving partnerships. The analysis affirms the characteristics of effective partnerships of multiple well-established models of effective partnerships developed by higher education, but reveal that community partners have a specific sense of prioritization among partnership factors. In addition, partners revealed a surprising depth of understanding and commitment to student learning, the "common ground" of the service-learning experience. Community partners also voiced challenges and recommendations for their higher education partners to transform service-learning partnership relationships to bridge their "different worlds," and enhance learning, reciprocity, and sustainability.

I think a great partnership is when you stop saying MY students. They're OUR students. What are OUR needs? We share these things in common, so let's go for it.

—Community Partner

Yes, [the community-campus partnership] is about organizations, it's about students, but it is about common values that are much deeper. What we're learning to do, whether we're students or whether we're a non-profit, is doing something that is actually moving us as a community, a path of achieving process along the context of what we care about.

—Community Partner

What would we hear if we listened to community partners about their experiences in partnering with academic institutions? We know that engaging in relationships with members from local communities is central to the higher education agenda (Maier, 2001) and many scholars (e.g., Benson & Harkavy, 2000; Boyer, 1990; Bringle, 1999; Enos & Morton, 2003) advocate for community-campus partnerships to become a more intentional component of actualizing the service mission of higher education. In particular, community-campus partnerships have become recognized as linked to service-learning initiatives for providing the service-learning experience for students and evaluating its impact (Baillie, 2002; Bringle & Hatcher, 2002; Dorado & Giles, 2004; Gelmon et al., 1998; Jacoby, 2003; Jones, 2003). In the absence of community-campus partnerships, it is difficult to imagine how service-learning might even exist. The sustainability of community partnerships with higher education institutions requires attention to their motivations and perceptions of the benefits of the partners from their own perspective, however. While reciprocity of benefits for the community has long been an intended hallmark of service-learning practice (Ferrari & Chapman, 1999; Honnet & Poulsen, 1999; Keith, 1998; Sigmon, 1979; Waterman, 1997), service-learning practitioners often do not often know if, when, and how this is achieved.

To date, there are few published studies documenting the perspectives of community members in partnership with universities, and the field acknowledges that this area continues to be under-represented in the overall service-learning literature (Birdsell, 2005; Bringle & Hatcher, 2002; Bushouse, 2005; Edwards & Marullo, 2000; Ferrari & Worrall, 2000; Giles & Cruz, 2000; Jones, 2003; Liederman et al., 2003; Sandy, 2005; Vernon & Ward, 1999; Ward & Wolf-Wendel, 2000). The growing number of academics
and practitioners who voice concern about the absence of the community perspective in the literature may be indicative of a growing openness to learn more about the perspectives of community members and a willingness to transform our practice in light of their input. However, Cruz and Giles (2000) indicate that there are complicated political and intellectual reasons why the perspectives of community partners continue to be under-represented in the field. The notion of "community" itself as a concept is contested (e.g., Stoecker, 2005; Tumil-Berhalter, Watkins, & Crespo, 2005; Wellman, 2001), which has led to some paralysis in the research community at-large. However, the failure to grapple with understanding the community perspective may have potentially dire consequences because there is considerable room for misunderstanding between higher education and community partners, a divide that is evident in the language higher education practitioners often use.

A common metaphor used by service-learning practitioners to frame their thinking about the service-learning experience is "boundary crossing," or "boundary work," entering another world where different rules apply (Hayes & Cuban, 1997; Keith, 1998; McMillan, 2002; Skilton-Sylvestre & Ervin, 2000; Taylor, 2002). Service-learning is often described as a metaphorical "bridge" between these two worlds or speech communities or, as Henry Giroux (1992) might describe it, akin to a "border pedagogy" where one must be familiar with the rules and norms of both so that we might become more effective border crossers. What do we know, versus what do we assume to know about these "other worlds" with whom we are entwined in the work of service-learning? Very little is written about the perspective of this "other world" that higher education wishes to engage. In an effort to facilitate better crossings for thinking and communicating together, Nora Bacon (2002) outlined the distinctions in theories of learning between higher education faculty and staff and community partner agency staff. Bringle, Gemes and Malloy (1999) also describe community-university partnerships as bringing together different worlds where academicians generally view knowledge as "residing in specialized experts, including disciplinary peers who are geographically dispersed and community residents who view knowledge as being pluralistic and well distributed among their neighbors" (pp. 9-10).

Higher education and "community" certainly do not represent monocultures, of course. There are distinctions in motivations and perceived benefits among various higher education practitioners (Holland, 2002) and we might well anticipate that there are diverse views about the motivations and perceived benefits of those individuals from agencies partnering with institutions of higher education. The goal of this study is to better understand the diverse perspectives of long-term community partners collaborating with institutions of higher education, and to identify partner recommendations for ways to transform higher education practice to strengthen such partnerships. This qualitative study, sponsored by California Campus Compact through a grant from the Corporation for National and Community Service, Learn and Serve America Higher Education, documented the partnership perspectives of 99 experienced community partners working with eight diverse higher education institutions in California. These partners were primarily supervisors and staff members from nonprofit community-based organizations and public institutions such as libraries, hospitals, and K-12 institutions.

As recommended (Cruz & Giles, 2000), our unit of analysis was the community-campus partnership, perceived through the lens of community partner eyes. Our research considers community perspectives on effective partnership characteristics as well as their own voices regarding the benefits, challenges, and motivations they have regarding partnership with an academic institution. Regarding partnership characteristics, we place this study in the context of four diverse models (Community-Campus Partnerships for Health, 1998; Holland & Ramaley, 1998; Liederman et al., 2003; Torres, 2000) of effective campus-community partnerships (Holland, 2005). Since these models were developed largely from a higher education perspective, the research question we addressed was how well the community partner perspective does or does not align with current models proposed by higher education. Regarding partner perspectives of the benefits, motivations, and challenges of their partnership with academic institutions, we place this study in the context of the work on partnerships such as Liederman et al. and Worrall (2005) but are breaking new ground regarding our method of documenting community voices from multiple institutions without the direct influence or involvement of higher education partners.

The need for this research was identified by practitioners in the field during a Fall 2004 retreat for service-learning professionals to learn from community partners how to improve their own practice. The research team worked to create a study design that would ensure the collection of purely community partner perspectives to significantly strengthen the academic literature on this topic of partnership relationships while assisting these experienced service-learning professionals in deepening their work. The study included community partners that would be considered to be in the advanced stages of partner-
ship that, to have such longevity, would have considerable knowledge of partnership dynamics, barriers, and facilitators. These partnerships are referred to as the “final” (Torres, 2000), “nurturing” (Dorado & Giles, 2004) or in the “cooperative” and/or “systematic and transformative” (Sackett, 1998) stages of partnership. Because of this sample selection, the conclusions here may or may not have implications for nascent partnerships. Due to staff turnover at some organizations, some of the participants themselves may have been new, although the partnership between the organization they represent and the higher education institution would have been well-established.

Literature Review

Many of the studies that have involved community partner perspectives on the outcomes and benefits of the partnerships have focused on various partners’ experiences with a single higher education institution (e.g., Birdsell, 2005; Bushhouse, 2005; Clarke, 2003; Ferrari & Worrell, 2000; Jorge, 2003; Miron & Moely, 2005; Schmidt & Robey, 2002; Vernon & Foster, 2002; Worrell, 2005). Some studies, such as Schmidt and Robey, and Skilton-Sylvestor and Erwin (2000), describe the direct benefits to the “clients” the community partner entities serve, while others focus on the perception of benefits from the supervisors of service-learning students through evaluation data (e.g., Birdsell; Ferrari & Worrell). There are fewer studies that specifically look at the partnership itself as the unit of analysis. Dorado and Giles (2004) provide an excellent analysis of the stages and types of activities that tend to occur at three different levels of partnership that vary over time. Clarke created and piloted a 3-T” evaluation model for community partners working with the same higher education institution designed to capture findings related to community impact as process. In a study sponsored by the Council of Independent Colleges, Liederman et al. (2003) spoke with 19 community partner leaders from around the country in a two-day summit to identify elements of partnerships, common benefits, challenges, and recommendations for practice. Similarly, Worrell developed a case study comprised of the perspectives of 40 community partners working with DePaul University in Illinois where she examined benefits, challenges and motivations for partnership involvement. Bushhouse (2005) also identified benefits and barriers to campus-community partnerships among small nonprofits at the University of Massachusetts-Amherst, and Miron and Moely used the partnership as the unit of analysis to examine community perspectives on agency voice, benefits to their organization, and perceptions of the university.

