2016

Higher education administrators' perspective on service learning

Briana Cicero-Johns
cicerojohns@gmail.com

HIGHER EDUCATION ADMINISTRATORS' PERSPECTIVE ON SERVICE LEARNING

A dissertation submitted to
the Graduate College of
Marshall University
In partial fulfillment of
the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Education
in
Educational Leadership
by
Briana Cicero-Johns
Approved by
Dr. Barbara L. Nicholson, Committee Chairperson
Dr. Michael L. Cunningham
Dr. Ronald Childress
Dr. Corley Dennison

Marshall University
August 2016

SIGNATURE PAGE

I hereby affirm that the following project meets the high academic standards for original scholarship and creative work established by my discipline, college, and the Graduate College of Marshall University. With my signature, I approve the manuscript for publication.

Project Title: Higher Education Administrators' Perspective on Service Learning

Student's Name: Briana Cicero-Johns

Department: Leadership Studies

College: Marshall University

Committee Chairperson

7.28.16

Date

ii

DEDICATION

To my husband, whose unwavering love, support, and encouragement have been instrumental in helping me to overcome the challenges of – and survive the "balance" of – graduate school, career, volunteerism, and family. His sacrifices were many, his patience extensive, and his assistance critical in helping me achieve this goal. His calming presence and sound advice have served me well through the successes and cheers as well as the disappointments and tears.

To my Mom, my first teacher, who shared her love for reading, nature, animals, children, and learning with me, my siblings, and everyone she met. Her pursuit of higher education and dedication to her studies during my childhood, and continued efforts to learn throughout her lifetime, has served to inspire and motivate me.

To my Dad, my first coach, who taught me and my siblings to pursue our passions, the importance of focused goal-setting, and the necessity to practice outside of practice. His dedication and high expectations helped me to excel in sports, leading to scholarships for my undergraduate and graduate educations.

To my children Linnea and Lawrence, the joys of my life, making me smile bigger and laugh louder than I ever have before. You make my life richer in every way.

To my beloved dog Luke, the one who throughout this process reminded me of the importance of breaks -- for walks and porch sitting and greeting the neighbors. You are such a good boy.

Together you have served as the driving force in my quest to achieve this goal.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Firstly, I would like to express my appreciation to my advisor, Dr. Bobbi Nicholson, for the support of my Ed.D. study and related research, and for her guidance throughout the process. She has challenged me to think differently and more fully reflect upon what I read, see, or hear. Her influence in my education and on my life has been profound, and I am forever thankful.

Besides my advisor, I would like to thank the rest of my dissertation committee: Dr. Michael Cunningham, Dr. Ron Childress, and Dr. Corley Dennison for their intellectual support, assistance in focusing my research, feedback, and moral support. Their insightful discussions and mentorship have been instrumental in my persistence to degree completion. I am most appreciative of the time, energy, and expertise they shared with me throughout this experience.

I thank my fellow classmates for the thought-provoking discussions, for the study sessions, vent sessions, and feedback, and for all the fun we have had over the years. Specifically, I thank my classmates Dr. Janet Rorrer, Dr. Brent Griffith, and Dr. Jessi Hanna for their friendship, willingness to provide expertise and technical support, and their motivation to help me see this through to completion. They truly enriched my doctoral experience and I am grateful.

Also, I thank my friend Dr. Bethany Meighen from the University of North Carolina – Wilmington. Her assistance in this process ranged from idea exploration to generating sources and from cheerleading to editing. Her willingness to assist me in overcoming barriers, enthusiasm for learning, and friendship were vital in completing this dissertation.

I thank my amazing colleagues, specifically Dr. Scott Bellamy, Suzanne King, and Dennis McMillen. Their wisdom and guidance have helped me grow immensely as a professional, student-researcher, friend, partner, and parent, and I am most grateful to them.

I thank my friends and neighbors for their support in various forms: vent sessions, dog walking/sitting, babysitting, leaf and/or snow removal, and providing garden vegetables and/or meals. They always seemed to know when I needed a little extra help to get by and willingly provided assistance to me.

My thanks also go to the Appalachian College Association and The University of Charleston, which provided me with a sabbatical to begin my study, and with numerous opportunities to grow through teaching, service, and scholarship. Without their support it would not be possible to conduct this research.

Finally, my sincere thanks to my husband, Scott Johns, children, Linnea and Lawrence, and golden retriever, Luke. Their love, patience, and willingness to sacrifice our time together during this process allowed me to be successful in completing this dissertation and my Ed.D. Much love to my favorites.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

List of Tables

ABSTRACT

An economic downturn beginning in late 2007 has led to decreased funding and greater competition to recruit and retain students in higher education. Service-learning, while demonstrated to be an effective recruiting and retention strategy, could fall victim to budgetary constraints – thus undermining institutions' historical commitment to service and engagement – unless administrators are convinced of its value. This study examined administrators' perspectives on the perceived financial benefits, if any, that accrue to the institution from the implementation of service-learning courses and programs, and whether service-learning requirements are perceived to contribute to student learning, recruitment, retention, and fundraising.

The study discussed the various costs and utility – value or satisfaction – of multiple measures of service-learning initiatives as perceived by higher education administrators. A cost-utility (CU) analysis was used because it allowed administrators to weigh the importance of various effects of service learning including student learning, student recruitment, retention, and institutional fundraising. It is in the context of economic instability in higher education that the study examined the cost-utility of service-learning courses and programs in higher education.

As it related to service-learning courses, administrators perceived better student learning outcomes; deeper understanding of course concepts; greater appreciation for diversity; better interpersonal skills; and higher levels of motivation. More than 80% of administrators in the sample also 1) perceived service-learning as important to retention of first-generation students, 2) perceived it important for retention of freshmen, and 3) considered it to be associated with student persistence to degree completion. Interestingly, however, only 47% of administrators believed that service-learning activities actually increased student retention on their campuses.

Administrators in the sample reported a financial benefit accrued to the institution from the service-learning initiative through 1) improved public relations, 2) improved student retention, 3) increased donor giving, 4) increased student admission, and 5) increased corporate sponsorship.

Keywords: service learning, recruitment, retention, fundraising, cost-effectiveness analysis

CHAPTER ONE

Introduction

In the 21st century, service learning has become a prominent component of higher education. It is a respected pedagogy that has been integrated in both academic and student life in order to prepare graduates academically and as engaged citizens contributing to a democratic society (Bringle, Clayton, & Hatcher, 2013; Felten & Clayton, 2011; Jacoby, 2009a). Nearly all colleges and universities include some form of civic or service-related language in their mission statements (Kezar, 2002) and service-learning courses and programs have been developed and implemented nationwide to meet their missions (Bringle & Steinberg, 2010; Felten & Clayton, 2011; Horgan & Scire, 2007; Weber & Weber, 2010). Changes in our economy, however, have created a new reality for higher education. The new reality includes decreased funding and escalating operational costs, and university administrators must reconsider the purposes of higher education, including its historical role in developing engaged citizens.

Background

Service learning is a pedagogy blending community-based service experiences that meet existing practical needs with academic course content for the purpose of enhancing learning, civic responsibility, and a variety of student development outcomes (Furco & Moely, 2012). It was defined by Bringle et al. (2013) as a pedagogy that benefits students while students are providing a tangible benefit to the community, reflecting on their work to support their "academic, civic, and personal development" (p. 6). Service learning provides faculty, students, and community partners with the opportunity to work together to solve problems (Harkavy & Hartley, 2010). The major differences between service learning and community service are the reflective and reciprocity elements of the former. Design of service learning should include

reflection before, during, and at the conclusion of student service-learning experiences. Reciprocity occurs whenever the student providing the service to a community partner learns from the recipient while providing the needed service (Eyler, 2002; Eyler, 2001; Felten & Clayton, 2011). A transition from traditional educational approaches toward one which links "theory and practice, cognitive and affective learning, and colleges with communities" (Butin, 2006) has assisted in spreading the service-learning movement throughout higher education, where it has become the preferred method of preparing engaged citizens in higher education (Epstein, 1999; Gabelnick, 1997; Hauser, 2000).

Bringle and Steinberg's (2010) review of the literature related to student service-learning outcomes found that most report service learning indeed leads to more civically-engaged students who fulfill their civic responsibility to society at an increased rate after graduation. Horgan and Scire (2007) also found that service-learning and civic engagement initiatives have been documented in numerous studies as being a crucial part of higher education for students today, and Eyler and Giles (1999) reported that students who took courses with service-learning components integrated into them had greater gains in "problem analysis complexity, solution complexity, knowledge application, and critical thinking ability" as compared to those who did not take these courses.

Historical Role of Service in Higher Education

The idea that one of the roles of higher education is to create engaged citizens is as old as higher education itself in the United States. The Morrill Act of 1862 and the establishment of land grant colleges and universities forever linked higher education and service. This historical commitment to service suggests higher education should provide students opportunities to

become engaged citizens in addition to meeting their educational goals. Service learning is one way in which institutions can meet this particular purpose of higher education.

Experiential education, which included service-learning, internships, and cooperative education, has its roots in John Dewey's theory of education, and it began to spread on campuses in the 1960s and 1970s (Dewey, 1938; Jacoby, 1999). The organization which became known as the National Society for Experiential Education (NSEE) worked throughout the 1980s and 1990s to get higher education to accept service learning as a new type of experiential education (Jacoby, 1999; Lounsbury & Pollack, 2001). Service learning as a new pedagogy was viewed as a more relevant, self-directed teaching and learning process which varied dramatically from the traditional education methods of faculty's disseminating knowledge to students in a classroom (Lounsbury & Pollack, 2001). NSEE's philosophy was that all experiential education should be rooted in the mission of the institution, involve faculty, and integrate the curriculum using sound pedagogical practices. Their organization-trained consultants worked with institutions of higher education in the development and strengthening of experiential education (Jacoby, 1999). The 1990s saw a rise in organizations devoted to service learning and federal funds were plentiful for these initiatives. Furthermore, as Harkavy and Hartley (2010) noted, early-1990s proponents of service learning in higher education believed service learning could effectively "link the core work of colleges and universities with higher purposes – transformative learning, education for democracy, and research to better understand and improve the world" (p. 419).

Service learning became a major movement in higher education in the 2000s, which was evident by the increase in the number of colleges and universities acquiring membership in Campus Compact. Campus Compact is an association dedicated to campus-based civic-engagement, to the development of students' citizenship skills, to assisting in the development of

campus-community partnerships, and to providing resources and training for faculty and staff to integrate civic engagement into the curriculum (Campus Compact, 2014). Institutions' membership in Campus Compact highlighted university and college presidential commitment to the civic purpose of higher education (Butin, 2006; Campus Compact, 2014; Holland & Hollander, 2006). In the late 1990s there were 578 member institutions participating in Campus Compact, while today there are 1072 colleges and universities participating in the United States hailing from public and private, and four-year and two-year institutions (Campus Compact, 2003; Campus Compact, 2014; Eyler & Giles, 1999). Service learning pedagogy has experienced the most growth, however, at institutions that highlight teaching over research; institutions that are focused on ways to improve undergraduate education. Service-learning initiatives have had the easiest inroads at institutions with organizational cultures which welcome and reward innovative teaching practices (Furco, 2001). Campus Compact (2014) has conducted an annual membership survey for nearly 30 years to assess campus-based community engagement and to identify emerging trends, finding a "strong trend toward increased engagement among … member institutions, as measured by service opportunities, participation in service-learning, community partnerships, and resources and infrastructures to support service work" (Campus Compact, 2014). Committing to service learning rather than to community service or volunteerism is in the best interest of higher education stakeholders because it provides a way for colleges and universities to meet their educational goals, including civic responsibility (Bringle et. al., 2013; Bringle & Steinberg, 2010; Jacoby, 1999).

Institutionalization of Service Learning

A commitment to preparing graduates for participation in public life can be demonstrated "through a strong, institutionalized service-learning program" that validates its importance and

situates it in the institution's mission (Jacoby, 1999; Rubin, 1996). In order to institutionalize service learning in higher education, colleges and universities must integrate it into their missions and it must be reflected in the policies and procedures of the institution (Bringle & Hatcher, 2000; Jacoby, 1999; Rubin, 1996) Furthermore, it should be integrated into not only the curricular, but the co-curricular aspects of the institution. More than 1,000 colleges and universities have been assisted with this integration through their membership in Campus Compact (Campus Compact, 2014).These member institutions have committed themselves to the civic purposes of higher education through the service-learning movement (Butin, 2006).

Institutionalization of service learning occurs whenever service learning is integrated into aspects of institutional work other than just the academic (e.g. admissions, student affairs, and assessment). The widespread support and understanding of service learning by staff and administrators is important when connecting and communicating an initiative to the mission of the institution (Bringle & Hatcher, 2009; Bringle & Hatcher, 2000). Rubin (1996) noted that college and university admission's offices use service-learning projects and programs to attract high school students who have community service experience, recruiting them because of an expectation that they will want to participate in service experiences while in college as well.

Advantages of Service Learning

Data from multiple studies document service-learning pedagogy as a means of improving student learning outcomes, as well as a contributing factor in the recruitment and retention of students (Astin & Sax, 1998; Bringle & Hatcher, 1996; Eyler & Giles, 1999; Holland & Hollander, 2006; Rubin, 1996; Yeh, 2010). Furthermore, positive service learning outcomes have been used to promote institutional fundraising initiatives, including grants and donor gifts (Butin, 2007; Holland & Hollander, 2006; Weerts & Hudson, 2009).

Service-Learning and Student Learning Outcomes

Eyler and Giles (1999) conducted two major studies on the outcomes of service-learning. One study involved pre- and post-test surveys of 1,500 college students enrolled in courses at 20 U.S. institutions of higher education; 1,100 of the students were enrolled in a service-learning course, while 400 were not. Additionally, they interviewed 66 of these students twice, at the beginning and end of the semester. Their second study involved interviews with 67 college students from six different institutions about their perspectives of the benefits of service-learning. These multi-campus studies gathered data about the outcomes of service learning from the students' perceptions.

Eyler and Giles' studies, reported in a single 1999 publication, reported a variety of academic and citizenship behavior outcomes for students engaged in service-learning courses. Students self-reported better mastery of subject matter, improved critical thinking ability, increased appreciation for diversity, and changes in personal development. Students also reported a "powerful impact on how they [saw] themselves and others" (p. 25) due to their interactions with people with whom they would otherwise not be associated. They reported an increased level of tolerance and appreciation of other cultures, and they believed service learning broke down barriers and provided them opportunities for real and personal connections. Service learning was found to have a significant positive impact on tolerance when controlling for other factors (e.g., age, socioeconomic status, minority status, other community service participation, and close relationships with faculty) (Eyler & Giles, 1999).