Structure and Methodology

Much of the value of this current study is its breadth in the context of diverse functioning partnerships. Service-learning coordinators at eight California campuses self-selected 99 advanced “nurturing stage” (Dorado & Giles, 2004) community partners to participate in 15 focus groups to discuss their perspectives on community-campus partnerships. To date, it is one of the largest multisite studies focused exclusively on community partners. The research team took extensive measures to ensure community partners’ confidentiality and anonymity. While the community partners included were nominated by their partnering service-learning directors, higher education representatives were not present during the study, nor did any higher education partner have access to the data before the findings were approved by community participants. This effort to control for interpretations by the higher education voice is in some contrast to previous studies with community partners (e.g., Liederman et al., 2003), in which higher education partners were present during the data collection process. To ensure broad relevance of the findings, the sites were selected based on the history and diversity of the partnerships and their institutional context; a mix of urban and rural, four-year and community college, public and private, faith-based and secular. Research I and liberal arts institutions were included from diverse geographical regions of California.

We employed focus groups as our inquiry strategy because we wished to obtain data from a large sample across multiple communities and sought “meaning and sense-making” more than the precise numerical data that would be provided through a survey instrument. Because partnerships are by definition an inherently social activity, focus groups were best suited to obtain information, as we could make “explicit use of group interaction to produce data and insights that would be less accessible without the interaction found in a group” (Morgan, 1989). Accepted standards for focus group processes and hermeneutic fieldwork (Herda, 1998; Marshall & Rossman, 1989) informed our theoretical orientation and design, and practitioners in the field at a California Campus Compact retreat helped shape the initial areas of inquiry. Informed by the relevant literature, a five-member research team, comprised of three facilitators, one recorder, and the Principle Investigator, refined the questions for the protocol, which were presented in a semi-structured interview format with guided participation by the facilitators. Participants addressed questions concerning their motivations, benefits, challenges, and recommendations that were similar to some of the areas of inquiry
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that Liederman et al. (2003) and Worrall (2005) studied. Because this study was more focused on the transformation of higher education practice from the community's perspective, it contrasts with a recent publication developed by the national Campus Compact office designed to serve as a practical guide for community agencies interested in partnering with higher education campuses (Scheibel, Bowley, & Jones, 2005).

Because a level of familiarity with the subject matter is necessary for research conversations to be productive (Gadamer, 1969/1975; Herda, 1999) and a particularly high level of trust was required to do this research, we involved seasoned scholars in service-learning who were familiar with service-learning concepts and focus group facilitation. The facilitators were neutral in the sense that they were not employed by the campuses and did not have a vested interest in the findings of each of the groups. Small stipends were awarded to community partners for their participation.

Data were collected by charting participant responses on easel paper, note-taking, and audiotaping and transcribing participant responses. We generated categories and themes to identify patterns, because our goal was to discern a set of characteristics across all partner responses. For each question on the protocol, the researchers developed a relational scheme that clustered participant responses according to themes. Notes from the audio-taped sessions were provided to participants to check for understanding. Data were coded and analyzed using Atlas-Ti software, and hermeneutic "constant coding" approaches (Herda, 1999) were used to check themes. Initial research categories were developed based on the protocol questions and additional categories and themes were developed after an analysis of the data. The team worked with community partners to check for understanding and completeness using methods derived from community-based practices.

The ethic of reciprocity, a hallmark of service-learning practice, informed the research design. One of the distinctions of this study in comparison to other studies of community partners is its place-based, two-tiered approach. The importance of location is often overlooked in academic research (Grunewald, 2003; Oldenburg, 1989; Sandy, 2005); and including this variable in our design had important benefits. We convened focus groups in the locations in which they partnered and included participants who had experiences working with the same higher education institution. By doing so, we expected that participants would be more likely to discuss the concrete details of their partnerships, as they all shared something directly in common with one another, and researchers would be able to tease out distinctions between different partners with the same higher education institution. There is evidence that the very act of convening the focus groups may have already begun to benefit the partnerships there. Participants shared ideas with one another and suggested solutions to directly benefit their particular partnerships at all focus groups.

In keeping with key aspects of community-based research methodology (Stoecker, 2005), participants were involved with approving the thematic interpretations, finalizing the reports designed to inform and improve their particular partnership, and the "meta-analysis" that includes a cross-analysis of all the data generated from all of the focus groups. In keeping with accepted practices of hermeneutic and ethnographic qualitative research, direct quotations were shared with community partners to develop themes and categories for both the meta-analysis and campus reports, although space constraints do not permit much of them to be presented here.

Given the traditional wisdom regarding focus group research (e.g., Fontana & Frey, 2000; Morgan, 1998) and the fact that the participants in this study represent a "convenience" sample, to some extent, the findings are not generalizable in a statistical sense. However, we fully expect these findings to have broad applicability, particularly given the diversity and size of the sample and the controls inherent in our approach.

The following section will offer a discussion of the themes emerging from data analysis and place each theme within a discussion of prior literature and apparent import to the advancement of research on service-learning partnerships and their practices. Direct quotations from community partners from all focus groups are included to highlight themes.

Emergent Themes

Convergence with Characteristics of Effective Partnerships: Relationships are Foundational

You can't assume the partnership will stay what it is. It needs to be fed. —Community Partner

A major contribution in advancing community-university partnerships has been the various ways the field has defined the core characteristics of effective partnerships. Important examples include: Community-Campus Partnerships for Health (CCPH), (1998); Campus Compact (Torres, 2000); the Wingspread Report (Homer & Poulsen, 1989); Housing and Urban Development Department's list of characteristics (Holland & Rumaly, 1998), and the study by Liederman et al. (2003) that describes the characteristics valued by community partners. Holland (2005) notes that while many of these lists...
contain unique aspects related to the context in which they were developed, there is a high level of convergence in their recommendations that provides a vision of ideal partnerships. These lists include topics such as developing a mutually beneficial agenda, understanding the capacity and resources of all partners, participating in project planning, attending to the relationship, shared design and control of project directions, and continual assessment of partnership processes and outcomes.

The analysis of the characteristics described by the community partners in this study reveals that while they concur with these general principles, the language they use to describe them and how they prioritize them is often distinct. Aspects of valuing and nurturing the partnership relationship were uniformly stressed as the highest priority among all the groups.

*If you're just going to do an event, and another event and a project, a project, it doesn't feel like you're connecting the dots. You're not growing anything. It has to be sustainable, and I think you only get sustainability when you're building relationships and there's a certain humility to the whole thing.*

—Community Partner

These partners emphasized that the relationship itself is foundational to service-learning and that all collaborative activities or projects stem from this. This supports the claim by Dorado and Giles (2004), and Benson and Harkavy (2000), that community partners value the relationship with the university beyond a specific service-learning project. This finding also provides support for the claim posited by Skilton-Sylvester and Ervin (2000) that people can begin to cross the borders that commonly divide university and community members “through the development of caring relationships and reflection on those relationships” (p. 73). It is in some contrast to the study conducted by Bushouse (2005), who found that small nonprofit organizations were more likely to prefer arrangements with minimal required staff time, with presumably less emphasis on relationship-building.

Other highly valued characteristics described by these community partners, ranked in order of frequency, include: 1) *Communication among partners,* particularly clearly defined roles and responsibilities, ongoing, accessible lines of communication, flexibility, and the ability to say ‘no’; 2) *Understanding partner perspectives.* While the lists generated by higher education researchers often stress mutual benefits, community partners were more likely to describe the need for understanding each partner’s work cultures, responsiveness to partner needs, and caring about mutual goals. Some partners stressed that higher education partners need to focus more intently on community needs; 3) *Personal connections.* Overall, partners did not often stress the need for formal structure or resources, although this may be partially explained by the fact that these experienced higher education partners already have this infrastructure in place. K-12 institutions tended to underscore the importance of written agreements and structure more frequently than community-based organization partners; 4) *Co-planning, training, and orientation.* Community partners described collaborative planning with faculty and staff, and agreed-upon systems for training and orientations for service-learners as one of the most critical areas to improve campus-community partnerships; 5) *Accountability and leadership.* These partners emphasized the need for adequate follow-through and accountability on the part of all partners, and shared, equitable leadership. Continuity of personnel is important.

**Common Ground: Our Partners in Education**

One of the most compelling findings of this study is the community partner’s profound dedication to educating college students — even when this is not an expectation, part of their job description, or if the experience provides few or no short-term or long-term benefits for their organization.

I should add that I’m a frustrated teacher! I see [service-learning] as an opportunity to influence the next generation. I see it not just as we’re getting those wonderful volunteers, but we have an opportunity to train and influence and sensitize people to deal with the issues the clients of our agency face. It can influence their family relationships, it’s going to influence their career choices, and it is maybe going to help them deal differently with people they meet on the street.

—Community Partner

We are co-educators. That is not our organization’s bottom line, but that’s what we do.

—Community Partner

Campus-community partnerships are commonly thought to be based on differences in self-interest and require negotiation to ensure these different needs are met (e.g., Bushouse, 2005; Schiebel, Bowley, & Jones, 2005). Enos and Morton (2003) suggest a continuum of “self-to-shared-interest,” where partnerships function first as a “transactional” partnership with distinct objectives and then move toward developing shared goals to a “transformational” relationship. A recent study by Worrall (2005) affirms this perception of community partners, indicating that they first become involved with service-learning to gain access to additional resources and then stay...
involved over time because they enjoy their role as community educators. In contrast, the community partners included in this study spoke of their shared goals regarding student learning at the inception of the partnership. They repeatedly stressed that educating college students was a more compelling reason for becoming involved in community-campus partnerships than more tangible "transactional" short-term benefits to their agency or organization.

While educating students was an initial motivation for these community partners, their commitment to educating students may have grown over time as they became more experienced. They demonstrated a remarkable awareness and level of student learning outcomes for career development, civic engagement, academic course content, diversity and multi-cultural skills, and personal development.

[Students] come from the university hoping to help us build a house, but with service-learning in context, that same student would understand why there is a lack of affordable housing, what is the impact of a lack of housing on the community, on a low-income family, on a neighborhood. Part of the challenge is broadening the scope of what the specific work a student might be doing at an agency and helping them understand that in context. That is really a tough thing to do, and it seems like it is often our responsibility as community partners to help make those links.

—Community Partner

While community partners are devoted to educating students, and often perceive this as a way to "give back," community partners face significant challenges inherent in the work itself. These include grappling with issues related to the academic calendar and logistics, workplace preparedness of students, understanding the learning goals and their roles in the experience, and dealing with recruitment, supervision, placement, and evaluation.

Their understanding of the benefits of service-learning for students and higher education institutions as a whole largely mirrors the benefits documented by higher education, and include: exploring career options, building competency in diversity and multicultural communication skills, obtaining deeper knowledge of a particular issue or profession and the non-profit world in general, developing practical job skills and job leads, cultivating skills of engaged citizenship and lifelong serving, enhancing self-esteem and self-exploration, and developing a greater sense of connectedness in their college life. Many focus group participants noted that the service-learning activities at their agencies aid in the retention of students in higher education by providing a sense of connectedness for students. They indicated that it seemed to be particularly important for students of color and first generation college students, corroborating other studies in the literature (e.g., Gallini & Moely, 2003). Community partners also believe higher education institutions are motivated to collaborate with them to improve the image of the campus and to obtain access to research sites and contacts.

Spectrum of Distinct Benefits to Partners

As a previous qualitative study with community partners affirmed (Bacon, 2002), relationships are a major vehicle through which learning and knowledge generation take place for community partners, and through which they accrue tangible benefits. While all partners demonstrated a deep dedication to educating college students, their description of other motivations and benefits for being involved in service-learning varied, and appeared to be on a continuum of those who spoke more about "brass tacks" benefits provided by individual college students, to those who described a need to contribute to the common good overall. The benefits community partners describe in this study can be categorized as 1) direct impact; 2) enrichment; and 3) social justice. The following outlines the most commonly described benefits:

1. Direct Impact

   (a) Impact on client outcomes.

   By engaging in relationships with nonprofit clients, college students have a positive impact on client outcomes, such as youth, English learners, the elderly, homeless, and disabled. As described in many other studies (e.g., Birdsell, 2005; Jorge, 2003; Schmidt & Robby, 2002; Vernon & Foster, 2002), college students are highly valued as age-appropriate role models for youth and given credit for raising educational outcomes and ambition among youth. Service-learners engage with people in various other settings as well, and provide companionship for the elderly and for other nonprofit clients such as the homeless.

   The college is right in our back yard for a lot of these high schools, it is great to have the college students come because then these kids will think about going to college. It shows that college is possible.

   —Community Partner

   (b) Sustaining and enhancing organizational capacity.

   Service-learners are a critical part of the workforce of some partner organizations and help sustain and extend the capacity of K-12 and nonprofit organizations, often enabling them to take on new projects that would have remained "on the back burner." They also enhance the workforce in various ways by
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becoming future staff, donors, and volunteers.

Our program would probably not survive if we
do not have service-learners. It's economics. We
couldn't possibly hire the number of people we
need to do our programs. —Community Partner

2. Enrichment

(2a) Staff and organizational development.

Another major benefit of partnering is staff and
organizational development. When partnering with
higher education institutions and supervising service-
learners, partners reflect more on organizational
practices, and gain from the intellectual assets of the
academic institution by learning new information
from students and obtaining greater access to aca-
demic research. Partners are often able to further their
organization's goals by garnering greater access to
the prestige associated with the academic institution,
and it is often affirming, energizing, and enjoyable
for staff to be involved. Some have even returned to
college themselves.

[Students] make us better professionals and they
ask us the kind of questions that we have forgotten
about. I am part of a consortium with faculty
and students and social service agencies. Not
only are the students looking at me but they are
looking at me in comparison to the other agen-
cies that they are interested in. In all levels it
forces us to be more professional. We have to
look at our ethical values because they ask those
kind of questions. —Community Partner

(2b) Increasing community capacity.

Social capital among community partner agencies
is often strengthened when universities foster link-
ages among community partners with whom they
are affiliated. This finding corroborates Gelmon et al.'s
(2001) work and the study by Vernon and Foster
(2002) that found that "service-learning and volun-
teer programs are conduits for building social capital
in a community." The partners expressed strong ben-
efits from being convened by the academic institu-
tion as a source for enhancing community networks
and relationships.

The university has brought us together as part-
ers. That's a real important outcome of this uni-
versity partnership and it has grown. It has
brought different partners together from differ-
ent towns, from the same town.
—Community Partner

3. Social Justice

(3a) Motivated by the common good.

Some community partners described their motiva-
tion for being involved with community-campus
partnerships as related to a common struggle for
social justice and equity, a way to strengthen com-
mon values, build their community, and impact the
greater good.

Being a participant in social change. This should
be the ultimate goal. —Community Partner

This may sound corny, especially these days, but
the idea of service, the idea of doing something
for the common good that benefits lots of people
is my motivation for being involved with ser-
service-learning. And maybe you're not going to
get paid a whole lot of money for it, and maybe
you're not going to crawl up the career ladder
doing it, but it is the right thing to do for society
and the community. —Community Partner

(3b) Transformational learning

At several focus groups, community partners
spoke of the ways in which community-campus
partnerships can transform knowledge by bridging the
gap between theory and practice, providing opportuni-
ties for reflection and furthering new theory that
can change both our knowledge and practice. This
may speak to the development of new knowledge
generation that connects the different ways of knowing
in community-campus partnerships that Bacon

And it gets at, 'This is the pedagogy thing. But
this is the real thing.' The college kind of lives in
the world of theory, and we live in the world of
reality, and we hardly get to think about the the-
ory because we're rushing from work. This is a
place to try on this theory or this practice and
let's see if it works. —Community Partner

If I was a professor... I'd really want to work with
a school, not just send students, but actually get
myself in there, do data, measure, try on differ-
ent things. And on the other side, as [K-12] edu-
cators, we do the same thing. We just sit in our
classrooms and teach what we know.
—Community Partner

4. Balance on the Benefits Spectrum

All focus groups included lengthy discussions on
the many direct benefits to agency clients (1 above)
and the enrichment opportunities for their organiza-
tions and for themselves personally (2 above). Both
are powerful themes on motivations and benefits for
community partners in the study. While issues relat-
ed to social justice (3 above) were voiced by a small-
er number of people overall—about half of the focus
groups involved discussed social justice in detail—it
is interesting to note that those community partners
motivated by the hope for social justice describe this
phenomenon in ways that faculty and students speak
of social justice. The emphasis on social justice may
largely be an individual preference, and their motiva-
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tions are likely as varied as the motivations voiced by higher education practitioners, some of whom emphasize the role service-learning as pedagogy while others stress civic engagement goals or social justice (Holland, 2002). As Dorado and Giles (2004) posit, however, relationships in campus-community partnerships are influenced by institutional as well as individual factors. The “ease” of the partnership experience seemed to make a difference in whether or not individual community partners emphasized benefits that were more short-term or altruistic. Those partners who described themselves as actively struggling with the logistics of the partnership seemed to take the most “transactional” approach in ensuring their institution received direct short-term gains to make the partnership worthwhile. Partners that seemed to experience fewer of these obstacles often spoke more about desire to further the common good. A comparison of how these direct impact, enrichment, and social justice benefits voiced by community partners might correspond with the mapping of the relationships between learning and serving in Robert Sigmon’s “Linking Service with Learning” (1994) could help shed more light on this in the future.