It is important to note that nearly all studies related to service learning from the late 1990s forward began with Eyler and Giles' seminal work, although there are many one-campus, one-semester studies supporting Eyler and Giles' findings (Bringle & Steinberg, 2010; Felten &

Clayton, 2011; Harkavy & Hartley, 2010; Hellman, Hoppes, & Ellison, 2006; Keen & Hall, 2009; Mundy & Eyler, 2002; Peterson, 2009; Prentice, 2009; Yeh, 2010). There is, however, a notable gap in longitudinal studies on student learning outcomes as they relate to service-learning practices.

Service Learning and Recruitment

Habley, Bloom, and Robbins (2012) noted that higher education student recruitment is a cyclical process with a beginning and end, as well as a clear way to measure success (i.e., the number of students in the recruiting class). The recruitment costs per student have increased dramatically over the past 25 years because "in an effort to attract more well-qualified students, colleges increase[d] budgets for staff, consultants, … advertising, travel, print and electronic media, and [made]other attempts to impress prospective students" (p. 82). Noel-Levitz (2009) reported that institutions of all types and sizes have increased their recruiting-per-student expense by between four-fold and seven-fold over the past 25 years. The results of their survey showed that four-year private schools' median cost to recruit an undergraduate student rose from $455 per student recruited in 1983 to $2,143 in 2009. "An individual college's recruitment success relies on the institution's ability to compete with other colleges for a finite group of qualified students" (Habley et al., 2012, p.82).

Many high school students today have been engaged in community service activities and have the expectation that they will continue their service efforts in college. Admissions offices which recognize prospective students' desire to engage in service opportunities highlight service-learning initiatives as a recruiting tool (Rubin, 1996). Vogel and Seifer's (2011) study to assess the impacts of service-learning sustainability 10 years after grant funds expired found that faculty, staff, and administrators reported the recruitment of service-oriented students to their

institutions as an unforeseen benefit of service-learning programs. Participants from the 16 different institutions in the study "explained that students cited the opportunity to engage in service-learning as an important reason they chose to attend these institutions" (p. 197). Jacoby (2009b) noted that service-learning scholarships are used to attract students with past service achievements and current service involvement, and individual institutions have begun offering financial aid for students engaged in service. Bringle and Hatcher (2010) found that on applications for the Carnegie elective Community Engagement Classification, institutions demonstrated the prevalence of service-learning courses' contributing to other institutional purposes, such as publicity about service and engagement practices to external audiences including prospective students (pp. 41-42). Some of Vogel and Seifer's (2011) study participants reported that service-learning center staff or faculty and administrative advocates for service learning collaborated with institutional marketing departments "to create student recruitment materials that highlighted the service-learning opportunities at their institutions" (p. 197). Marketing or public relations offices have kept abreast of student and faculty service-learning accomplishments in order to keep the college or university name in the press (Rubin, 1996).

Bringle and Hatcher (1996) reported a link between student recruitment and service-learning, and Holland and Hollander (2006), who are employed by Campus Compact, stated that service learning was strongly associated with student transition from high school to college. Eyler and Giles (1999) stated that college administrators concern themselves with student-faculty relationships because of recruitment factors, and their studies on over 1,500 college students' perceptions of service learning found that service learning was attractive to students when selecting a college.

Service Learning and Retention

Retention is a continuous process where "students entering college are an annually renewable resource" (Habley et al., 2012, p. 80). Tinto (1993) reported that institutions may have as many as 50% of their students leave their original institutions during their matriculations, while Habley et al. (2012) stated that "conventional wisdom suggests that about one-third of all first-year students fail to return for a second year" (p.86). Tinto (1993) found a link between students' learning experiences and departure from college, discovering that the stronger the connection between students and their faculty and peers, specifically outside of the classroom, the less likely they were to depart the institution. Astin and Sax's (1998) study found that nearly 50% of service-learning participants spent at least an hour each week interacting with faculty. In the Eyler and Giles' studies (1999) students reported that their service-learning experience allowed them to get to know their faculty well. In fact, 30% more of the service-learning participants than the non-service-learning participants reported a "close personal relationship with a faculty member," which suggested that one benefit of service learning is the creation of student-faculty relationships (Eyler & Giles, 1999, p. 52). The "student-institution fit is a critical element in student persistence" and institutions lose greatly – tuition, fees, institutional financial aid, and room and board – when students depart their original institutions (Habley et al., 2012).

Bringle and Hatcher (1996) found both curricular and cocurricular outcomes accrue to institutions with service-learning options for students. The first was that linking academic credit with service increased the likelihood of student participation, and the second was that service learning could build a greater sense of community on campus. The former finding was supported three years later in Eyler and Giles' (1999) studies, which suggested college students may need an incentive, such as academic credit, to engage in service. They also found that

service learning was a predictor of student connectedness to their campus communities: "For some students, service learning creates this chance to combine social interaction, academic work, and service in ways that strengthen the bonds to the college" (Eyler & Giles, 1999, p.48). They further noted that service learning may help to reduce feelings of isolation at college, add meaning to students' lives, and provide an opportunity for them to make friends – all of which would contribute to filling the need for meaningful relationship identified by Tinto (1993).

Service Learning and Fundraising

Fundraising efforts are important in higher education, especially in a time of decreased state funds for public institutions and an increase in intense competition for tuition dollars at private institutions. Weerts and Hudson (2009) noted that colleges' and universities' advancement or development offices must work with institutional stakeholders to create a fundraising strategy to engage donors and will have to ask themselves whether engagement "is reflected as a budget priority and key component in [their] resource development campaigns" (p.65). Institutions touting an engagement brand were found to have a better chance of securing private and public support and funding than those not branding themselves as leaders in service or engagement (Weerts & Hudson, 2009, p. 66). Holland and Hollander (2006), researchers for Campus Compact, agreed that "[i]nstitutions with a clear engagement agenda are also likely to see growth in donor support and alumni giving" (p.4).

Donors are more interested in giving to specific programs with tangible outcomes (Weerts & Hudson, 2009) because they are "looking for tangible evidence that their gifts are making a difference" (Grace & Wendroff, 2001). They want to make gifts that will "be transformational – to make visible changes in programs, perceptions, or an organization's future" – which is far different from the traditional transactional giving of simply asking donors to give

to the institution. Strickland (2007) reported that transformational donors are more interested in how institutions use their gifts to build communities because "current donors are using transformational gifts to reshape institutions – institutions that are poised for or are already exhibiting engagement" (p. 105). Grace and Wendroff (2001) suggested that university administrators evaluate the impact of their service learning and engagement programs since transformational giving is focused on how the donor perceives the benefit or impact of her gift to the institution.

It was donors' perceptions that service learning must be integrated into the curriculum in order to validate its importance and the institution's commitment to its mission that influenced the institutionalization of service learning (Jacoby, 1999; Rubin, 1996). Jacoby (2009b) noted that the institutionalization of service learning varies to some degree based on the "extent to which the president and other leaders mention it in speeches and fund-raising efforts" (p. 101). Reshaping "institutional advancement programs (e.g., marketing, branding, and fundraising activities) to leverage support" from donors (Weerts & Husdon, 2009, p.65) has also led to many institutions featuring community engagement efforts on their alumni-magazine covers (Butin, 2007). The transformational donors of today require significant engagement with the institution and hold the expectation that the institution will be engaged with off-campus communities (Strickland, 2007). Weerts and Hudson (2009) further note that "[f]undraising for public engagement programs has gained momentum, especially in the area of service-learning" (p. 65).

Funding Service Learning

Initially service-learning courses and programs were funded externally by federal and non-profit grants; as external funding has diminished, however, higher education administrators have been asked to provide internal funding to sustain these efforts as well as to seek funding

from the private sector (Butin, 2006; Jacoby, 1999; Rubin, 1996). While multiple sources of funding support service-learning programs today, stable internal funding is necessary for long-term program sustainability. The fundamental representations of the institutionalization of service learning are a stable budget and resource allocation (Bringle & Hatcher, 2010; Jacoby, 1999; Morton & Troppe, 1996; Rubin, 1996), which are needed for a multitude of purposes including faculty development and release time, course and curriculum design and assessment, and development of community partnerships (Bringle & Hatcher, 2010; Jacoby, 1999; Rubin, 1996).

The central role service learning has come to play in 21st century higher education has essentially required institutions to bear the financial burden of supporting service-learning curricular and cocurricular initiatives in an effort to conform to the historical ideal of civic engagement (Kezar, 2002). Society's belief that colleges and universities must prepare graduates to be engaged citizens in a democracy places an external source of pressure on institutions of higher education which may feel obligated to rise to this democratic expectation through citizenship education and service-learning experiences (Waggaman, 2001). There is an increased demand for both community engagement and fiscal accountability in higher education; institutions must offer programs that are meaningful to all stakeholders while balancing their budgets (Horgan & Scire, 2007).

Service learning is a central component of the institution when funding for service-learning courses and programs is stable, and development offices prioritize supporting these initiatives whenever service learning is central to the institution's mission and goals (Jacoby, 1999). Critics of the service-learning movement, however, find the costs of resources greatly

outweigh what are perceived to be the minimal benefits provided to students and local communities (Butin, 2006).

Fiscal Uncertainty

In higher education, revenues are mostly used to meet an institution's mission. There is not a focus on making a profit, and there is not a way to measure profit in higher education anyway (Shaw, 2011). Private colleges and universities do not have taxpayer subsidies, and therefore must operate in a competitive market while public institutions are largely funded by state taxes (Ferrall, 2011). Ehrenberg (2012) noted that "[h]igher education is not immune to economic forces" (p. 212) and that pressures on institutions included "expanding enrollment, increasing graduation rates, and limit[ing] future cost increases" (p. 212). In the past, higher education institutions did not have to undertake extensive cost-cutting measures because students and their families simply accepted the ever-increasing tuition and fees; however, that is no longer the case (Palfreyman, 2007). Shaw (2011) noted that "[f]or private schools that depend heavily on tuition, and for public universities that count on rising enrollment funding from their states, decisions by potential students to stay away could spell serious financial trouble" (p. 439). Johnson and Leachman (2013), however, reported that in the 2012-2013 academic year there were "2.5 million more public college and university students than when the [2008] recession began" (p.3).

State-assisted public institutions and private, non-profit institutions are eligible for federal student aid programs under Title IV of the Higher Education Amendment of 1992 (Higher Education Act, 2002). "In public higher education, tuition increases in recent decades have barely offset a long-run decline in state appropriations per full-time equivalent student" (Ehrenberg, 2012, p. 195). Over the past 30 years private colleges and universities have used

financial models that included raising tuition faster than the rate of inflation, increasing financial aid budgets, internally subsidizing research funds, and increasingly using contingent faculty while increasing expenditures for administrators and staff (Ehrenberg, 2013). Additionally, "between 2008-2009 … the recession substantially cut into the endowments of almost every higher education institution, public and private, university and college" (Ferrall, 2011, p. 29) and administrators had to develop campaigns to raise money for endowments for undergraduate financial aid (Ehrenberg, 2013).

Ehrenberg (2013) noted that during this economic downturn institutions increased student-services expenditures (e.g. admissions, registrar, student life) because they "have positive effects on persistence and graduation rates" (p. 21). This supported Webber and Ehrenburg's (2009) findings that "[s]tudent services expenditures influences graduation and first-year persistence rates" (p.17), especially at institutions with lower entrance scores, larger Pell Grant aid per student, and lower graduation and persistence rates.

Fain (2012) explained that many states are currently considering – or have already begun – to tie funding of higher education to "accountability measures." These measures include student persistence and graduation rates, student learning outcomes, and career preparation and placement. In a time where calculating an institutions' graduation rate has become the standard of success, administrations of public institutions fear their future funding will be tied to this accountability measure, which is easily calculated and understood (Melancon & Frederick, 2014). Ehrenberg (2012) stated that "American higher education is in transition along many dimensions: tuition levels, faculty composition, expenditure allocation, pedagogy, technology, and more" (p. 194).

Cost Analysis in Higher Education

Catterall (1998) provided the classical definition of educational productivity: "the relationship between resources expended to provide instruction on the one hand and the outcomes of instruction on the other" (Catterall, 1998, p. 62). The various resources which need to be accounted for in the implementation of an alternative instructional design, like that of service-learning pedagogy, included the initial course or program development, faculty and staff time, and ongoing resource needs (e.g., supplies, transportation). There are several ratio analyses which can be used to calculate the costs and the effectiveness, benefits, utility, and feasibility of a given intervention in higher education (Walsh, Levin, Jaye, Gazzard, 2013). Among those analytical tools are the traditional cost-benefit method, the "ingredients" or cost-effectiveness approach, the cost-utility process, and the cost-feasibility examination. The latter two are most appropriate for evaluating the benefit of service learning.

Levin and McEwan (2001) defined a "[c]ost-utility (CU) analysis [as] the evaluation of alternatives according to a comparison of their costs and their utility or value" (p. 19), and noted that it can "combine multiple measures of effectiveness into a single estimate of utility," or satisfaction derived from one or more outcomes (p. 20). A CU analysis allows administrators to weigh the importance of effects relative to other outcomes (many outcomes can be included) and create consensus around the utility of the alternatives. Service learning could yield effects in many areas: student learning, student recruitment, retention, institutional fundraising, and community relations. CU can help whenever alternatives vary in their measured effectiveness and costs by providing a way for decision-makers "to construct a summary measure of utility, which reflects the overall satisfaction that is derived from each alternative" (Levin & McEwan,

2001, p. 21). A limitation of using CU analysis, however, is the subjectivity of applying weights to different measures; it becomes difficult to replicate the evaluation.

"Cost-feasibility (CF) analysis refers to the method of estimating only the costs of an alternative in order to ascertain whether or not it can be considered" (Levin & McEwan, 2001, pp. 22-24). In this type of analysis, administrators simply eliminate the alternative(s) that exceed their budget or available resources. If the institution cannot afford to implement an alternative pedagogy, no further analysis is necessary (Levin & McEwan, 2001).

Many of the documented benefits of service-learning programs cannot be measured monetarily (e.g. communication skills, personal and interpersonal development); however, there are ways to evaluate multiple measures of the effectiveness of alternative approaches (e.g., documented learning outcomes compared to traditional lecture courses, retention of students taking service-learning courses compared to those who do not), and fiscal reasoning to eliminate options that exceed the institutional budget.