More Faculty Involvement in the Partnership

There is a profound missed opportunity when faculty are absent from the community-campus collaboration and their students’ service-learning experiences.

Communication with professors seems to fall apart. We would appreciate a heads-up from them about what they're going to do and what their goals are.

—Community Partner

Maybe the faculty should have to do fifteen hours.

—Community Partner

Community partners indicated that their greatest challenge in partnering with campuses is to find ways to interact directly with faculty through ongoing, reciprocal relationships, become collaborators in designing the service-learning curriculum, and engage with faculty more deeply in the work of their agencies. As Gelmon et al. (1998) advise, community partners and faculty need to become more cognizant of community strengths and needs, to work together to come to agreement on a clear message for students, and to create more appropriate service-learning experiences that are linked to the classroom. There was an overwhelming clamor among these community partners that faculty should be more directly involved with their sites and work to better understand the culture, conditions, and practices of their community co-educators.
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The impact of their weak connection with faculty is disturbing. All eight focus group sites indicated that it was fairly commonplace for faculty to create assignments that were illegal or inappropriate for their workplace. That curriculum or schedule changes often occur without their consent or prior knowledge, causing significant disruption for agency staff. Partners also report that they are rarely informed about assessment and evaluation outcomes for student learning. Recruitment processes, on-campus orientations for new and experienced partners, orientations for service-learners, evaluation, recognition, and celebrations were all discussed as important areas for improvement. These community partners also provided many examples of partnership experiences that worked well with faculty, including joint planning days prior to the start of the semester, on-going collaboration with a faculty member throughout the lifespan of a project, clearly defined responsibilities, and shared expectations and roles for students.

As Miron and Moudy (2005) report, there are still significant benefits to community-based agencies and positive interactions with higher education partners in the absence of co-planning and authentic collaboration, but these partners indicate that the “status quo” with faculty relationships is often unacceptable. While faculty involvement, co-planning, evaluation, and celebration are all usually included as important characteristics of effective partnerships (e.g., Honnet & Poulsen, 1989; Torres, 2000), practicing these principles more diligently, and with a greater emphasis on co-teaching, may go a long way to demonstrating respect to community partners.

Higher Education Institutions as Citizen and Community Partner

All of the community partners at the participating campuses stressed that they would welcome more opportunities to network with their campus partner and partnering agencies. Experienced partners often desire more coordinated involvement in larger-scale community development initiatives, and some recommended that the campus take on a leadership role in bringing community members together.

I would like to get out of the internship approach, to look at what has to happen for the broader purpose...I've been pushing for [the university] to take a larger-scale community-based look at some of these things, so students can interact over a longer time-span, allow a lot of students to [participate] and also have a more interdisciplinary approach throughout the project.

—Community Partner

Perhaps because of the importance education institutions play in the development of social capital in
rural areas (Miller, 1997), it was predominantly community partners based in more rural areas who voiced interest in this. In urban areas, in contrast, the relationships community partners have with any one campus did not appear to be as critical for them because they routinely partner with so many higher education institutions. In fact, community agencies may help bridge connections among universities:

We had a partnership with two universities. So these two universities and two sets of students never partnered and at the end of our program students were saying we should have one or two classes on social welfare for our child development department and vice versa. I know there is a linkage now with the professors and that had never happened before. — Community Partner

A few community partners — in both rural and urban settings — voiced concern that higher education campuses and service-learning offices focus too much on individual courses and programs and not enough on the obligation of the higher education institution to participate as a partner in community matters. In support of their request, it might be interesting to learn if higher education partners grow more committed to community development as they spend more time engaging in service-learning work. This study’s research team may not have had adequate representation among those who might work with academic institutions on longer-term community development projects in ways advocated by Harkavy (1999) and Bringle (1999) to address this adequately.

Diverse Views of Infrastructure

Experienced community partners may require different types of support from service-learning offices than new partners. Findings by Vernon and Foster (2002) reinforce the best practices literature (Campus Compact, 1999) by indicating that community partners, particularly those in the early stages of partnership, express much more satisfaction in their campus partnerships when there is a service-learning office to facilitate student placement and provide an accessible contact point. There is also convergence on this point in the four models of higher education literature (Holland, 2005; Campus Compact, 2000; Holland & Ramaly, 1998; Liederman et al., 2003; Torres, 2000). While the experienced community partners involved with this study expressed very high satisfaction with the staff of service-learning offices, described by one group as the “face and heart” of the institution, there is some evidence that service-learning offices, in an attempt to “make things easier” for faculty and community partners, often function as unknowing gatekeepers or barriers for those partners who seek to make authentic connections with faculty.

Is it just the service-learning coordinator that cares about this program? — Community Partner

I’ve never developed a relationship with a professor. I work with the service-learning coordinator primarily, and some students. — Community Partner

[The service-learning office] keeps the list [of participating faculty]. They have a lot of concern that administrators come and get a hold of the list and recruit students before they assign them. — Community Partner

Community partners recognize that faculty are essential to their ongoing collaboration with the higher education institution and would appreciate more assistance in making those connections from the service-learning offices. These partners expressed a tremendous depth of awareness of academic culture and campus politics; some sites were worried that the service-learning offices do not have support of the higher education institution overall, and are viewed as inconsistent with campus culture and norms.

Access and Fairness

Focus group participants spent considerable time strategizing together on how to gain greater entry to their higher education institution partner. In larger institutions, the service-learning office may represent only one of several possible connections for community partners. They are well aware that there are often special benefits associated with developing relationships with particular faculty members, departments, or programs that might even provide additional financial resources for them. This process can be mystifying even for experienced partners.

To what extent are all the agencies aware of all these different opportunities? Is the university reaching out to community organizations, and not just with a piece of the puzzle but the bigger picture? I learned about things [from other focus group participants] I have never heard of before today. — Community Partner

There should be a more formal process for soliciting involvement. Right now, it is hit or miss based on a relationship that you are fortunate to have. — Community Partner

The processes for making these connections are not necessarily funneled through service-learning offices and may not even be "public," as the agreements are often arranged through personal relationships between faculty and individual agencies. While recognizing that all partnerships are based on relationships, these partners expressed a great deal of
concern about fairness and many suggested there be ways to standardize access for all partners. Many hope for more access to campus classrooms, but also expressed concern about how recruitment processes for students are usually handled in these situations, often pitting them in a popularity contest with other organizations where the most enthusiastic guest speaker "wins." One partner commented, "I feel like I'm kind of in a roadshow to get students. It is not ideal." Some partners suggested more partner fairs and mixers, curriculum planning sessions, Web sites, videos, and other forms of communication infrastructure. One said, "We need a communication system that we could tap into."

**Appreciating Differences across Partner Types**

To strengthen campus community partnerships, many agencies and institutions stressed the need for better communication infrastructure that was sensitive to their particular workplace culture and organizational infrastructure. They point out that communication is not a "one size fits all approach." K-12 institutions, for example, may require processes and procedures that are distinct from social service nonprofits because they usually have different hours of operation and often more hierarchical and complex chains of command.

It is pretty hit or miss with the [higher education student leader coordinators]. They're students, sometimes they don't get up until 4:00 in the afternoon, and well, that means we're probably not going to get to talk that day. —K-12 Partner

More research may be needed to identify the special needs of K-12 higher education partnerships because these are often mandated rather than voluntary.

Maybe being in a university town — it's the elephant in the room. When you get involved at the [K-12] administrative level, part of our time is getting involved with the university. But it is not written into your job description. It's another unfunded mandate. —Community Partner

**The Great Divide: The Mythology of Hours**

Overall, community partners expressed a high level of frustration with mandatory hour requirements and did not feel that this was a particularly useful indication of student achievement or impact on the community partner site. Many felt that the designated hour requirement sends the wrong message to students and were sometimes distressed by the amount of paperwork this requirement generates. One partner said,

I'm very concerned about the students that just want to get their hours done. That's not service-
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learning...Some are just doing community service, and that's defeating the purpose.

—Community Partner

An unintended outcome of the emphasis on hours seems to be a misunderstanding of the term, 'service-learning.' One partner commented, "The only difference between service-learners and volunteers is in the tracking of the hours; the service-learning students are much more interested in it if you are tracking their hours." Birdsall (2005) reported a similar finding.

Community partners were unanimous in expressing their desire to provide service-learning experiences of adequate duration that would be meaningful to service-learning students and for their nonprofit clients. Partners working with campuses that required less than 20 hours reported the most distress with the hours requirement and the most concern about the adequacy of the service-learning experience, in terms of the quality of the education experience for students, and the short- and long-term benefits for their organization. One said, "How valuable is it to the student to spend 10 hours someplace? What have they really learned?" Their concern corroborates the literature conducted with service-learning students and supervisors on the importance of time as a learning factor (e.g., Eyler, Giles, & Braxton, 1997; Mabry, 1998; Patterson, 1987). As expected, many other community partners with longer time commitments from service-learners sought to increase the time allotment as well. The time required for training, orientation, and background checks is sometimes longer than the duration of the service-learning commitment. A short-term commitment on the part of service-learners could even be harmful when working with sensitive populations such as refugee children.

**Implications for Higher Education Practice**

The community partners' emphasis on the importance of relationships points to further recommendations for transformations in higher education practice:

**1. Value relationships.** As service-learning coordinators are well aware, the need to cultivate positive relationships in campus-community partnerships is complex because of the sheer number and diversity of partners involved, and because partners and situations change over time. Community partners expect their higher education institution partner to connect with them personally. On the "macro-level," new practices may need to be instituted to ensure more equitable access to campuses, while on the "micro-level," partners must continue to engage in ongoing relationship-building. Rather than feeling inconvenienced by requests for participation, community
partners ask for more campus visits, more face-to-face meetings, and greater inclusion in orientations and planning sessions. These partners stress that building effective community-campus relationships involves communicating roles and responsibilities clearly, working to better understand different workplace cultures, demonstrating sensitivity about how to best communicate with one another, and expressing appreciation for one another.

2. Hold conversations regularly about partnership process and outcomes. The research team recommends that higher education institutions consider sponsoring or participating in conversations among all partners to reflect on their formal partnership arrangements, informal communication links, critique current practice, and collectively identify ways to strengthen partnerships, document impacts, celebrate achievements, and build networks.

3. Involve faculty more directly. This is the most critical area for improvement. Experienced partners need a way to connect with faculty to plan the curriculum, negotiate student placement, and assess and evaluate the service-learning experience. At a minimum, partners desire to see the syllabus and the specific learning goals and expectations for students so they can contribute to an effective learning arrangement. Partners want faculty to visit their sites and perhaps even volunteer to truly understand the partner's organization and assets. While they did not usually make specific requirements for recognition, their strong self-identity as co-teachers warrants attention from the academic institution.

4. Consider ways the academic institution can help build social capital. Because an important asset of community-campus partnerships involves developing connections among community agencies and the campus, higher education institutions and service-learning offices may wish to find ways to participate in the long-term development of their community and to develop longer-term service-learning activities that involve the campus as a whole.

5. Develop more facilitative roles for service-learning offices. While the gate-keeping and coordinating function may be essential for beginning partners, expanding activities related to convening faculty, community, and students together for curriculum planning, evaluating, networking, and collaboration is a more critical role for service-learning offices to play for advanced partnerships. Service-learning offices can also expand their role as an information hub for activities and opportunities sponsored by the academic institution and even serving as a community bulletin board for local events.

6. Address the hours divide. While tracking hours has been a favored way for higher education to document accountability and impact, community partners often see this as an impediment. Appropriate duration of the experience and an emphasis on learning may be a more appropriate measure for achievement than hourly requirements.

Conclusion

"[Service-learning] pushes forward this question about what education is for."

—Community Partner

Longstanding community-campus partnerships are more than simply the "byproduct of self-interested action" (Maier, 2002, p. 23). Rather, they involve our inherent solidarities aligned with educating college students and an openness and sensitivity to the distinct benefits and challenges involved for all partners. While certainly not a roadmap for border-crossing, this study can deepen higher education practice by highlighting community partners' insights on the work to which we are all committed. Effective campus-community partnerships requires attention to and an exploration of both distinct needs and interests of higher education and community partners — the different "worlds" in which we live — as well as a recognition and appreciation for the inherent commonalities and motivations that bind us together. The day-to-day work of educating students, and in some instances, our aspirations for a more just world, provides common ground for our mutual engagement. The path by which we traverse this ground together is cultivated through our ongoing relationships with one another, and nurtured through open, respectful, and appropriate communication. To further this work, it is important to reflect together to improve our practice locally, and enable us to ask deeper questions together.

Topics on which we might begin to hold conversations include how to engage more deeply with faculty; recognizing partners as co-educators of students, with all the planning and preparation that entails; committing the academic institution to ongoing action as an institutional citizen in larger-scale community development projects; and finding ways to develop appropriate institutional infrastructure that supports and facilitates these shifts in emphasis and practice. In the "end," higher education and community partners may find that they have each become more committed to the mission, values, and goals of the other. We hope that others will be encouraged by this study to engage in future research conversations to deepen our work as service-learning educators and as participants in campus-community partnerships.

Notes

This article is based upon work supported by the Corporation for National and Community Service under
Learn and Serve America Grant No. G3LEHCA004. Opinions or points of view expressed in this document are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the official positions of the Corporation or the Learn and Serve America Program.

The research team for this project included Elaine Beeda, Ph.D., principal investigator; Nadine Cruz, M.A., Barbara Holland, Ph.D., Kathleen Rice, Ph.D., and Marie Sandy, Ph.D. The data analysis for this project was the result of the collective effort of this team, in collaboration with community partners. Kathleen Rice ably facilitated the group data analysis process, and Nadine Cruz and Elaine Ikeda provided extensive assistance with critiquing this article. We are especially grateful to the service-learning directors and coordinators at the participating campuses and the 99 community partners for helping to make this project possible.
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Building Capacity for Sustainability Through Curricular and Faculty Development: A Learning Outcomes Approach

Jennifer H. Allen, Jeffrey J. Gerwing, and Leslie G. McBride

Abstract

Portland State University has made integration of sustainability across its academic programs an institutional priority. This article describes the strategies that have been used to engage faculty in developing sustainability curricula, including adopting sustainability as one of eight campus-wide learning outcomes, incorporating sustainability into the general education program, providing faculty development, and developing a Graduate Certificate in Sustainability. The article shares lessons learned and next steps planned to advance Portland State’s sustainability curricula.

Sustainability is one of those big, complex concepts that defy easy definition or simple responses, yet demand attention for our collective well-being (Timpson, et al. 2006).

Portland State defines sustainability as an integrating concept that encompasses the interaction of humans both with each other and with the natural environment, guided by the objective of improving the long term health of social, economic and environmental systems. In addition to being central to the vision and values of Portland State, this commitment to sustainability is shared by many citizens, governments and members of the business community in the Portland metropolitan region and the State of Oregon. This alignment, combined with Portland State’s long standing leadership in community-based learning, makes the development of sustainability curricula a natural priority for the university.

Portland State’s efforts to develop sustainability curricula also reflect a growing interest in sustainability education in higher education. While many early sustainability efforts focused primarily on “greening” campus operations, in recent years there has been growing interest in exploring how sustainability can be integrated into both curricula and research. Building on its motto—“let knowledge serve the city”—Portland State recognizes the potential to expand its long history of community based learning to provide opportunities for students to learn about sustainability experientially at both undergraduate and graduate levels.