Statement of the Problem

Most of the research that has been conducted on service learning supports positive student outcomes (Astin & Sax, 1998; Batchelder & Root, 1994; Eyler & Giles, 1999; Jacoby, 1999; Vogel & Seifer, 2011). The outcomes administrators expect to see in order to financially support service-learning initiatives in light of increasingly limited funding, however, have not been reported; thus, a missing link in higher education budget planning appears to be the assessment of service-learning programs. Administrators need to know the outcomes related to academic objectives within service-learning courses and across the service-learning curriculum in order to make an informed financial decision regarding service-learning initiatives (Bringle & Steinberg, 2010). All too often, however, assessments are not in place to determine whether

resources for service learning have their intended outcomes (Shulock & Harrison, 1998). Service-learning programs have been eliminated whenever economic times get tough because of a lack of documented outcomes (Eyler & Giles, 1999). Welch (2009) argued there is a real need to undertake a research agenda for empirical assessment of service-learning outcomes in regard to higher education's historical purpose of civic engagement. If the costs of service learning exceed its utility or feasibility and if a balance between them cannot be achieved, it is likely service-learning opportunities will be eliminated on campuses (Waggaman, 2001).

University leaders must ask themselves whether service learning is worth the expense during a time of budget cuts, decreased giving, and increased competition for student tuition dollars. Is service learning's tie to the organization's mission strong enough to justify the costs associated with offering service-learning courses and programs (Kezar, 2002)? Bringle and Steinberg (2010) observed that administrators must ask themselves only two questions in relation to service-learning: 1) Do students master the course objectives because of their service-learning experience? and 2) Is service learning a better pedagogy for achieving the course objectives than other approaches? For higher education's historical commitments to service and civic engagement to continue to be met in higher education, they must be balanced against fiscal priorities and ensure that institutions meet their other obligations in educating students.

Purpose of the Study

An economic downturn beginning in late 2007 has led to decreased funding and greater competition to recruit and retain students in higher education. Service-learning, while demonstrated to be an effective recruiting and retention strategy (Astin & Sax, 1998; Bringle & Hatcher, 2010; Bringle & Hatcher, 1996; Eyler & Giles, 1999; Hurd, 2006; Jacoby, 2009b; Rubin, 1996; Vogel & Siefer, 2011; Yeh, 2010), could fall victim to budgetary constraints – thus

undermining institutions' historical commitment to service and engagement – unless administrators are convinced of its value. Nearly all previous studies of service-learning courses and programs have focused on student learning outcomes and engaged citizenship behaviors without exploring either the perceived return(s) to the institutions or administrators' perspectives on the costs and effectiveness of these courses and programs. This study will examine administrators' perspectives on the perceived financial benefits, if any, that accrue to the institution from the implementation of service-learning courses and programs; the level of financial benefit perceived to be necessary in order to justify the costs of service-learning courses and programs to the institution; and whether service-learning requirements are perceived to contribute to student learning, recruitment, retention, and fundraising.

Rationale for the Study

The study will discuss the various costs and utility of multiple measures of service-learning initiatives as perceived by higher education administrators. A cost-utility (CU) analysis will be used because it will allow administrators to weigh the importance of various effects of service learning including student learning, student recruitment, retention, and institutional fundraising. It is in the context of economic instability in higher education that the study will examine the cost-utility of service-learning courses and programs in higher education. No previous studies have been identified that explored factors which might explain how administrators determine which benefits and to what level those benefits must rise for the institution to make an investment in service-learning courses and programs.

Significance of the Study

Most research on service learning is focused on student outcomes, and many of these studies are simply one-shot case studies of service-learning courses or programs at individual

institutions. The effect of service learning on community partners has a growing body of research and studies on service-learning outcomes as they relate to faculty and institutions are largely in the developmental stage. Among the studies that are missing is, as Bringle and Steinberg (2010) have argued, an examination of "how institutional support and infrastructure for service-learning results in improved capacity for … benefit" – to students, faculty, institutions, and community partners (p. 438). The data collected in this study will begin to address that deficiency in information by establishing an initial account of administrators' perceptions of the costs and benefits of service-learning programs in their institutions.

Methods

This descriptive case study will investigate how higher education administrators perceive the costs and the utility associated with service learning in the curricular and cocurricular areas of their institutions. To this purpose, a survey questionnaire will be designed for and distributed to the college presidents, provosts/chief academic officers, vice-presidents of finance, and vice-presidents/deans of student affairs at institutions affiliated with the associations and councils of independent colleges and universities in Kentucky, North Carolina, Tennessee, Virginia, and West Virginia (See Appendix E). This population of 125 member institutions spans five states, and is comprised of 14 different Carnegie Classifications: 39 institutions are Bac/Diverse; 33 are Bac/A&S; 12 are Master's M; seven are Master's S; 11 are Master's L; one is RU/H; three are RU/VH; six are Spec/Health; one is Spec/Law; and two schools each are identified as Bac/Assoc, DRU, Spec/Arts, Spec/Faith, and Spec/Med. Eighty-six percent of these institutions overtly state service or citizenship in their mission statements, core values, or institutional goals or purpose statements, and 34% are members of Campus Compact (Campus Compact, 2015). The population for this study will be less two institutions, the researcher's recent employer and

the lone two-year institution holding membership in North Carolina Independent Colleges and Universities' association, for a sample of 123. The researcher-designed survey instrument will be tested for face and content validity through a pilot study of administrators at institutions outside of the study population.

Research Questions

1) Do administrators perceive a difference in student-learning outcomes between service-learning courses and conventional courses?
2) To what extent, if any, do administrators perceive the existence of a service-learning requirement contributes to student recruitment?
3) To what extent, if any, do administrators perceive the existence of a service-learning requirement contributes to student retention?
4) To what extent, if any, do administrators perceive the existence of a service-learning requirement contributes to fundraising?
5) Do administrators perceive there are financial benefits for the university from the implementation of service-learning courses and/or programs?

Conclusion

Service-learning is located squarely at the intersection of three powerful movements in higher education: the focus on active, engaged learning; the establishment and assessment of student learning outcomes; and the call for the renewal of the civic role of higher education (Jacoby, 2009b, p. 90).

Bringle, Phillips, and Hudson (2004) called for more, high quality research in order to establish "when, for whom, how, and why service learning produces intended outcomes" (p. 9), and Bringle and Hatcher (2000) believed that measuring the institutionalization of service

learning could be improved and validated only when a variety of stakeholders are provided an opportunity to weigh in on the outcomes. Gathering administrators' viewpoints about the costs and utility of service learning compared to alternative approaches will provide a much needed contribution to the field of higher education administration.

CHAPTER TWO

Review of Literature

This chapter reviews the relevant literature which explores the evolution of service learning in higher education. It examines research studies around student learning outcomes, recruitment, retention, and fundraising efforts as they relate to service learning. The purpose of the literature review is to provide an understanding of previous research in these areas as well as to provide a rationale for the four variables explored in this study.

Fiscal Uncertainty in Higher Education

"In public higher education, tuition increases in recent decades have barely offset a long-run decline in state appropriations per full-time equivalent student" (Ehrenberg, 2012, p. 195). Johnson, Oliff, and Williams (2011) highlighted how 43 states have enacted budget cuts in higher education since the 2008 recession, and that many state governments have also drained their budget reserves. These cuts, made because "revenues from income taxes, sales taxes, and other revenue sources used to pay for these services declined due to the recession" as well as cuts to state business taxes, resulted in tuition increases, and downsizing of faculty and staff (Johnson et al, 2011, p. 1; Shaw, 2011). The American Recovery and Reinvestment Act offset even deeper cuts in state budgets for a time, however "half of the states are still appropriating less for higher education than they did five years ago" (Kelderman, 2015). Kelderman further noted that "among the 10 states that cut higher-education spending from 2014-2015, Kentucky and West Virginia had the largest decreases, 2 percent each."

Weerts and Ronca (2012) noted that "changes in support of all campuses are strongly linked to state fiscal health (e.g. unemployment rate) and the influence of competing priorities such as corrections in vying for tax dollars" (p. 170). Weerts and Ronca (2012) further reported

that “there is a very large variation in support among states, but not within states” (p. 171), and noted that institutional mission is a predictor of which institutions will get state support. The state institutions with a focus on workforce development are most likely to be the funding priority because they can help meet the economic needs of the state. They also suggested comparisons be made using Carnegie Classifications of institutions, not simply of all institutions of higher education from one state to another (Weerts & Ronca, 2012).

Over the past 30 years private colleges and universities have used financial models that included raising tuition faster than the rate of inflation, increasing financial aid budgets, internally subsidizing research funds, and increasingly using contingent faculty while increasing expenditures for administrators and staff (Ehrenberg, 2013). Ferrall (2011) noted that private institutions have long engaged in the practice of discriminatory pricing – selling education at different prices to different people – and their limited ability to increase market share was reflected in the noncomparative ways in which their marketing and promotional materials praised their qualities. Ehrenberg (2012) pointed out that private school tuition rose partly because of the substantial increases in tuition discounting. Tuition discounting is “the share of each tuition dollar that institutions returned to their undergraduate students in the form of need-based or merit grant aid – [and it] increased substantially at private four-year institutions” (p. 194). Following the 2008 financial collapse, there was a dramatic increase in the number of students needing aid. The less-selective private institutions followed the lead of the most selective private institutions in increasing grant aid and providing tuition discounting in order to recruit students. The less-selective private institutions also had to compete with the lower-priced, heavily tax-subsidized public institutions for students (Ehrenberg, 2012; Ferrall, 2011). Additionally, “between 2008-2009 … the recession substantially cut into the endowments of almost every higher education

institution, public and private, university and college" (Ferrall, 2011, p. 29), costing schools millions in lost endowment funds (Biemiller, 2015). "Small-college leaders … face bigger challenges than ever before" (Biemiller (2015), and administrators have had to develop campaigns to raise money for endowments for undergraduate financial aid (Ehrenberg, 2013).

Historically the expense of creating and operating service-learning courses and programs was externally funded through federal grants and corporate gifts. In an effort to institutionalize service-learning, however, universities began providing internal funding to sustain their programs and meet their mission statements. Ehrenberg (2013) stated that when institutions do attempt to secure external funding "the federal government and other external … funders sometimes require institutional matching funds to be included in grant proposals" (p. 19). Johnson et al. (2011) noted that since "states cannot maintain services during an economic downturn by running a deficit" (p.3), they must find ways to close the budget gaps between the available funding and the services provided in public higher education. Johnson and Leachman (2013) noted that some state revenues have improved since the 2008 recession, however, they "remain about 6 percent below where they were five years ago" (p.1). Private institutions have found themselves bearing the financial burden of a large part of students' tuition because, as they have raised tuition to cover expenses they have simultaneously increased the discount rate to address the problem of students' unwillingness to pay full tuition (Ehrenberg, 2013). Ehrenberg (2012) noted:

> The financial pressures being placed on academic institutions, along with demands to increase access and to support students in persisting to the completion of a degree, are forcing institutions to reexamine how they educate students. Institutions are reexamining the prevailing 'lecture/discussion' format. (p. 212)

Administrators have had to approach their budgets with a discerning eye in order to run more efficient enterprises while still providing a mix (e.g., academics, sports, activities) that will

attract students to their institutions (Ferrall, 2011). Ehrenberg (2013) noted that during this economic downturn institutions increased student-services expenditures (e.g., admissions, registrar, student life) because they "have positive effects on persistence and graduation rates" (p. 21). This supported Webber and Ehrenburg's (2009) findings that "[s]tudent services expenditures influence graduation and first-year persistence rates" (p.17), especially at institutions with lower entrance scores, larger Pell Grant aid per student, and lower graduation and persistence rates.

Fain (2012) explained that many states are currently considering – or have already begun – to tie funding of higher education to "accountability measures." These measures include student persistence and graduation rates, student learning outcomes, and career preparation and placement. At a time when calculating an institutions' graduation rate has become the standard of success, administrations of public institutions fear their future funding will be tied to this accountability measure, which is easily calculated and understood (Melancon & Frederick, 2014).

Positive learning outcomes from service-learning experiences, including the practical value of leadership development, relation of coursework to real life, and preparation for a career, were reported in Astin and Sax's (1998) study. Beal (2012) noted that most health-related majors over the past decade have redesigned their curriculums to focus on service as career preparation. Creating academic-service partnerships has enabled institutions of higher education to build the workforce capacity and lead for change (Beal, 2012). Studies conducted by Eyler and Giles (1999) reported that participation in a service-learning course had a significant effect on positive change related to students' future careers. Students believed that experiences in their service-learning courses could lead them to careers in service. Bringle and Steinberg (2010) stated, "The

case for service learning can be strengthened … by understanding its capacity to prepare students to assume a civic-minded disposition in their career and acquire knowledge, skills, and dispositions to be active citizens in their communities" (Bringle & Steinberg, 2010, p. 429).

Review of the Literature

Higher education has historically served society in a variety of ways, including preparing graduates academically and as moral and civic leaders who contribute to a democratic society (Felten & Clayton, 2011). A democratic life requires a penchant for being involved in civic matters (Bringle & Steinberg, 2010), and solving problems in a democratic society "requires citizens who have developed positive attitudes about community involvement, the intellectual abilities to think and plan, and the understanding to live with uncertainty" (Eyler & Giles, 1999, p. 152). Most colleges and universities, past and present, include "citizenship," "civic-engagement," or "service" in their mission statements (Kezar, 2002). Service-learning is one of the most effective ways to meet the common mission of higher education: "to produce educated citizens who understand and appreciate not only how democracy is supposed to work but also their own responsibility to become active and informed participants in it" (Astin, 1994, p. 24). Civic learning is difficult to document; however, it is "one of the most important social and civic contributions our colleges and universities provide our society" (Cunningham, 2006, p. 4).

Citizenship in higher education became the basis for the elective Carnegie Community Engagement Classification (New England, 2015) which made this stipulation:

> The purpose of community engagement is the partnership of college and university knowledge and resources with those of the public and private sectors to enrich scholarship, research, and creative activity; enhance curriculum, teaching and learning; prepare educated, engaged citizens; strengthen democratic values and civic responsibility; address critical societal issues; and contribute to the public good. (New England, 2015)

This classification provides a way for institutions to document, assess and improve service-learning courses and programs as well as receive recognition for their successful efforts. Jacoby (1999) noted that one of the goals of service-learning is to address citizenship, to prepare students to participate in a democracy. Service-learning courses and programs have been developed and implemented on campuses across the country in order to address the belief that colleges and universities must produce civically-engaged graduates (Bringle & Steinberg, 2010; Felten & Clayton, 2011; Horgan & Scire, 2007; Weber & Weber, 2010). Service learning is about both learning and serving while being involved in the greater community (Bringle & Steinberg, 2010) and is "emerging as a central component of efforts to connect both disciplinary learning and general education with this historic and increasingly salient commitment to public purposes" (Felten & Clayton, 2011).