Portland State’s Academic Sustainability Programs

Portland State’s engagement in sustainability-related curricular programs date back to the 1970s, when the University developed the first Environmental Science and Resources Ph.D. program in the United States. Portland State’s urban planning program also has a longstanding national reputation for its expertise in livability and sustainability issues, a leadership position aligned with the Portland region’s innovation in planning and community design. Course work in environmental sustainability was first introduced into the general education program in the mid-1990s and over the past decade many departments have developed sustainability-oriented courses.

In 2000-2001, the university launched a broader initiative to integrate sustainability into its academic programs, research, and operations by appointing its first campus operations sustainability coordinator and coordinator for academic sustainability programs. Portland State established the Center for
Sustainable Processes and Practices (the Center) in 2006 to promote and support academic sustainability activities on campus with an emphasis on facilitating multi-disciplinary research and community engagement. The Center’s efforts received a significant boost in the fall of 2008 when the James F. and Marion L. Miller Foundation awarded Portland State a $25 million ten year challenge gift to expand its academic sustainability programs.

The resources provided by the Miller Foundation gift are being invested in enhancing student learning opportunities related to sustainability, strengthening faculty research and curricular development, and supporting community engagement. Specific investments of the Miller Foundation funds have included supporting multi-disciplinary faculty research teams, providing staff support for internships and student leadership development, and funding the development of courses and curricular initiatives in specific department and degree programs. A number of the activities described in this article have been supported with Miller Foundation funding.

As part of a strategic planning process undertaken in 2005 as well as more recent planning related to the Miller Foundation gift, Portland State actively engaged community partners in identifying priority needs and opportunities for sustainability-related curricula. In both cases, community partners from private sector companies, government agencies and non-profits were invited to provide input on what they saw as the key skills and knowledge base that Portland State should ensure its students were developing related to sustainability. Two of the most important elements identified through these sessions were multi-disciplinary perspectives and “systems thinking,” and these elements have continued to serve as central themes as Portland State has expanded its sustainability curricula.

Commitment to Campus-wide Integration—Curricular Implications

Portland State’s Declaration in Support of Sustainability, developed in 2005, outlines the following principles guiding the University’s sustainability programs:

1. To infuse sustainability into all colleges, schools and programs.
2. To develop a sustainable physical campus that is an example to other institutions.
3. To make Portland State University a demonstration model of sustainable processes and practices.
4. To develop core multidisciplinary research competencies in key sustainability areas related to pressing real world problems.

The commitment to multi-disciplinary approaches embedded in these principles is reflected in Portland State’s Graduate Certificate in Sustainability (http://www.pdx.edu/sustainability/graduate-certificate-sustainability). Formally approved in 2008, the Certificate was developed by a multidisciplinary group of faculty to provide a mechanism for any graduate student to gain grounding in the basic principles of sustainability, in addition to gaining the disciplinary expertise provided through masters or PhD level course work. Certificate students gain an understanding of the major theories and concepts related to the key dimensions of sustainability, as well as case analysis experience. Students must complete six classes totaling a minimum of 22 credits, including four core courses that provide exposure to the breadth of contemporary sustainability concepts and offer an opportunity for interaction among students with different disciplinary backgrounds. The core courses of the program—several of which are team-taught—address ecological, social, and economic theoretical frameworks and the fundamentals of implementing sustainability on the ground.

The development of the Certificate program implicitly involved the definition of learning objectives, as faculty worked together to ensure the core elements of sustainability would be conveyed through the core courses. A focus on such “learning outcomes” has also been central to Portland State’s efforts to integrate
sustainability into the undergraduate experience, as well as into the University Studies general education program. In recent years, developing learning outcomes has emerged as a central strategy for strengthening general education programs nationally as well as at Portland State. The movement toward the use of learning outcomes reflects a shift from “teaching” to “learning” as the core focus of curricular development. The following section traces the process through which learning outcomes have been developed and adopted at Portland State, with specific focus on the integration of sustainability in this process.

Learning Outcomes as a Strategy for Curricular Development

In 2009, the Association of American Colleges and Universities (AAC&U) released survey findings showing that 78% of its member institutions had established a common set of intended learning outcomes for their undergraduate students (Association of American Colleges and Universities 2009). Of these institutions, 24% identified sustainability as among the learning outcomes at their campus (Schneider 2009). These findings provide some of the best evidence to date of the national progress being made in the shift from teaching to learning. Other indications of this shift include greater incorporation of learning theory and research into course development and delivery, and the push for greater accountability through ongoing assessment of both general education and disciplinary programs.

Reflecting these trends, Portland State’s leadership has demonstrated continued commitment to student learning and success over the years, especially through its innovative general education program—University Studies—whose first year seminars and senior capstones were originally based on this literature. The university’s 15 years of commitment to community-based learning also reflects its understanding of the powerful role of active engagement in student learning.

Having based its general education program on four main learning goals for the past 15 years, Portland State is no stranger to the value of developing curricula around learning outcomes. These four goals, which are prominently displayed on Portland State’s general education web pages (http://www.pdx.edu/unst/university-studies-goals), are introduced during the first year seminar, and incorporated into course design; they also form the basic organizing structure of student e-portfolios, and provide essential reference points for assessment. Even with this history of using a learning outcomes approach in general education, however, when the institution’s leaders decided to initiate development of a set of campus-wide learning outcomes those responsible for carrying out the charge were somewhat daunted by the task.

The Campus-wide Learning Outcomes Process at Portland State

The Vice Provost for Instruction and Dean of Undergraduate Studies carried primary responsibility for the Campus-wide Learning Outcomes (CWLOs) project that was initiated during spring of 2007. At that time, the Institutional Assessment Council and the Center for Academic Excellence Assessment Integration and Support Team (the Assessment Team) initiated a review of institution-level learning outcomes based on recommendations from four key sources, including AAC&U’s report, Liberal Education and America’s Promise. By January 2008, five learning outcomes had been identified. "Sustainability", which was not among the original five, was added later that year after three roundtable discussions involving over 60 faculty and staff determined it was appropriate and feasible to include “sustainability” (as well as “engagement”) as additional learning goals.

Over a span of 18 months, the Office of Academic Affairs, the Institutional Assessment Council (IAC), and the Assessment Team organized faculty discussions about the general merit of taking a campus-wide approach to learning outcomes as well as creating opportunities for faculty and staff to get involved in actual learning outcome development. The earliest of these opportunities was a faculty symposium held in
fall 2007 to elicit reactions to the IAC’s efforts to identify appropriate learning outcomes for Portland State and to share the supporting rationale for them. Given the project’s ambitious nature and the significant impact it would have on academic units, faculty members attending the symposium were intent on understanding the rationale for institutional learning outcomes and concerned to know more about how and why decisions were made to move forward on their development. Faculty wanted to understand the amount of work involved and to be satisfied—as much as possible at this early stage in the process—that CWLOs would result in curricular improvements.

The ensuing discussion was frank, sometimes intense, and produced valuable feedback that informed subsequent steps taken by IAC members and administrators. One such step was to meet with chairs of key faculty senate committees to hear their concerns and incorporate their feedback. Another step was taken by graduate students on the CAE Assessment Team, who organized a series of focus group discussions with students to elicit their input. Feedback gathered from all of these sources was reviewed during IAC meetings, incorporated into the CWLO development process, and presented for review and comment during faculty senate meetings.

To encourage faculty members to actively engage with the proposed CWLOs, the IAC Chair and the Assessment Team designed a pilot project to link the learning outcomes to program-level learning and assessment practices. The project took place during winter and spring terms of 2008, culminating in a CWLO showcase event and reception held at the end of that academic year. At the showcase, 34 different poster presentations of results were on display for review by faculty, staff, and administrators. In hindsight, the showcase was one of the most significant events in terms of gaining faculty acceptance of the CWLOs. The number and quality of the pilot projects clarified participants’ understanding of the power of a learning outcomes approach and the range of the 34 applications helped illustrate the fundamental distinctions between this approach and the instructor-centered, content-based approach commonly used during course development.

As a result of this work, progressive rounds of valuable feedback were available to IAC members as they composed and revised each learning outcome. Eight CWLOs were presented to and accepted by faculty senate in March 2009. These CWLOs addressed areas of disciplinary and/or professional expertise; Creative and critical thinking; Communication; Diversity; Ethics and social responsibility; Internationalization; Engagement; and Sustainability.

At the time the faculty senate ratified the CWLOs, the Sustainability learning outcome was written as follows: “Students will identify, act on, and evaluate their professional and personal actions with the knowledge and appreciation of interconnections among economic, environmental, and social perspectives in order to create a more sustainable future.” The campus community will be involved in further refinement of this outcome for some time. Some of this refinement is occurring as efforts are made to establish sustainability within the undergraduate curriculum. These efforts are described in the next section.

**Sustainability in General Education**

While a campus-wide learning outcome in sustainability declares an institutional commitment to sustainability education, individual programs, departments, and faculty members must then translate that commitment into specific student learning experiences. General education courses can present early opportunities to incorporate interdisciplinary sustainability learning outcomes because they are often less constrained by the need to cover discipline-specific content than are courses related to disciplinary majors (e.g., Chase and Rowland 2004).

General education at Portland State consists of a four-year program known as University Studies that comprises interdisciplinary courses that have been developed over the past 15 years to address the student
learning goals of critical thinking, communication, diversity, and ethical issues and social responsibility (White 1999). While sustainability has not historically been an explicit goal of the University Studies Program, from the outset it has been a strong theme within the interdisciplinary curriculum as reflected in courses such as Global Environmental Change, Environmental Sustainability, and Healthy People/Healthy Places.

The recent adoption of the CWLO in sustainability, together with the resources made available through the Miller Foundation gift, has provided an opportunity to enhance sustainability as an explicit emphasis of the University Studies curriculum. To develop a baseline for future course and curricular development, a small faculty working group was convened to identify which University Studies courses had already incorporated sustainability. As part of a larger effort to improve transfer student success, this working group focused on the approximately 400 courses that constitute the “Upper-division Cluster” portion of the curriculum. These are courses taught by departments and designed to address the goals of the University Studies Program.

The working group asked faculty to self-identify their sustainability courses via a web-based survey. The reasoning in employing this approach, as opposed to developing a priori criteria for identifying sustainability courses and generating the list ourselves, was to ensure that the criteria for what constitutes a sustainability course in the University Studies Program would be reflective of the work that faculty had already done in course development. Also, this approach provided the opportunity to gauge overall faculty interest in the CWLO in sustainability without predetermining which courses were “in” and which were “out”.

Of the 413 survey invitations sent out, 247 were returned. Three clear themes emerged from the completed surveys:

1. **The majority of respondents identified sustainability as an element of their courses.** In response to the question, “Does this course in some way address the recently-adopted campus wide learning outcome in sustainability as you understand it?” 58% answered yes, 32% no, and 9% were uncertain. The 145 positive responses represent approximately 35% of all courses offered in the Upper-division Cluster portion of the University Studies curriculum and included courses from 33 different departments and programs.

2. **Several sustainability “Big Ideas” were commonly identified.** Drawing upon the work of the Washington Center for Improving the Quality of Undergraduate Education (2008) and Sherman (2008), faculty were asked to identify the sustainability concepts or principles in their courses from the following list:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sustainability “Big Idea”</th>
<th>Courses Identified</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interconnectedness and interdependence (systems thinking)</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social/economic equity</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural diversity and traditional knowledge</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intergenerational thinking</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental/ecological literacy</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental/ecological ethics</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental justice</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bioregionalism</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessing sustainability (e.g., “triple bottom line”)</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecological design (cradle to cradle design, green building)</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
One explanation for the high incidence of faculty identifying both “Social/economic equity” and “Cultural diversity and traditional knowledge” as concepts identified by faculty is that they are similar to the “Ethics and Social responsibility” and “Diversity” goals of the University Studies Program, whereas “Environmental/ecological” concepts have been incorporated into individual courses but not yet program wide.

3. **Categorizing courses by the amount of emphasis placed on sustainability was difficult.** To attempt to determine the relative emphasis placed on sustainability in courses identified by faculty, a taxonomy proposed by the Association for the Advancement of Sustainability in Higher Education (AASHE) as part of their Sustainability Assessment, Tracking & Rating System (STARS) program was utilized (http://www.aashe.org/stars/index.php). The 145 faculty members who identified their courses as addressing sustainability were asked to classify their courses as either sustainability-focused (i.e., courses where student application of sustainability concepts and principles to better understand multi-faceted issues and problems that integrate economic, social, and environmental aspects is a primary focus) or sustainability-related (i.e., courses that incorporate sustainability as a distinct course component or module or concentrate on a single sustainability principle or issue). In response, 29% chose sustainability-focused, 54% sustainability-related, and 17% neither.

However, the wide range of faculty responses to the prompt “Briefly describe your rationale for classifying this course as sustainability-related or sustainability-focused” suggests that applying this distinction with any consistency across the curriculum would be difficult. For example, some faculty described their courses as sustainability-focused because they involved study of something that has been sustained over time (e.g., “The National Parks are the ultimate sites of sustainability in that we want to sustain them into the future as they have sustained themselves for generations”). Other faculty, in contrast, described using approaches in their sustainability-focused courses that explicitly integrated economic, social, and environmental aspects into addressing multidisciplinary problems (e.g., “Use public policy and participatory processes to balance, environmental, economic, and social concerns”). Another group of faculty described their courses as providing theoretical bases for understanding sustainability without addressing sustainability explicitly (e.g., “Elementary Ethics offers a theoretical knowledge of normative ethical alternatives to proper conduct within society”).

In general, the results of this survey were encouraging in that many faculty members indicated an interest in the CWLO in sustainability and openness to receiving support in incorporating sustainability more explicitly into their courses. For example, one faculty wrote,

…the topic of sustainability has not been fully fleshed out in the Japanese Religious Traditions course, but could easily be developed. Water, for example, is extremely important in Japanese culture and has both practical and religious significance. It is very carefully conserved and preserved.

This broad-based faculty interest in the CWLO in sustainability, combined with the wide range of faculty articulations of how sustainability is or might be incorporated into their courses, suggested the need for specific sustainability course-development resources that could support a diversity of approaches while maintaining programmatic cohesiveness. Course-level sustainability learning outcomes that could be mapped onto Portland State’s broader general education goals were sought out in order to support faculty in incorporating sustainability into additional general education courses. To find examples of course-specific learning outcomes, syllabi were collected from faculty who had indicated in the first survey that their courses addressed the CWLO in sustainability. Of the 55 syllabi provided, 22 contained either explicit sustainability learning outcomes (e.g., Students will apply basic physical laws and biological
principles to analysis of resource use.) or implicit sustainability learning outcomes (e.g., To introduce students to feminist perspectives on the causes of and solutions to the problem of global warming.) (See Table 1).

Perhaps not surprisingly, most of the sustainability learning outcomes identified in this review of course syllabi were related to increasing student knowledge and developing students’ abilities to explain and describe interconnections among concepts and perspectives. Fewer of the outcomes addressed skills that students might apply to sustainability efforts (e.g., develop and evaluate strategies) and only one addressed the affective domain of values and attitudes. The overrepresentation of knowledge-based learning outcomes compared to skills-based and affective outcomes in this data are consistent with the general pattern seen in education for sustainability in general education (Shephard 2008). However, if general education is to play a significant role in helping society develop more sustainable policies and behavioral norms, students need opportunities to develop their problem-solving skills and to test their beliefs and attitudes in working through actual sustainability problems (Rowe 2007). Portland State’s ongoing curricular development work will pay attention to these underrepresented domains because they are particularly well suited to community-based learning.