Jacoby (1999) noted that higher education must not only meet its own educational goals for students, but also provide its students opportunities for service-learning experiences in fulfilling its "historical commitment to service" (p. 3). Eyler and Giles (1999) believe that "[a]ctive and effective citizenship requires the personal qualities and interpersonal skills and also the understanding and cognitive development that are strengthened by well-designed service-learning." Participation in service-learning experiences contributes to the five elements of their citizenships model: values, knowledge, skills, efficacy, and commitment (p. 163). It is in the best interest of higher education stakeholders to commit to service-learning, as opposed to community service, in order for colleges and universities to meet educational goals, one of which is civic responsibility (Bringle, Clayton, & Hatcher, 2013; Bringle & Steinberg, 2010; Jacoby, 1999). "The overall body of research supports the conclusion that service learning can lead to

more civically-minded students who have increased post-graduation civic involvement" (Bringle & Steinberg, 2010, p. 438). Furthermore:

> [e]ffective programs that fully involve participants in service-learning will develop individuals who will go on to use the important lessons they have learned to create and sustain institutions and environments that, in turn, will lead future generations of citizens to seek solutions to social problems and opportunities to engage in service and learning. (Jacoby, 1999, p. 333).

Service-learning has become a respected pedagogy in the twenty-first century (Bringle et al., 2013) and has become prominent in higher education, which is evident through its integration in both academic and student life (Jacoby, 2009). Service-learning has spread in higher education because of a shift away from traditional teaching and learning approaches and toward one which links "theory and practice, cognitive and affective learning, and colleges with communities" (Butin, 2006, p. 479). Service-learning helps to promote relationships between the campus and surrounding community, which is "part of the academic fabric of the institution" (Furco, 2001, p. 74). Butin (2006) noted that service-learning "is used by a substantial number of faculty across an increasingly diverse range of academic courses; administrative offices and centers [were] devoted to promoting its use" (p. 475). Service-learning is not discipline specific; it is universal and provides a way to forge interdisciplinary efforts (Furco, 2001). "One of the most salient manifestations of the heightened attention to service has occurred in its integration with teaching in the form of service learning" (Bringle & Hatcher, 2000, p. 274), and the concept of service-learning has positioned itself in mainstream academia (Butin, 2006).

Definition of Service-Learning

"Civic mindedness" is an individual's orientation toward the community and the people making up a community. In higher education, civic mindedness has been developed in students through a variety of curricular and co-curricular activities, including service learning courses,

internships, and political activism (Bringle & Steinberg, 2010); yet, there is some evidence that service learning has become the choice method to prepare these engaged citizens (Epstein, 1999; Gabelnick, 1997; Hauser, 2000). Many terms such as "community service learning," "citizenship," and "community engagement" are used interchangeably to describe service learning courses and programs (Keen & Hall, 2009). The definition provided by The National Service-Learning Clearinghouse (2013) states that "[s]ervice-[l]earning is a teaching and learning strategy that integrates meaningful community service with instruction and reflection to enrich the learning experience, teach civic responsibility, and strengthen communities." Bringle et al. (2013) define service-learning as a pedagogy which benefits students while students are providing a tangible benefit to the community, reflecting on their work to support their "academic, civic, and personal development" (p.6). The most commonly quoted service-learning definition is offered by Bringle and Hatcher (1996):

> We view service-learning as a credit-bearing educational experience in which students participate in an organized service activity that meets identified community needs and reflect on the service activity in such a way as to gain further understanding of course content, a broader appreciation of the discipline, and an enhanced sense of civic responsibility.

Central to the design and implementation of service-learning experiences are reflection and reciprocity, the two concepts which distinguish service-learning from other forms of community service and volunteerism. Reflection on the service-learning experience is where the learning and development occur; they do not automatically accrue as the result of having merely completed a service experience. Reflection on service-learning can occur in a variety of ways, including poster presentations, journaling, in-class or online discussions, and essays (Eyler, 2002; Eyler, 2001; Felten & Clayton, 2011). Reciprocity allows for the needs of the community to drive the service of the participant while the recipients of service become empowered (Felten

& Clayton, 2011). “Service-learning is supposed to foster respect for and reciprocity with the communities that colleges and universities are all too often in but not of” (Butin, 2006).

History of Service-Learning

“The concept of college and university outreach is as old as American higher education itself” (Jacoby, 2009, p. 16). Following the Revolutionary War there was a slow shift in the purpose of higher education from a focus on the development of the individual student to a focus on building a new nation (Boyer, 1994). The Morrill Act of 1862 and the establishment of land grant colleges and universities forever linked higher education and service, specifically service to agriculture and industry (Jacoby, 1999; Morrill, 2015). American colleges and universities were founded on the premise that they would develop the next generation of leaders as well as civically engaged individuals. Boyer (1994) found the link of higher education and service reaffirmed time and again: During the Great Depression, Franklin D. Roosevelt recruited scholars as consultants to address social problems; during World War II, research universities and the government formed partnerships to create solutions to new problems (e.g., the National Science Foundation and the GI Bill); and, during the time of *Sputnik* in the 1950s, higher education and the government partnered to improve K-12 education, specifically science education, and increase the security of the country by creating the National Defense Education Act of 1958 (Boyer, 1994, p. 48).

“Service-learning [was] rooted in the theories of constructivism and experiential education” with the link between service and learning in higher education made by educator John Dewey in 1933 (Furco, 2001, p. 67). Dewey stated that there was an “intimate and necessary relation between the processes of actual experience and education” (Dewey, 1938, p. 20), and he noted that learning could be powerful for students if they were given the opportunity to examine,

address, and reflect on significant problems (Harkavy & Hartley, 2010). College students and community service have a long history, including co-curricular offerings such as the YMCA, 4-H, Greek life, and Campus Ministry. College students' involvement in the community grew dramatically in the 1960s, inspired by President John F. Kennedy's Peace Corps, the creation of Volunteers in Service to America (VISTA), and the civil rights movement (Jacoby, 1999).

Service-learning drew from other sources, such as participatory action research, action theory, and experiential education in order to facilitate an increase in student learning through the solving of real problems (Harkavy & Hartley, 2010; Jacoby, 1999). Experiential education, which included service-learning, internships, and cooperative education took off on campuses in the 1960s and 1970s (Jacoby, 1999). Experiential learning connected students to real world problems, specifically the anti-poverty movement, and provided an opportunity to solve these problems as part of their higher education experience (Lounsburg & Pollack, 1999).

The term service-learning, however, was not used until 1966 at Oak Ridge Associated University in reference to the work students were engaged in during summer internships. The Office of Economic Opportunity established the "National Student Volunteer Program" in 1969, which was later known as the "National Center for Service Learning." In 1971, the National Center for Service Learning was combined with the Peace Corps and VISTA, to create one federal agency known as ACTION. ACTION became the national center for student services, "focused on cultivating student involvement in the anti-poverty effort" (Lounsbury & Pollack, 1999, p. 17). During the 1970s the "federal program University Year for ACTION, invested approximately $6 million annually in service-learning programs, funding full-year, full-credit opportunities for students to engage in anti-poverty work in their communities" (p.17). The agency published *Synergist* magazine, developed a network, and distributed seed money; many

college and university service programs were created during this period utilizing the ACTION resources (Jacoby, 1999). During this era, "service-learning was understood as a 'program,'" officially incorporated into the Domestic Volunteer Service Act (PL 93-113) as Title I, Part B, entitled 'Service-Learning Programs' and as a "program" it took place outside of the traditional classroom structure (Lounsbury & Pollack, 1999). The service programs of the 1960s and 1970s mostly failed because they were not integrated into the central missions and goals of institutions; the charity aspect of service did not allow for reciprocity; and a service experience did not mean a student learned or provided meaningful service to others (Kendall, 1990).

In 1978 the National Society for Internships and Experiential Education was created and became "the central practitioner association involved in the development of service-learning" throughout the 1980s and 1990s (National Society, 2014; Lounsbury & Pollack, 1999). NSISS's Council for Adult and Experiential Learning did much of the work to get higher education to accept experiential learning (Jacoby, 1999) and service-learning became a new pedagogy, which was a far stretch from the traditional education methods of faculty disseminating knowledge to students in a classroom (Lounsbury & Pollack, 1999). The NSISS organization, which became known as the National Society for Experiential Education (NSEE), began to focus on service-learning, which was thought to be a "more relevant, self-directed educational process" (Lounsbury & Pollack, 1999, p. 17) than dominant educational approaches in higher education. NSEE trained consultants to work with institutions of higher education in the development and strengthening of experiential education. The NSEE philosophy held that all experiential education should be rooted in the mission of the institution, involve faculty, and integrate the curriculum using sound pedagogical practices (Jacoby, 1999). During the 1980s, service-learning developed a field of practitioners motivated by the reformation of teaching and learning practices

"in a way that would allow civic engagement to be a valorized and appropriate element in the overall educational experience" (Lounsbury & Pollack, 1999). In 1985 Campus Compact, a national coalition of college and university presidents who were committed to fulfilling the public purpose of higher education, was created by the Education Commission of the States. Campus Compact (2014) became the

> only national high education association dedicated solely to campus-based civic-engagement…promot[ing] public and community service that develops students' citizenship skills, help[ing] campuses forge effective community partnerships, and provid[ing] resources and training for faculty seeking to integrate civic and community-based learning into the curriculum.

Campus Compact was an organization that provided a voice for the civic purpose of higher education, used campus resources to assist in community building, and educated students to be active citizens in their communities (Holland & Hollander, 2006).

In 1987 NSEE and the Johnson Foundation hosted the Wingspread conference, where a collaborative effort was undertaken to define service-learning and create the "Principles of Good Practice in Combining Service and Learning" (Porter Honnet & Poulsen, 1989). The various service-learning definitions in practice today are based on one statement made at the Wingspread conference: "[S]ervice, combined with learning, adds value to each and transforms both" (Porter Honnet & Poulsen, 1989, p.1).

The early 1990s proponents of service-learning in higher education were driven by their belief that service-learning could effectively "link the core work of colleges and universities with higher purposes — transformative learning, education for democracy, and research to better understand and improve the world" (Harkavy & Hartley, 2010, p. 419). Lounsbury and Pollack (1999) noted that service-learning required greater collaboration in curriculum development as opposed to traditional educational approaches, and "these institutional entrepreneurs had

engaged in the jurisdictional work to successfully transform service-learning from a type of anti-poverty 'program' to a pedagogical 'method' emphasizing students' academic learning" (p. 20). They further noted that service-learning during this time was seen as complementing traditional educational approaches, not opposing them. Service-learning was now credit-bearing, had an associated syllabus and readings, and had a guided component of community-related service within the course. Resources were created and publications for service-learning initiatives in K-12 and higher education took off. NSEE and Jane Kendall published a service-learning textbook around facilitating student reflection in the practice (1990). The Office of Community Service Learning at the University of Michigan published three volumes focused on curricular service-learning for faculty to use in the design of service-learning courses between 1993 and 1995, and in 1994 the *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning* was created as an avenue to publish research in the field.

During this period the U.S. government passed the National and Community Service Trust Act (NCSTA) of 1990, and another in 1993, creating the Corporation for National and Community Services. The Corporation for National and Community Services merged ACTION with two National Commissions, and provided grant funding to promote service-learning. NCSTA provided a new definition of service-learning whereby "service-learning" was not associated with "program" any more, but was rather a pedagogical method integrated into the academic curriculum (National and Community Service Act of 1990). Furthermore, the NCSTA maintained and connected service-learning in higher education by "encouraging the faculty of the institution to use service-learning methods throughout their curriculum" (National and Community Service Trust Act of 1993). The Corporation for National Community Services

funded AmeriCorps positions as well as service-learning programs in K-12 and higher education through “Learn and Serve America” (Harkavy & Hartley, 2010; Jacoby, 1999).

During the 1990s associations focused on service-learning created various initiatives: Campus Compact hosted summer workshops to assist educators in the development of service-learning curriculum, while The American Association for Higher Education promoted service-learning with conferences and “monograph series on service-learning from the perspective of various academic disciplines” (Harkavy & Hartley, 2010, p. 420). In September of 1994, President Bill Clinton wrote a letter to college and university presidents asking them to commit to “inspiring an ethic of service across the country.” In response to President Clinton’s letter, the American Association of Higher Education and Campus Compact put on the Colloquium on National and Community Service (Zlotkowski, 1995). Campus Compact believed college students had to become knowledgeable about academic content and understand how it could “benefit society or influence democratic decision-making” (Holland & Hollander, 2006, p. 2).

In 2000 the annual International Research Conference on Service-Learning and Community Engagement was established (Felten & Clayton, 2011) and in 2001 Campus Compact hosted college students at a conference to “consider how service and politics might be combined to enhance students’ civic engagement and efficacy for social change” (Welch, 2009, p.175). The Campus Compact conference for students led to “Raise Your Voice,” a three-year campaign which empowered college students to use service-learning and civic engagement to create political change. The objectives of “Raise Your Voice” included increased college student involvement in public life; student involvement in public life connected with a larger national student movement; documented civic activities and issues which students found important; and mobilized higher education to involve students in creating civic-engagement central to their

learning (Welch, 2009, p. 176). Service-learning became a major movement in higher education, evident by nearly 1000 colleges and universities' garnering membership in Campus Compact and the creation of 31 Campus Compact state offices supporting regional campuses (Holland & Hollander, 2006). These institutions have "committed to the civic purposes of higher education" (Butin, 2006) through their membership in Campus Compact. Membership in Campus Compact occurred in all types and sizes of institutions of higher education, distributed resources and support at all levels, and assisted the public in understanding that higher education should be a major resource in their communities and a democracy (Holland & Hollander, 2006). Service-learning has grown the most, however, at institutions that highlight teaching over research since primarily teaching institutions tend to be more focused on ways to improve undergraduate education. Institutions with an organizational culture which welcomed and rewarded innovative teaching practices had the easiest inroads for service-learning initiatives (Furco, 2001).