Table 1. Portland State’s General Education Goals and Corresponding Course-level Student Learning Outcomes in Sustainability Drawn from the Syllabi of General Education Courses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Portland State’s General Education Goal</th>
<th>Corresponding Course-level Sustainability Learning Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Inquiry and Critical Thinking:** Students will learn various modes of inquiry through interdisciplinary curricula—problem-posing, investigating, conceptualizing—in order to become active, self-motivated, and empowered learners. | • Assess changes to regional ecologies resulting from economic development.  
• Analyze claims surrounding environmental controversies.  
• Describe connections among environmental condition, human health, and patterns of urbanization.  
• Evaluate the environmental consequences of different economic systems.  
• Understand systems thinking as an interdisciplinary problem solving process. |
| **Communication:** Students will enhance their capacity to communicate in various ways—writing, graphics, numeracy, and other visual and oral means—to collaborate effectively with others in group work, and to be competent in appropriate communication technologies. | • Learn the skills to form and maintain successful interdisciplinary problem-solving teams.  
• Produce descriptions and analyses of multidisciplinary problems that make use of written, numerical, graphical, and visual information. |
| **The Diversity of Human Experience:** Students will enhance their appreciation for and understanding of the rich complexity of the human experience through the study of differences in ethnic and cultural perspectives, class, race, gender, sexual orientation, and ability. | • Explain the cultural foundations of environmental relationships.  
• Explain feminist perspectives on the cause of and solutions to global climate change.  
• Explain indigenous perspectives on the definition of sustainability.  
• Explain and apply the concept of environmental justice.  
• Analyze interrelationships between environmental |
Ethics and Social Responsibility: Students will expand their understanding of the impact and value of individuals and their choices on society, both intellectually and socially, through group projects and collaboration in learning communities.

- Describe the linkages between human activities and environmental change.
- Apply ethical theories to environmental issues.
- Conduct a personal resource audit or “Ecological Footprint” assessment.
- Develop & evaluate strategies to improve the health of interconnected environmental and social systems.
- Articulate a personal understanding of the values that help guide your actions and decisions as they impact nested environmental, social, and economic systems.

Faculty Development—Sustainability Retreat

As a complement to the collection and review of syllabi within University Studies and to better understand graduate student course experiences, CAE staff and graduate assistants initiated meetings with faculty who were either teaching courses affiliated with the Graduate Certificate in Sustainability or teaching special topics and experimental courses at the graduate level. The goal of these meetings was to talk with instructors about their course goals, learning outcomes, and assignments. These discussions sought to understand what aspects of sustainability (i.e., environmental, social, and/or economic) were emphasized in these courses and how student learning outcomes might be distributed between knowledge, attitudes, and/or skills domains. During these informal interviews, faculty we asked for copies of their syllabi and additional descriptions of assignments.

Over 40 syllabi were collected through this process, which took place over two terms. Review of their content revealed two overall and somewhat surprising findings: first, community engagement activities—including field work, field trips and interviews, and community projects—comprise less than 15% of all sustainability assignments; second, 50% of the syllabi contained neither learning objectives nor learning outcomes. With these results in mind, a sustainability retreat was organized in spring 2009. Each faculty member who had been interviewed was invited, as were faculty teaching regularly scheduled undergraduate courses.

Convening faculty and hosting events such as retreats that bring together faculty with shared interests in a particular topic is one of the key roles that CAE plays. The expertise assembled at gatherings of this sort can address questions and common challenges. The sustainability retreat also helped faculty make connections with others teaching similar courses, creating a communication network that would help spread information necessary to implement change (Kezar 2009).

The day-long retreat was held two months after sustainability had been approved as a campus-wide learning outcome and was framed around the following goals:

- Understand the range and variety of sustainability curricula on campuses around the country as well as the factors supporting sustainability curricular development;
- Understand the range and variety of sustainability curricula and coursework at Portland State;
- Explore common ideas, approaches, goals, and challenges related to teaching sustainability courses;
• Discuss desired student gains from the learning opportunities offered through sustainability courses at Portland State;
• Identify constraints, challenges, barriers, and/or rough edges experienced in sustainability work and explore their potential solutions;
• Identify helpful resources and sources of support.

Co-facilitated by a sustainability educator known nationally for faculty and curricular development work, the retreat helped participants gain insight into the range and variety of curricular work taking place at campuses around the country as well as at Portland State. Initial results from the survey of faculty teaching undergraduate sustainability courses and information compiled by CAE graduate assistants were both shared at the retreat. The 20 full- and part-time faculty members attending the retreat shared background about themselves and their courses, discussed common concerns including pedagogical and interdisciplinary challenges, and shared perspectives on student learning outcomes and the learning opportunities in their courses. Participants’ interest and imagination was sparked by the stories of novel teaching ideas and curricular innovations occurring nationally that were shared at the retreat. Discussions were particularly rich because the faculty participants had been teaching sustainability courses and thinking deeply about this subject for some time. Other participants, who taught part-time, brought perspectives from their full-time jobs doing sustainability work in the community.

Next Steps and Reflections

The activities and evaluations described above have made it clear that, in spite of Portland State’s attention to learning outcomes, the University is a long way from effectively operationalizing sustainability as an outcome at the institutional level. Even though Portland State now has a CWLO for sustainability, there is plenty of work to be done to actually get people to think in terms of learning outcomes.

As a next step, CAE is continuing its review of course syllabi collected in the spring of 2009, taking a closer look at the alignment between stated student learning outcomes and course elements including assignments, readings, and class sessions. Improving this alignment is of interest for curricular and faculty development planning in order to strengthen more direct connections between student learning and the elements of the course designed to encourage that learning. CAE is also planning focus groups to better understand students’ experiences related to learning about sustainability at Portland State. Conducting interviews with different groups of Portland State students, including graduate students in sustainability programs, student leaders in campus sustainability programs, and undergraduates from diverse majors with interests in sustainability, should enhance the University’s understanding of what students find most valuable in their sustainability studies and where they see room for improvement.

The findings from these studies will be incorporated into a series of faculty development workshops that will draw upon the successful model of AASHE’s Sustainability Across the Curriculum Leadership workshops (www.aashe.org/profdev/curriculum.php). The goals of these workshops will be to present faculty with examples of best practices, drawn from the work of their peers, for incorporating sustainability student learning outcomes into their courses and for making explicit connections between those learning outcomes and the work they ask students to complete.

A recent evaluation of the Graduate Certificate has also identified a number of opportunities to strengthen both individual courses and the integration among courses in this program. Core faculty in the program are developing a road map to identify the key activities and investments needed over the coming years to both meet the increasing demand for this program and ensure that the intended learning outcomes of the program are being achieved.
Finally, although Portland State is known nationally for its commitment to community based learning, this assessment suggests that surprisingly few faculty members have fully integrated community-based learning elements into their sustainability-related courses. This gap constitutes a missed opportunity. As Cortese (2006) points out, the sustainability curricula that students experience should be part of their institution’s regular work “to improve local and regional communities, contributing to making them healthier, more socially vibrant and stable, economically secure, and environmentally sustainable” (p. xiii). Cortese also notes that an institution’s curriculum should be closely connected to its research and to “understanding and reducing any negative ecological and social footprint of the institution” (p. xiii). While Cortese’s comments are strongly aligned with Portland State’s commitment to the campus as a “living laboratory”, the University clearly has work to do to more fully integrate sustainability teaching, learning and research opportunities on campus. In recent years, Portland State faculty and administrators have voiced an aspiration for the university to become a “living laboratory” for learning about sustainability in an urban environment. Achieving this aspiration will clearly require that the university more fully integrate its long-standing community-based learning programs and its emerging sustainability curricula, but it will be important to ensure that faculty receive sufficient support for such opportunities to be realized. The payoff will be significant if Portland State can more fully advance such integration. As G. Chase (personal communication, May 8, 2009) has observed, through such a re-visioning curriculum can become the avenue through which real change is possible.

**Conclusion**

Educating students about the sustainability challenges and opportunities in urban environments is a growing global imperative. In the United States and internationally, population is increasingly concentrated in urban communities; the United Nations estimates that by 2030 at least 60 percent of the world’s population—approximately 4.9 billion people—will be living in cities (United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs 2006). Successful approaches to urban sustainability challenges must reflect the specific economic, social and environmental context of individual urban communities. These are compelling reasons for urban-serving universities to mobilize their research and educational programs around sustainability challenges and to engage in sustainability-related partnerships relevant to their respective communities.

The broader Portland region has often been recognized as a leader in sustainability and Portland State has benefited greatly from input community partners have provided on the skills and knowledge base that graduates need to contribute to sustainability solutions. Although Portland’s leadership in this area may provide Portland State with some unique advantages, other urban-serving universities have similar opportunities to engage their students in learning about sustainability in ways relevant to their particular community. The learning outcomes approach pursued by Portland State may be particularly relevant to the topic of sustainability – a topic that is of increasing importance in terms of both theory and practice – as it focuses attention on the translation of teaching to learning.
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