Institutionalization of Service-Learning

> It is difficult to imagine an institution of higher education that does not have as a goal to graduate citizens who will participate in public life with wisdom and dedication to democratic values. There is no more effective way for colleges and universities to demonstrate their commitment to these and other core values than through a strong, institutionalized service-learning program. (Rubin, 1999, p. 315)

Service-learning, which was on the periphery in higher education two decades ago, has spread across the academy (Harkavy & Hartley, 2010). Jacoby (1999) noted that service-learning must be central, institutionalized and strong in order for it to thrive in higher education (p. 317). She said it must be "fully integrated into the mission, policies, and practices of individual institutions of higher education if it is to remain viable" (p. 328). The service-learning programs that are central, not on the periphery, grow from the institution's mission. It is expected that religious institutions connect service learning with their spiritual missions; however, public and

secular private institutions often include service in their organizational missions as well (Jacoby, 1999; Rubin, 1999). Service-learning provides colleges and universities a way to meet institutional goals, and administrators viewed service-learning as an essential practice needed to reach these goals (Furco, 2001).

Advocates of service-learning have focused their efforts on institutionalizing, or sustaining, service-learning in order to move it from the periphery of higher education to a more central position (Butin, 2006). Bell, Furco, Ammon, Muller, & Sorgen (2000) defined 22 components of service-learning institutionalization and organized these components into five dimensions. The five dimensions were 1) a mission and philosophy supporting service-learning; 2) faculty engagement in and support for service-learning; 3) strong partnerships with community members; 4) student engagement in and for service-learning; and, 5) structures in place to support service-learning (Bell et al., 2000). Furco (2001) believed that administrators could institutionalize service-learning by creating an interdisciplinary center, providing financial support to faculty, and making it a part of the formal promotion, review, and tenure process.

Evidence of the institutionalization of service-learning at the institutional level can be seen in its representation in the organization's mission statement, its reflection in its policies and procedures (Bringle & Hatcher, 2000; Jacoby, 1999), and its congruence with strategic planning (Morton & Troppe, 1996). Harkavy and Hartley (2010) concluded that "institutionalization is best achieved if service learning functions as a means for fulfilling the primary mission of the institution" (p. 419). Rubin (1999) stated that "[i]nstitutions with strong service-learning programs have realized that service-learning has much to offer institutional planners as a powerful means of achieving a wide range of educational outcomes and, at the same time, fulfilling institutional missions" (p. 300).

Funding

Institutionalization of service learning is fundamentally represented in stable budget and resource allocations as well (Bringle & Hatcher, 2010; Jacoby, 1999; Morton & Troppe, 1996; Rubin, 1999). Service-learning programs which operated on the margins have to rely on "verbal support and some resources" from administration to keep the same level of activities going (Furco & Holland, 2009). Higher education depended on federal funding to support early service initiatives in the 1960s and 1970s, but came to learn that federal funding was not sustainable over time. Butin (2006) noted that most institutions relied upon external "soft money" to fund projects, which resulted in unsustainable initiatives. During the 1990s institutions recognized they would have to make their own investments in service learning programs and did so modestly, with focus and with a desire for assurance of program sustainability. Most service-learning programs are funded by multiple sources today; however, stable funding from the institution is generally required for program sustainability (Bringle & Hatcher, 2000; Rubin, 1999).

There is limited funding from federal and nonprofit sources for service-learning initiatives, so institutions often need to seek funding from the private sector. Development Offices, however, tend to make supporting service-learning a priority whenever service-learning is central, not marginal, to the institution (Jacoby, 1999). Rubin (1999) noted that the Development Office often assists in funding service-learning programs through a combination of focused alumni giving, solicitation of large private gifts from individuals and corporations, foundation support, and the creation of an endowment. "Strong service-learning programs coordinate their fundraising efforts with other priorities of their institution rather than placing themselves in competition with them," and funding must come from a variety of sources for

institutionalization of service-learning to occur (p. 312). A study by Bringle and Hatcher (2000) revealed that institutions with dedicated funding to service-learning displayed greater institutionalization than those institutions without it, and Holland and Hollander (2006) found institutions with clear service-related agendas demonstrated more growth in their donor support and alumni giving. Essentially, service-learning was central to the institution whenever funding was secure; it was peripheral whenever funding was scarce (Jacoby, 1999).

Curricular and Co-curricular Presence

Rubin (1999) found that strong service learning programs creatively connected service to both curricular and cocurricular activities, with clearly stated learning outcomes, and assessed these outcomes for improvement. Most institutions "choose the route of accumulating solid programmatic pieces, curricular and cocurricular, as means of institutionalizing service-learning" (Rubin, 1999, p. 309). A challenge Campus Compact recently highlighted was the need to embed engagement more deeply across the institution. Institutions need to intentionally build the education of civically-minded students into academic and student life (Holland & Hollander, 2006). Furco (2001) believed that service-learning should be integrated into both the curricular and cocurricular programs for institutionalization of service-learning to occur, and he believed that faculty could highlight their "scholarship of teaching" through the development and implementation of service-learning courses. Holland and Hollander (2006) stated, "Engaged practices, including service-learning and community-based research, must be recognized as legitimate, rigorous forms of teaching and scholarship" for institutionalization to occur. Campus Compact (2003), however, discovered that service-learning offices were often housed in Student Affairs and operated without full-time staff to assist students and faculty with service-learning initiatives. Butin (2007) noted that faculty perceived service-learning as "too curricular, too

much like yet another under-financed fad" (p.34), while Rubin (1999) touted that service-learning can only be central – not marginal – whenever it was integrated in the curriculum.

Service-learning needs faculty involvement to ensure it is integrated in the curriculum and central to the institution. Release time, stipends, and recognition provided ways to engage faculty in the planning of service-learning curricular or cocurricular initiatives. Rubin (1999) found that "students and private donors alike are more likely to believe service-learning is important to an institution if it is incorporated in the curriculum" (p. 307).

Benefits to the Institution

Jacoby (1999) noted that service-learning could only be made central and sustainable by institutionalization to the extent which the institution supporting the initiative benefitted by it. She outlined the potential benefits to include student learning and development; relevant teaching and learning practices; favorable public opinions; and more financial support (Jacoby, 1999). Service-learning programs which were associated with academic affairs reflected a higher level of institutional commitment than those housed in student affairs (Bringle & Hatcher, 2000; Jacoby, 1999); however, student affairs and academic affairs needed to collaborate to a build a service-learning culture in both the curricular and cocurricular realms. Collaboration between these two offices assisted in the institutionalization of service-learning (Jacoby, 1999).

Effects of Community Involvement

Harkavy and Hartley (2010) reported that service-learning experiences provide opportunities for faculty, students, and community members to work together on solving significant problems. These community issues are often complex and multifaceted. Service learning needs to incorporate an interdisciplinary approach in order to address these complex needs. Staff from both the institution and the community partner needed to plan and implement

the service-learning programs together (Jacoby, 1999; Rubin, 1999). Institutionalization of service-learning at the community partner level is realized whenever community partner "agency resources are coupled with those of the academy to build reciprocal, enduring, and diverse partnerships that mutually support community interests and academic goals" (Bringle & Hatcher, 2000, p. 275). Strong service-learning programs highlight their respect for community partners through the involvement in planning and implementation for a sustainable, mutually beneficial commitment (Rubin, 1999).

Presence in other Institutional Offices

Finally, institutionalization of service-learning occurs whenever service-learning is integrated into other aspects of institutional work, such as admissions, student affairs, and financial aid (Bringle & Hatcher, 2000). Service-learning was characterized as legitimately institutionalized only whenever it seeped into all "aspects of a college's or university's programs, practices, and policies – in both the curricular *and* cocurricular realms" (Jacoby, 1999, p. 331).

Service Learning and Student Learning Outcomes

Service learning is a respected pedagogy which has been integrated in both academic and student life in order to prepare graduates academically and as engaged citizens contributing to a democratic society (Bringle, Clayton, & Hatcher, 2013; Felton & Clayton, 2011; Jacoby, 2009a). Many colleges and universities have developed and implemented service-learning courses and programs as a way to meet the stated "service" or "citizenship" component of their institutions mission statements (Bringle & Steinberg, 2010; Felten & Clayton, 2011; Horgan & Scire, 2007; Weber & Weber, 2010). Most studies on service learning have been conducted around student learning outcomes, both academic and citizenship outcomes.

Academic Outcomes

Eyler (2009) believed that reproducing material did not constitute learning. She stated, "For knowledge to be useable, it has to be acquired in a situation," and material that is understood can be recalled and applied in different situations "because it is linked with multiple experiences and examples and not isolated from other experience and knowledge" (pp. 3-4). Providing structured opportunities for feedback and reflection is critical for reaching student learning outcomes in service-learning. Deep learning occurs when students "connect the concrete and the abstract and … connect reflection with action" (p. 8). Kuh (2008) also believed that service-learning experiences increase the "opportunities to integrate, synthesize, and apply knowledge [which] are essential to deep, meaningful learning experiences," and the likelihood that students would try classroom concepts in practice (p. 28). McEwen (1996) reported the primary reason institutions used service-learning pedagogy was that it could produce strong student learning outcomes. Jameson, Clayton, and Ash (2013) stated "a key reason to use service learning is that its integration of disciplinary content and community-based experience makes it particularly well suited to support and challenge students to achieve higher levels of academic learning and to develop critical thinking capacities" (p. 87). Ash, Clayton, and Atkinson (2005), however, found that the results comparing service-learning and non-service-learning courses have been mixed, "suggesting that 'type' of learning may be differentially affected" (p. 49). For example, they noted that recalling facts on multiple choice tests does not appear to improve with service-learning, but solving complex problems does seem to improve student learning outcomes.

Eyler and Giles (1999) conducted two major studies on the outcomes of service-learning. One study involved a survey of 1,500 college students enrolled in courses at 20 U.S. institutions

of higher education; 1,100 of the students were enrolled in a service-learning course while 400 of them were not enrolled in a service-learning course. This study utilized a pre- and post-survey at the beginning and end of the semester as well as two interviews of 66 of these students (beginning and end of the semester). Their second study involved interviews with 67 college students from six different institutions about their perspectives of the benefits of service-learning. These multi-campus studies gathered data about the outcomes of service-learning from the students' perceptions.

Eyler and Giles' studies (1999) reported a variety of academic and citizenship behavior outcomes for students engaged in service-learning courses. Students self-reported better mastery of subject matter, improved critical thinking ability, increased appreciation for diversity, change in personal development, and better developed interpersonal skills. Students reported a "powerful impact on how they see themselves and others" (Eyler & Giles, 1999, p. 25) due to their interactions with people with whom they would otherwise not be associated. They reported an increased level of tolerance and appreciation of other cultures, and they believed service-learning broke down barriers and provided them opportunities for real and personal connections. "One of the most consistent outcomes of service-learning is in the reeducation of negative stereotypes and the increase in tolerance of diversity" (Eyler & Giles, 1999, p. 29). Eyler and Giles (1999) found that service-learning had a significant positive impact on tolerance when controlling for other factors. The results of these studies on students' perceptions of personal development found that students' self-knowledge increased, their spiritual growth or a need to "give back" was acknowledged, and they felt rewarded for helping others. It was also discovered that participation in a service-learning course had a significant effect on positive change related to students' future careers. Students believed that experiences in their service-learning courses

could lead them to a career of service. Students reported increased self-efficacy through the completion of real and meaningful work in their communities. Eyler and Giles (1999) also found that participation in service-learning was a significant predictor of an increase of efficacy over a semester. The studies found that students believed they developed better interpersonal skills and learned how to better work with others. The research team also found a significant impact on leadership skills over the course of the semester.

One of the main questions of Eyler and Giles' studies (1999) was whether service-learning assists students in learning more than traditional teaching approaches in higher education. Students in their studies reported learning more in a service-learning course and that the quality of learning was different from that acquired through the traditional teaching and learning methods. Nearly 60% of students reported learning more in their service-learning courses; and 55% of students reported higher levels of motivation in their service-learning courses. Academic achievement, however, is usually defined by course grades and/or GPA, and Eyler and Giles' (1999) studies did not find that the students in service-learning courses fared better than the students in the non-service learning courses when achievement was defined by course grades or GPA.

The differences in academic achievement appeared whenever the depth of understanding and application of material were explored, not simply the determination of letter grades. The researchers found that the depth of understanding of course material and the ability to apply it were the greatest differences reported by the students in the service-learning courses versus those in the traditional courses. Students in the service-learning courses perceived that they learned more than facts and understood class concepts by "doing" and not simply memorizing course material. Students reported that richer, three-dimensional learning occurred from their service-

learning experiences and that the application of material was important for understanding, or learning, to take place.

These studies also found that service-learning experiences may assist students in developing critical thinking ability. Evidence from the studies supported the idea that reflective service-learning "may contribute to improved critical thinking" (p.101) because service-learning involves ambiguity and problems that lack structure. Eyler and Giles (1999) found that high quality service-learning was a predictor of critical thinking and the students in well-integrated service-learning courses were more likely to report an increased level of critical thinking through problem analysis.

Eyler and Giles (1999) outlined that willingness to serve is a dimension of citizenship and that an ability to solve ambiguous, ill-structured problems is at the heart of citizenship (p. 156). They found that the service-learning outcomes of personal, interpersonal and intellectual development were viewed by students as preparation in becoming engaged citizens. Their studies found that 75% of students in service-learning courses intended to continue serving others in subsequent semesters (Eyler & Giles, 1999).

Mpofu (2007) used a quasi-experimental design over the course of one semester to assess student academic achievement of those enrolled in a service-learning section versus a traditional lecture-based section of a senior-level course. The 130 students self-selected into the service-learning or non-service-learning course (65 students in each section); the same instructor taught both courses. The research design involved an examination of service-learning students' grades – calculated with fewer exams to offset their service-learning assignments – and the grades of non-service-learning students. The researcher tested two hypotheses: 1) service-learning students would achieve higher grades on case studies than their peers in traditional courses, and 2)

service-learning students would achieve similar grades on multiple choice exams when compared to their peers in traditional courses. “Student academic achievement” was measured by using three multiple choice exams and three case studies. The case studies were graded by a teaching assistant who was blinded to the students’ course section numbers. The study controlled for “confounds” on learning outcomes by major and initial student achievement (i.e., first exam and case study). Furthermore, the researcher varied timing of data collection in order to gauge learning over time. The findings were that “[s]tudents involved with service-learning achieved significantly higher scores on the case studies and comparable scores on the multiple choice tests. Service-learning appeared to enhance academic learning more so than classroom-only instructions” (Mpofu, 2007, p. 46).

Ash et al. (2005) conducted a year-long study in two different courses with different instructors on the effectiveness of their model, which was an integrated approach to reflection and assessment to better “align the practice of service-learning with the theoretical claims of its learning potential” (p. 3). The researchers hoped to better demonstrate significant student learning outcomes – both academic and cognitive – through writing assignments already embedded in the courses (i.e., leadership and nutrition). They did not use end-of-the-semester surveys because they believe those better represent student satisfaction, not learning. They embedded “approaches to assessment in the context of an inquiry-guided learning initiative,” thus using student work in the courses for assessment of academic, civic, and personal outcomes resulting from service learning experiences (p. 4). These “describe and analyze experiences” were already produced by the students (i.e., students had to articulate experiences and learning when answering reflective writing prompts), and therefore could be used to assess course outcomes. The researchers were able to use guided reflective writings to assess what students

actually learned and whether that learning met expectations. The research design included distribution of the researchers' "Service-Learning Guidebook" to students, faculty, and staff and guidance on critical thinking to assist students in taking "their learning from levels of identification and application to the levels of analysis and evaluation" (p. 7) provided by both instructors and "Reflection Leaders" facilitating service learning project out-of-class discussions. The researchers collected a random sample of reflective writings from each of the classes (e.g., leadership had nine students, four represented in the study, and nutrition had 22 students, 10 represented in the study) each semester. The raw, revised, and final reflective writings for each academic, civic, and personal objective were analyzed using a rubric covering learning objectives and critical thinking by faculty and staff, who were blinded to the author, draft, or date of the assignments. There were 249 individual essays from the 14 randomly selected students that were reviewed in the study, and improvements were seen in all three categories. The researchers did see improvement in scores on both the learning objectives and critical thinking standards, which indicated there was a higher level of thinking across revisions. Although they found that critical thinking improved on the first drafts as the semester progressed, students were unable to improve on the learning objectives without guidance from their course instructors or trained "Reflection Leaders" in service learning group reflections. Finally, Ash et al. (2005) found that there was a difference in the degree to which students could achieve mastery among academic, civic, and personal through service learning. Although they found definite improvement across revisions in all three categories, students had a more difficult time improving their mastery of learning objectives in the academic realm.

Govekar and Rishi (2007) conducted a qualitative study of two service learning courses – economics and management – without a control group over a four-year period. The service-

learning component comprised 25% of the economics course and 37.5% of the management course. The research team assessed students' responses to structured reflection questions in journals as well as anonymous comments on post-course student evaluations of teaching. They also administered pre- and post-surveys of the students to collect quantitative data. The researchers' analysis of qualitative data highlighted that students reported that service-learning had addressed learning outcomes better than traditional lecture-exam courses: 80-89% of students in the economics service-learning course reported better understanding of economics and financial concepts, and 80% of students in the management service-learning used course concepts and "provided examples of problem-solving skill development and ability to respond to change" (p. 6). Another major outcome from the qualitative data was related to preconceived stereotypes of "the other." Working with people from unfamiliar populations during service-learning experiences altered students' perceptions about "the other." Govekar and Rishi (2007) collected pre- and post-survey data during one semester of the four-year study. Survey questions "addressed course general learning objectives such as better understanding, application of classroom concepts, critical and creative thinking, ability to respond to change, better teamwork, better communication skills, and an awareness of diversity" (p.8). There were 43 students who completed both the pre- and post-surveys anonymously during the spring semester in 2004. The researchers reported statistically significant results of paired *t* tests comparing student assessments between pre- and post-test responses on 15 items. Students reported less discomfort with public speaking in front of authority figures and unfamiliar people, "increased ability to think creatively, engage in group discussions, lead a group, go beyond the textbook to find answers, communicate with others, and know whom to contact to get things done" (p. 8-9). Students reported applying what they learned in their courses and believed they would do so in

future service experiences. The researchers reported service-learning pedagogy as one way through which faculty can create real-world learning in a business school curriculum (Govekar & Rishi, 2007).

Jameson et al. (2013) reviewed studies since Eyler and Giles 1999 studies which used measures of student learning (e.g. graded products, exams) instead of surveys or self-reported outcomes. They found that the constant "does service learning improve student learning of course content better than other pedagogies? question could be answered by comparing performance on graded assignments and exams between students in service-learning courses and those in non-service-learning courses. Ultimately, Jameson et al. (2013) believe that "service-learning presents students with opportunities to see examples of academic material emerge in community experiences" (Jameson et al., 2013, p. 86).

Citizenship Outcomes

Keen and Hall (2009) conducted a longitudinal survey study of 23 liberal arts colleges by participants in the co-curricular service-learning Bonner Scholar Program (BSP), which is a 16-year old program. The BSP is funded by the Bonner Foundation, providing funds for 1,500 students on 23-25 campuses each year in exchange for a minimum of 1,680 service hours over four years. Most colleges housing BSP's are located in the Appalachian region, with 10-20 students selected for the program on each campus each year. The BSP participants are selected based on their financial need (80%) and/or their membership of underrepresented groups (20%) on individual campuses. Keen and Hall's (2009) two research questions were these: 1) Does co-curricular service learning have an impact on desired outcomes of the college experience, especially an appreciation of diversity?, and 2) Do characteristics of liberal arts colleges ("specifically, more or less internationally-focused, faith-oriented, diverse, urban or 'elite'" p.

60) increase the effects of participation in co-curricular service-learning on college outcomes? The researchers developed surveys to assess BSP participants during their first, third, and fourth years in the program, with a goal of improving the student experience and for program leadership to better understand the effects of the program on student development. The first-year survey was used to collect demographic information – including past service experience, interest in service opportunities and expectation – from 790 participants. The third-year survey collected information from 467 participants about their perceptions of the impact of the BSP during their first two years in the program, and the fourth-year survey collected information from 537 participants on their perceptions of the impact of program design elements, participant values, future outlook, and after-college plans. Keen and Hall (2009) collected data from two cohorts as well as from 40 alumni who had graduated from 10 of the schools. The researchers reported relationships among academic, civic, and personal gains and four years of service-related involvement in college. Furthermore, they reported that no differences were evident on faith-based, elite, internationally-oriented, and urban types of campuses, however"[a}ttending a more diverse liberal arts campus enhanced desired program outcomes" (p. 64). Keen and Hall (2009) reported three limitations in their study: 1) self-selection of above-average participants into small campus programs; 2) repeatedly measuring participants (each survey had over 100 questions); and 3) the lead researcher is an advocate of the BSP and former director of a BSP during the data collection period. The researchers stated, "Colleges have invested in supporting service-learning, both in the classroom and co-curricularly, as service-learning has been recognized for its capacity to enliven colleges' mission statements, and advance developmental goals for students" (p. 76).

In another study, Astin and Sax (1998) used entering freshman and follow-up data from 3,450 students (i.e., 2,309 service participants and 1,141 non-service learning participants) spanning 42 higher education institutions which had federally funded service programming to examine the impact of service participation on undergraduate student development. The study utilized UCLA's national survey data drawn from the 1990-1994 Cooperative Institution Research Program (CIRP) Freshman Survey for assessment of the Corporation for National Service's Learn and Serve America Higher Education (LSAHE) program and its effects on student development. The research team followed-up with a mailed survey (i.e., the 1995 College Student Survey) to a large sample of service participants and compared their development with a sample of nonparticipants from the same institutions. They used additional data including SAT scores, ACT scores, enrollment information from the U.S. Department of Education, and information on LSAHE programs collected by the RAND Corporation. The research team followed-up with a mailed survey (i.e., the 1995 College Student Survey) to a large sample of service participants and compared their development with a sample of nonparticipants from the same institutions.

The researchers examined effects of service participation after controlling for the effects of student input characteristics (e.g., a greater personal inclination to serve), as well as effects of college environment characteristics (e.g., larger, more effective service learning programs), before examining the service participation effects. Astin and Sax's (1998) study used 35 dependent variables identified by LSAHE and classified them into three domains (i.e., civic responsibility, academic development, and life skills) and six independent variables (i.e., input characteristics and five environmental measures). The input characteristics "included available freshman year pretests for each outcome variable; demographic variables (e.g., race and

ethnicity, sex); and a set of service propensity variables from the freshman survey that were found to predict college service participation" (p. 253). Examples of environmental measures were students' majors and type of institution. The primary focus of the study involves "intermediate outcomes," or environmental experiences occurring after students enrolled in college. There were three blocks of variables used to measure service participation: 1) generic service variables used to determine whether students were engaged in service; 2) "six interaction terms to test for possible interactions between either service and sex or service and race and ethnicity" (p. 253); and 3) 20 measures of service participation (e.g., type, duration, location, and sponsorship).

The researchers found that there were several predisposing factors for participating in service in college, including volunteering while in high school, involvement in religious activities, being a guest in a teacher's home, and being a woman (Astin & Sax, 1998). They also discovered that most service was performed as a part of student life/affairs (70%), while only 29% performed service as part of a class. They found as well that three of the four top reasons students reported participating in service were related to civic responsibility: "To help other people," "to improve my community," and "to improve society as a whole" (p. 254). Astin & Sax (1998) reported the strongest relationships "between 'to improve my community' and 'to improve society as a whole' and between' to develop new skills' and 'to enhance my academic learning'" (p. 255).

Eleven of the 12 civic responsibility outcomes were statistically significant; all 12 were positively influenced by civic participation. The reported civic outcomes of service learning participation included stronger "commitment to helping others, serving their communities, promoting racial understanding, doing volunteer work, and working for nonprofit organizations.

They also became less inclined to feel that individuals have little power to change society" (p. 256). The researchers reported positive effects of service on 10 academic outcomes and a small, positive, and statistically significant effect on service participants' GPAs. Fifty-one of 52 possible effects on life skills were statistically significant with the largest differences between service participants and non-participants found in understanding community problems; knowledge of different races and cultures; acceptance of different races and cultures, and interpersonal skills. Other differences favoring service participation included understanding the nation's social problems, ability to work cooperatively, practicing conflict resolution skills, and developing an ability to think critically.

Kansas Campus Compact funded a quantitative study on higher education in Kansas, including state, private and community colleges. The research team of Ayella, Bowman, and Decker (2013) looked for a relationship between service-learning and three factors: 1) development of students' personal set characteristics (e.g., extraversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness, emotional stability, and openness to experience); 2) increased civic engagement; and 3) improved academic performance. They used pre- and post-tests to measure changes in civic engagement (e.g., good citizenship and civic responsibility) and data collection from students, teachers, and institutions to measure academic outcomes. They had 139 students complete both the pre- and post-tests; of those participants, however, only 44 completed the full grade and academic background information piece. Of the 139 students who completed both surveys, 80 (58%) were in a service-learning course while 59 (42%) were in a traditional course. Students reported that 45% of them had taken at least one service-learning course before that semester and 64% reported participating in volunteer work in the past. The researcher surveyed participants over one semester, reporting that service-learning acts independently from the three

factors in the study. Service-learning had no impact on the development of students' personal set characteristics; service-learning had marginal impact on increased civic engagement; and service-learning had a significant negative impact on improved academic improvement (Ayella et al., 2013). Although the researchers did not provide an explanation, the conclusions drawn from their study reached far different outcomes than reported in other studies on student learning outcomes.

Service Learning and Recruitment

Maffeo and Goldsmith (2009) defined student recruitment as"[t]he methods of bringing them through the door" (p. 113). "An individual college's recruitment success relies on the institution's ability to compete with other colleges for a finite group of qualified students" (Habley, Bloom, & Robbins, 2012, p.82). Marketing higher education involves communicating a value proposition to those whom the institution has a relationship with or desires to develop a relationship. Bejou and Bejou (2012) stated that the objective of recruitment is "to build desirable recruits' satisfaction to a high enough level that they apply" (p. 253). Habley et al. (2012) explained that student recruitment in higher education is a cyclical process with a beginning and end, and that success is measured by the number of students in a recruiting class. Maringe and Gibbs (2009) noted that an enrollment strategy should include an analysis of factors related to why students attend or depart the institution as well as a profile of a student-university match for the admissions department to focus their recruiting efforts on. They claimed that "[m]atching institution and student values is the key to successful recruitment … in the higher education sector" (p. 153). Maffeo and Goldsmith (2009) outlined essentials for recruitment, including knowing the student (buyer); understanding psychographics, sociographics, and success predictors; and developing and selling a niche (p.113). Schee (2009) noted that private

institutions, which rely on tuition revenues, must increase the number of students recruited and enrolled each year in order to remain economically viable. Bejou and Bejou (2012) stated, "Institutions of higher education face many challenges … [with] the most critical of these challenges [being] … to recruit and retain qualified and diverse students" (pp. 257-258).

"No longer can higher education institutions rely on passive approaches to recruiting students" (Bejou & Bejou, 2012, p. 248). Institutions must adopt enrollment management practices, which are "a comprehensive approach to college student marketing" (Schee, 2009, p. 2). A 2013 Noel-Levitz poll on what is working in student recruitment and marketing in higher education discovered that events, visit days, and customer relationship management (CRM) were at the top of four-year private and public institutions' lists. Researchers at Noel-Levitz also reported that 89% of private four-year institutions and 92.5% of public four-year institutions use enrolled students in recruitment and marketing efforts, 86.8% of private and 74.7% of public four-year institutions used alumni in these efforts, and 97.5% of private and 96.4% of public four-year institutions used faculty in these efforts (Noel-Levitz, 2013). The top five modes of communication for these types of institutions included sending emails; calling cell phones; and creating and promoting recruiting pages on websites, publications in general (e.g. viewbook, search piece, etc.), and websites optimized for mobile browsers (Noel-Levitz, 2013).

"In an effort to attract more well-qualified students, colleges increase[d] budgets for staff, consultants … advertising, travel, print and electronic media, and [made] other attempts to impress prospective students" (Habley et al., p.82). Schee's (2009) longitudinal study of over 100 private, religious institutions found that the practice of enrollment management had increased in higher education because of increased competition to recruit students. He further noted that "small private colleges that are heavily dependent on tuition for fiscal viability are

challenged each year to maintain and grow student enrollment" (p.1). Noel-Levitz (2009) reported that institutions of all types and sizes have increased their recruiting-per-student expense by between four-fold and seven-fold over the past 25 years. The results of their survey showed that four-year private schools' median cost to recruit undergraduate students rose from $455 per student recruited in 1983 to $2,143 in 2009.

Noel-Levitz conducted a benchmark poll of United States enrollment and admissions officers in the fall of 2013 and reported that four-year private institutions spent $2,433 per student, the most spent to recruit new students of all institution types, versus $457 spent per student at four-year public institutions (Noel-Levitz, 2013). This study reported "four-year private institutions staffed their admissions/recruitment outreach activities at the highest levels" compared to all other institution types; "outreach staff were defined as employees involved in face-to-face outreach, such as high school visits, college fairs, or on-campus events/tours" (Noel-Levitz, 2013). Furthermore, Noel-Levitz (2013) reported that four-year private institutions had higher levels of admissions staffing at a "median ratio of new student enrollees to full-time-equivalents of 31:1" This study, however, found no significant correlations between the cost per new student and the size of the private institutions (Noel-Levitz, 2013).

Many prospective college students were engaged in community service activities while in high school and have the expectation that they will continue their service efforts in college. Recognizing that some prospective students desire service opportunities, some admissions offices highlight service-learning initiatives as a recruiting tool (Rubin, 1996). A study assessing the impacts of service-learning sustainability 10 years after grant funds expired found that faculty, staff, and administrators reported the recruitment of service-oriented students to their institutions as an unforeseen benefit of service-learning programs (Vogel & Seifer, 2011).

Student participants from the 16 different institutions in Vogel and Seifer's (2011) study reported that the opportunity to participate in service-learning was an important reason for selecting their institutions of higher education. Admissions offices use service-learning scholarships to attract students with past service achievements and current service involvement, and individual institutions have begun offering financial aid for students engaged in service (Jacoby, 2009b). Bringle and Hatcher (2010) found that on applications for the Carnegie elective Community Engagement Classification, institutions demonstrated the prevalence of service-learning courses' contributing to other institutional purposes, such as publicity about service and engagement practices to external audiences including prospective students (pp. 41-42). Some of Vogel and Seifer's (2011) study participants reported that service-learning center staff or faculty and administrative advocates for service learning collaborated with institutional marketing departments "to create student recruitment materials that highlighted the service-learning opportunities at their institutions" (Vogel & Seifer, 2011, p. 197). Rubin (1996) explained that marketing or public relations offices keep informed of student and faculty service-learning accomplishments in order to keep the college or university name in the press. Ng and Forbes (2009) said, "We show that true student-oriented marketing puts the university ideology at the center of marketing efforts and that marketing may well be an effective tool to communicate such ideologies" (p. 40).

Bringle and Hatcher (1996) reported a link between student recruitment and service-learning, and Holland and Hollander (2006) stated that service learning was strongly associated with student transition from high school to college. Eyler and Giles (1999) stated that college administrators concern themselves with student-faculty relationships because of recruitment factors, and their two studies on over 1,500 college students' perceptions of service learning

found that service learning was attractive to students when selecting a college. Ng and Forbes (2009) stated that "the core service in a university experience is a learning experience that is the cocreation of the people within the university – between students, students and teachers, [and] students and administrators" (p. 40).

Service Learning and Retention

Retention is a continuous process without a beginning or end and it involves factors which keep students at an institution. The only way to measure retention is to gauge the number of students who stayed at the institutions against the number that left (Habley et al., 2012). Schee (2009) stated that retention at an institution is measured in two ways: first time, full-time freshmen persisting to their sophomore year (i.e., freshman retention), and first time, full-time freshmen persisting to graduation within six years (i.e., retention to graduation) (Schee, 2009).

ACT collection of 31 years of annual survey results as well as a comprehensive database of student retention rates from first- to second-year and persistence-to-degree rates (five years or less) reported that the 2014 four-year BA/BS public freshman-to-sophomore graduation rate was 64.2%, while the four-year BA/BS private non-profit rate was 69.8%. The freshman-to-sophomore persistence rates have been reported at their lowest for each type of institution recently, in 2014 for four-year publics and in 2013 for private non-profits (ACT, 2014). A report by the National Center of Education Statistics (NCES, 2014) stated that overall student retention rates of first-time, full-time students enrolled at institutions in 2011 were 79% at four-year public institutions and 80% at four-year non-profit private institutions. Those institutions which were least selective had much lower retention rates, in the mid-60th percentile range, and those that were most selective had much higher retention rates, of 95% and 96% respectively (NCES, 2014). Furthermore, the six-year graduation rate for first-time, full-time students who began their

degree pursuit in 2006 was reported as 59% overall (57% at public institutions and 66% at private non-profits). Graduation rates, like retention rates, varied across institutions based on selectivity (NCES, 2014). Melancon and Frederick (2014) noted that retention and graduation rates have become a major factor in higher education accountability metrics. They examined the six-year graduation rates of minority students at public institutions in Texas over a 10-year period and reported a statistically significant positive relationship in the graduation rates of Hispanics (rising by 6.8% over 10 years). "Use of graduation rates as the metric for collegiate success gained acceptance because this measure is easy to calculate, easy to understand, and there are few alternative measures available" (p. 126). The researchers found that tying public university funding to the six-year graduation rate had an impact on the graduation rates for Hispanic students in their study (Melancon & Frederick, 2014).

Tinto (1993) found that tuition-driven institutions, primarily private institutions, struggled financially during times of shrinking enrollments and had responded in the past by investing in marketing campaigns for student recruitment. Those marketing campaigns eventually created noise in an oversaturated market and institutions focused greater attention on student retention in order to survive in a tough economy. Retention efforts moved to the forefront in higher education as the high attrition rate for students who departed their original institutions rose (Tinto, 1993). Schee's (2009) longitudinal quantitative study of over 100 private, religious institutions found that "[t]he retention programs component was … not utilized by as many institutions as institutional marketing, [and] admissions/recruiting" (p. 15).

Habley et al. (2012) stated that retaining students involves a campus strategy of effectively serving the students who are presently enrolled in the college or university. The loss of tuition and fees from student departure is very costly to institutions and retention efforts

should focus on “maintaining enrollment rather than replacing students who have left the institution” (p.90). They further noted that“[a]lthough investing resources in retention is intuitively reasonable, retention is ill-defined, difficult to measure, and lacks an accountability mechanism” (p. 93). Schee’s (2009) study, however, found that most retention programs are housed in student affairs. Retention efforts are deemed everyone’s responsibility, which makes it difficult to hold anyone accountable for an institution’s retention rate (Habley et al., 2012). Schee (2009) noted that retention “requires the cooperation of many units on campus and therefore is also more challenging to implement” than other programs (p. 15). Habley et al. (2012) stated that proponents of retention programs lack convincing evidence, and have had difficulty in proving, that there is a return on investment from any specific retention efforts. Schee’s (2009) study found that having a retention program in place for more than five years resulted in a significant difference in the retention-to-graduation rate at institutions. Patton, Morelon, Whitehead, and Hossler (2006) reviewed empirical evidence around retention services and reported only a select few retention programs improved retention rates at institutions. They found a small amount of evidence which supported faculty-student interactions as an effective retention strategy (Patton et al., 2006).

Tinto (1993) reported a link between student learning experiences and their departure from college; the more connected students were to classmates and their faculty – especially outside of the classroom – the more likely they were to stay at their original institutions. Service learning can contribute to the development of those connections. “The potential for rich, diverse relationships and social and community connections illustrates service-learning’s ability to provide bonds amongst students, faculty, and the community that would appear to contribute to social integration” (Mundy & Eyler, 2002, p. 9). “Involvement leads to the appreciation of the

need for involvement and both lead, in turn, to an increased likelihood that students will continue to be involved in the future" (Tinto, 1993, p. 69). Mundy and Eyler (2002) also noted that "[i]nvolvement is a key construct in both service-learning theory (via active learning) and in college student retention theory (via academic and social integration)" (p. 5). Tinto's (1993) belief that active learning is an important cornerstone of an effective retention strategy was reinforced by Mundy and Eyler (2002):

> An educational pedagogy that not only involves academic (cognitive) and social (affective) integration but also makes more effective the ways in which students learn and make sense of their worlds, service learning seems a logical and necessary response to Tinto's interactionalist model of student departures. (Mundy & Eyler, 2002, p. 5)

Zlotkowski, Robbins, and Noeth (2004) wrote an ACT policy report which analyzed critical issues related to student retention. Their report used data from multiple sources, including three national studies on retention practice and 20 years of data collection and reporting through the ACT's online questionnaire. Their findings included positive relationships between retention and academic goals, institutional commitment, social support, and social involvement. Social involvement was defined as the "extent to which a student feels connected to the college environment, peers, faculty, and others in college, and is involved in campus activities" (p. vii). Further findings from their study suggested that integrating academic (e.g., high school GPA, ACT score, and academic goals) and non-academic (e.g., socioeconomic factors, institutional commitment, social support) factors into retention programs could lead to improvement in retention and persistence rates (Zlotkowski et al., 2004). Braxton and McClendon (2002) noted that academic integration could "be developed through learning-centered interaction with faculty, academic peers and staff, and through informal social contact with faculty and involvement in student organizations." Zlotkowski et al. (2004) reported that even students who mastered course content could be at risk of dropping out of the institution if they failed to

develop socially and become involved with the campus community. They recommended that institutions

> [t]ake an integrated approach in their retention efforts that incorporates both academic and non-academic factors into the design and development of programs to create a socially inclusive and supportive academic environment that addresses the social, emotional, and academic needs of students. (p. viii)

A quantitative study which examined the extent to which non-traditional transfer students – with junior or senior standing – interacted with faculty and students through the university's emphasis on engagement and retention reported a positive, significant relationship between student grades and overall relationships with faculty, but found no significant relationship between engagement and retention (Cox, 2013). Yeh (2010) conducted an exploratory qualitative study of the experiences of six low-income, first-generation college students who participated in curricular and co-curricular service-learning programs. The objective of the study was to understand the ways in which service learning might influence students and affect their persistence, and all students in the study reported that service learning participation was vital to their college experience. They reported the development of coping behaviors (i.e., sometimes using service learning experiences to cope with life stressors); development of problem-solving skills; creation of support networks with peers, faculty, staff, and community members; empowerment through increased self-efficacy; and increased integration into the university, both academically and socially (Yeh, 2010).

Lantta (2013) conducted a mixed-method study on the perceptions of higher education stakeholders on the impacts of student persistence from freshman to sophomore year. The impacts of student persistence that were studied involved the students' relationships with faculty or staff members and active learning in the classroom. The researcher surveyed 277 sophomore students and 24 faculty, staff, and administrators who were involved in freshman programming

at a single institution. The "[p]articipants claimed that involvement in extra-curricular activities and active learning experiences have a greater impact [than support and feedback] on freshman to sophomore year persistence" (p. iv). Lantta's (2013) study reported the most beneficial retention resources perceived by students to be 1) extracurricular activities which connected them to other students and the community; 2) supplemental instruction which connected them to faculty, staff, and peers; and 3) student-faculty relationships. The student focus group participants recommended retention resources for incoming freshmen as 1) student-faculty relationships, 2) academic advising, and 3) supplemental instruction. Faculty, staff and administrators also cited student-faculty relationships as the most beneficial retention resource (Lantta, 2013).

Helgesen (2008) described students as customers, stating that they are satisfied with services (e.g., education) whenever they perceive them to meet their needs and wants and create value. "By allocating resources to activities that are important to students, managers may increase the value offered, thus increasing student retention rate" (p. 52). Furthermore, Helgesen (2008) noted that there were both direct and indirect drivers of student satisfaction and reputation of institutions. Noel-Levitiz (2011) examined 15 years of data on student satisfaction and priorities at four-year institutions. Their study concluded that instructional issues continued to be both the top concern and priority of students. The quality of academics is extremely important to students and the success of the institution because "if students feel they are receiving a quality education, they are most likely to feel positive about their experiences" (Noel-Levitz, 2011, p. 14).

Holland and Hollander (2006) noted service-learning was strongly associated with student transition from high school to college, retention of first-generation students, retention of

students during their freshman year, and persistence to degree completion. Bringle and Hatcher (1996) also found a link between the service-learning curriculum and increased retention. Campus Compact (2014) purported that one of its membership benefits for university presidents was an increase in student retention via engagement initiatives. Roberts' (2011) qualitative study explored student's experiences in learning environments and their perceptions of current teaching practices and how they affected their desire to persist in higher education (Roberts, 2011). The researcher interviewed five second-year non-traditional students in this exploratory study to discern whether the teaching environment (i.e., pedagogy) affected retention.

A research study funded by Florida Campus Compact was conducted over one semester at a community college which has the largest undergraduate enrollment in the United States to "assess the impact of service-learning on the social, academic, and career growth of students in first semester developmental classes," specifically developmental courses in reading, writing, and life skills (Prentice, 2009, p. 275). Eight faculty were selected to teach two sections of the same course, one using service-learning pedagogy and one without it. Faculty were trained on "the four-step service-learning process of preparation, action, reflection, and demonstration" for use in the service-learning courses, and 400 total students enrolled in the courses under study (Prentice, 2009). Students in the service-learning courses were required to complete 15-20 hours of service, while the non-service-learning students were given additional assignments. There were 199 students who completed both the pre- and post-tests for the study and 15 students who participated in focus groups. Participating in service-learning developmental courses appeared to have helped students be academically successful, gain interpersonal skills, and improve retention into the next two semesters. An analysis of institutional data found that "service-learning

students were more likely to register for the summer and fall semesters than non-service-learning students" (Prentice, 2009, p. 280).

Atkinson-Alston (2013) conducted a mixed-method study on the impact of students' participation in entrepreneurial service-learning in relation to retention. She collected 125 surveys from students and alumni randomly selected from an institution's database and followed-up with a focus group consisting of 10 survey respondents. The results of Atkinson-Alston's (2013) study stated that entrepreneurial service learning participation "greatly influences students' ability to persist from semester to semester" (p. ii), with 67% of students reportedly persisting because of their participation in the service learning program. Thirty-three percent reportedly persisted from a two-year institution to a four-year institution because of their involvement in the service learning program as well. The researcher further reported a link between service learning and retention in her qualitative results:

> [Entrepreneurial service learning] influenced me to stay in school because, once you have a positive experience from service learning, you decide that that's what you want to do, to make a difference. I have seen that I can make a difference; that's what I gained from my participation. I saw that I can do it, and I knew that I could complete my program of study/major. (p. 49)

Habley et al. (2012) noted that university administrators lack time for proof and instead make concerted efforts to improve retention rates anyway they can. "They are seeking to validate the return on investment for the resources allocated to enhance student success" (p. 96). Tinto (1993), however, explained that effective retention programs need to have three types of commitments: to students above all else, to the education of all students at an institution, and to supportive social and educational communities of which students are fully integrated members. Maffeo and Goldsmith (2009) noted there were essential factors for successful student persistence, including academic quality, innovative courses and curriculum, education

partnerships, and quality social environments (p. 113). Finally, Habley et al. (2012) stated that "[r]etention goals should be improvement goals. Where possible, institutional goals should include target goals for selected programs and student groups" (p. 86).

Service Learning and Fundraising

Fundraising efforts are important in higher education, especially in a time of decreased state funding for public institutions and an increase in intense competition for tuition dollars at private institutions. Weerts (2007) noted that "[e]nrollment pressures, unstable state appropriations, and increased public scrutiny about higher education's commitment to serving societal needs have created significant challenges for university advancement professionals at public colleges and universities in the United States" (p. 79). Rooney and Nathan (2011) reported that nonprofits have struggled to meet fundraising goals following the 2008 recession and that giving fell by 6% during the recession. "Through an analysis of giving over forty years, it is clear that changes in giving are closely tied to economic changes, especially in household wealth, household income, and, for foundations, stock market performance" (p. 122). Weerts (2007) noted that "fundraising will remain an important strategy for public institutions as they face the realities of today's political and fiscal environment" (p. 83).

Weerts (2007) defined institutional advancement as "campus external relations offices charged with building relationships with a full range of external stakeholders: alumni, donors, community partners, corporate partners, state legislatures, governors, and other government officials at the state, federal and local level" (p. 81). Historically, institutional advancement officers have been rewarded for securing major gifts for certain colleges or programs within an institution. A new system, however, needs to be implemented which rewards the identification, cultivation, and solicitation of prospective major gifts donors who can also provide other capital

– knowledge, political, financial – to advance the campuses' and greater communities' interests and the public agenda (Weerts, 2007). Institutional advancement efforts must be focused on the organization's mission and programs, and the institution must be accountable to a variety of stakeholders by providing outcomes and impacts of donor gifts (Enright & Seiler, 2011; Rooney & Nathan, 2011; Rosso, 2011). Curry, Rodin and Carlson (2012) conducted a mixed-methods study about development efforts conducted at the height of the recession. Their study included a web-based survey (37 % response rate) as well interviews with presidents, provosts, and vice-presidents from Christian institutions of higher education, which were spread out geographically. One outcome of their study was that "performance is related to a transformational approach to development work built on a compelling vision that is communicated clearly" (P. 241).

Rooney and Nathan (2011) noted that more than 65% of Americans make some form of donation each year, which demonstrated a higher participation rate than voting, and that "giving by individuals is always the largest slice of the giving pie, usually about 75 percent" (p. 121). Curry et al.'s (2012) study reported that "organizations with greater numbers of local donors [i.e., donors within 100 miles of the organization] were more likely to report increased revenue, and at a statistically significant level" (p. 246). Stephenson and Bell (2014) noted that tight economic times have led to greater reliance on alumni giving, the result of a quantitative study of alumni giving "at a medium-sized (approximately 15,000 students) state-run institution in the Mid-Atlantic region" to learn their perceptions related to giving or not giving to their alma mater (p. 178). They emailed more than 45,000 alumni and received usable responses from 1,617 donors with an average age of 52 years and 1,146 non-donors with an average age of 40 years. They reported the top three reasons alumni donate to their alma maters are because they were alumni (68%), to give back to their institutions (47%), and to help students (43%). The

researchers noted that all three of these reasons were related to an identification with the group, or institution. Non-donating alumni reported reasons for not donating as being unable to afford it (43%) and changes at the institution which led to feeling disconnected from the organization (11%) (Stephenson & Bell, 2014). Weerts (2007) reported that studies on alumni giving have shown that institutions producing high wage earners have a fundraising advantage over smaller liberal arts institutions which likely produce lower wage earners.

Burlingame (2011) noted that businesses engage with the general public and institutions of higher education in a variety of ways, including gifts and partnerships. "In the past twenty-five years, cause-related marketing, sponsorships, and various other partnerships between business and nonprofits have been the fastest-growing area of corporate financing of nonprofits" (p. 139). In response to the economic downturn, businesses have focused their giving on "activities that address community needs met in partnership with others, including government" as well as more local (p. 141). Businesses look for ways to connect with nonprofit causes that can economically and socially benefit their organizations. Development officers are most likely to seek money for special projects, capital campaigns, or sponsorships; however, "more than a third of corporate philanthropic giving is through in-kind donations – most often in the form of company product" (p. 141).

"The relationship between a foundation and a nonprofit is built on mutual desire or interest directed at improving civic or public good" (Davis, 2011, p. 150). Foundations have the ability to fund projects and programs that can greatly alter social outcomes and communities. At 13% of total gifts made to nonprofit organizations, foundations provide a lot of support to nonprofits, second only to individual giving (Davis, 2011). Ostrander (2007) conducted a case study to look at changes in private foundation funding of higher education civic engagement over

a 10-year period, specifically looking at the key influencers of the service-learning and civic engagement movement's funding (i.e., Carnegie, Pew, Kellogg). The researcher conducted a mixed-methods study involving the collection of extant data from website reports and 10 interviews with key players in the funding process (Ostrander, 2007). The study uncovered a suggestion that foundation support shifted away from service learning and civic engagement in higher education and toward funding K-12 or direct community needs in order to address the root cause of social problems. Foundations, which pride themselves on innovation, found the "newness" had worn off of service learning by the early- to mid-2000s. Furthermore, foundations were meant to provide the seed money for innovation while higher education was meant to pick up the funding for initiatives if they were serious about service learning and civic engagement. "The major finding of this study is a very clear shift in funding priorities as those three foundations virtually ended their support for higher education civic engagement" (Ostrander, 2007, pp. 238-239). Receiving foundation support is often the catalyst for a nonprofit to implement a vital project or program, and "[c]ollaboration among foundations is a key trend in combating global problems and is an expected result of their grants to nonprofits" (Davis, 2011, p. 154).

Donors want to see evidence that their gifts are making a difference at the institution and in the community, and people are willing to give to causes that can prove to be both worthy and accountable (Grace & Wendroff, 2001; Rosso, 2011). Strategic, or venture, philanthropy is a common practice today, involving the building of close relationships between donors and fundraisers and between donors and the institution with a focus on outcomes achieved due to the gift (Weerts, 2007). Philanthropists see themselves as investing in "addressing a concrete human problem" and they expect measurable results to gauge the effectiveness of their gifts (Enright &

Seiler, 2011, p. 271). Weerts (2007) stated that donors today are interested in and "motivated by giving opportunities that will make a tangible impact on society" (p. 90). This type of fundraising, however, may allow external stakeholders to influence the strategic direction of the institution in exchange for a major gift (Weerts, 2007).

This new fundraising philosophy of engagement "emphasizes a shift … toward a more collaborative model where community partners play a significant role in creating and sharing knowledge to the mutual benefit of institutions and society" (Weerts, 2007, p. 85). Institutions touting an engagement brand were found to have a better chance of securing private and public support and funding than those not branding themselves as leaders in service or engagement (Weerts & Hudson, 2009).

Holland and Hollander (2006), researchers for Campus Compact, agreed that "[i]nstitutions with a clear engagement agenda are also likely to see growth in donor support and alumni giving" (p.4). Weerts and Ronca (2006) reported that institutions that were engaged in authentic service received higher levels of appropriations than predicted, likely because the service performed by the institution met state and community needs. Weerts (2007) stated, "Past research suggests that institutional commitment to outreach and engagement was associated with increased levels of state appropriations for public research universities during the 1990s" (p. 89). He further noted that "engagement has the capacity to leverage major private gifts for higher education" (p. 90).

Weerts (2007) noted that "[u]nder an engagement model of advancement, external relations officers … have a critical role in facilitating institutional transition toward a deeper, more authentic relationship with external stakeholders to the mutual benefit of their campuses and society at large" (p. 91). Donors are more interested in giving to specific programs with

tangible outcomes because they are "looking for tangible evidence that their gifts are making a difference" (Grace & Wendroff, 2001; Weerts & Hudson, 2009). They want to make gifts that will "be transformational – to make visible changes in programs, perceptions, or an organization's future" – which is far different from the traditional transactional giving (Curry et al., 2012; Grace & Wendroff, 2001). Strickland (2007) reported that transformational donors are more interested in how institutions use their gifts to build communities because "current donors are using transformational gifts to reshape institutions – institutions that are poised for or are already exhibiting engagement" (p. 105). Innovative ideas – which are generated by both donors and institutional leaders – with common goals and outcomes drive transformational giving at engaged institutions. Transformational gifts have the capacity to alter the institutional mission and vision, and change the direction of the university (Weerts, 2007).

Grace and Wendroff (2001) suggested that university administrators evaluate the impact of their service learning and engagement programs since transformational giving is focused on how the donor perceives the benefit or impact of her gift to the institution. Engagement acknowledges that knowledge exists with internal and external partners and that these partners can "be a part of a larger teaching and learning community in higher education" (Weerts, 2007, p. 93). "Engagement shows great promise as a lever to inspire donors to make transformational gifts to higher education" (Weerts, 2007, p. 91).

Donors perceive that service learning must be integrated into the curriculum in order to validate its importance and the institution's commitment to its mission and the institutionalization of service learning (Jacoby, 1999; Rubin, 1996). Jacoby (2009b) noted that the institutionalization of service learning varies to some degree based on the "extent to which the president and other leaders mention it in speeches and fund-raising efforts" (p. 101).

Reshaping "institutional advancement programs (e.g., marketing, branding, and fundraising activities) to leverage support" from donors has also led to many institutions' featuring community engagement efforts on their alumni-magazine covers (Butin, 2007; Weerts & Hudson, 2009, p.65). The transformational donors of today require significant engagement with the institution and hold the expectation that the institution will be engaged with off-campus communities (Strickland, 2007). Curry et al.'s (2012) study reported a qualitative theme of institutions' need to be proactive in communicating their identities and vision through engaging with those outside. "For example, faculty and administrators need to be engaged in civic activity at various levels, increasing the institutions' public profile" (p. 250). Weerts and Hudson (2009) further noted, "Fundraising for public engagement programs has gained momentum, especially in the area of service-learning" (p. 65).

Weerts and Hudson (2009) noted that colleges' and universities' advancement or development offices must work with institutional stakeholders to create a fundraising strategy to engage donors and will have to ask themselves whether engagement "is reflected as a budget priority and key component in [their] resource development campaigns" (p.65). Administrations will have to make strategic decisions in the coming years which include determining programs that are core to the institutions' missions, marketing programs that attract new students, and eliminating or adding programs to control costs. Higher education needs to use data in fundraising-related decision-making and they "need reliable modeling systems that integrate financial accounting and budgeting with cost analysis of programs" (Curry et al., 2012, p. 250). Although institutions rely more on private support for general funding needs than in the past, Weerts (2007) reported "donor gifts are typically earmarked to support specific programs and are not available for discretionary spending" (p. 83).

Assessment and Costs of Service-Learning

An institution's investment in service-learning must be measured to ensure it is meeting the mission. In order to sustain service-learning programs, institutions must see the benefits through high quality assessment measures. Effective assessment is essential in order to gather and report evidence of service-learning outcomes to administration; however, poor assessment of service-learning courses often involves documentation of hours of service or the collection of service journals. The assessment and evaluation of service-learning initiatives needs to be planned for while crafting the service-learning course or project. Calculating a return-on-investment of service-learning is one way to justify the expense of offering these programs and sustaining funding both internally and externally requires quality documentation of service-learning outcomes. Documented outcomes of service-learning may be used to develop best practices in service-learning as well as to build a case for additional financial support (Holland, 2001).

Addressing the longstanding service-learning ideal through curricular and co-curricular offerings requires colleges and universities to bear the burden of the associated costs of academic and program implementation. In a time of significant budget cuts, decreased giving, and greater competition for students and their tuition dollars, university leaders need to ask themselves whether or not service-learning was worth the expense (Kezar, 2002). Service-learning programs historically started out with grant funds; when those grant funds expired, the administration was often asked to provide institutional funding to sustain the service-learning program and staff (Rubin, 1999). Waggaman (2001) noted that cost pressures arise for many reasons in higher education. Whether cost pressures are based on an effort to become more prestigious, increase educational quality or provide service-learning opportunities for students, revenue sources have

to be available to implement and sustain the initiatives. From an external perspective, society also placed pressure on colleges and universities to provide citizenship education through service-learning experiences (Waggaman, 2001).

The assessment of service-learning programs was often the missing link in the budget planning process in higher education. Mechanisms often were not in place to determine whether resources directed toward service-learning courses and programs had the intended academic and social results (Shulock & Harrison, 1998). Welch (2009) noted that service-learning was integrated with content knowledge; however, he questioned whether it empowered students to create social change (p. 174). "If the service provided costs more than the resources provided, then some way must be found to bring them into balance" (Waggaman, 2001, p. 302). Eyler and Giles (1999) pointed out that service learning programs have been closed when economic conditions become tough because they lacked articulated student learning outcomes and Kezar (2002) asked whether service learning courses and programs tied into the organizations' missions were strong enough to justify the logistics and costs involved in offering them.

Cost Analysis in Higher Education

"The relationship between resources expended to provide instruction on the one hand and the outcomes of instruction on the other" is the classic definition of educational productivity (Catterall,1998, p. 62). Institutions of higher education have to account for various resources when implementing an alternative instructional design, like that of service-learning pedagogy. This often included the initial course or program development, faculty and staff time, and ongoing resource needs (e.g., supplies, transportation). There are several ratio analyses which could be used to calculate the costs and the effectiveness, benefits, utility, and feasibility of a given intervention in higher education (Walsh et al., 2013). Among those analytical tools are the

traditional cost-benefit method, the "ingredients" or cost-effectiveness approach, the cost-utility process, and the cost-feasibility assessment. Of the four types of cost analyses, the cost-utility and cost-feasibility examinations are the most appropriate for evaluating the benefit of service learning.

Levin and McEwan (2001) defined a "[c]ost-utility (CU) analysis [as] the evaluation of alternatives according to a comparison of their costs and their utility or value" (p. 19). A CU analysis can "combine multiple measures of effectiveness into a single estimate of utility" or satisfaction derived from one or more outcomes (Levin & McEwan, 2001, p. 20). A CU analysis allows administrators to weigh the importance of effects (many outcomes can be included) relative to the costs and create consensus around the utility of the alternatives. Service learning could yield effects in many areas, as noted earlier in this chapter, including student learning, student recruitment, retention, institutional fundraising, and community relations. CU could help whenever alternatives vary in their measured effectiveness and costs by providing a way for decision-makers "to construct a summary measure of utility, which reflects the overall satisfaction that is derived from each alternative" (Levin & McEwan, 2001, p. 21). A limitation of using CU analysis, however, is the subjectivity of applying weights to different measures; it becomes difficult to replicate the evaluation.

"Cost-feasibility (CF) analysis refers to the method of estimating only the costs of an alternative in order to ascertain whether or not it can be considered" (Levin & McEwan, 2001, pp. 22-24). In this type of analysis, administrators simply eliminate the alternative(s) that exceed their budget or available resources. If the institution cannot afford to implement an alternative pedagogy, no further analysis is necessary (Levin & McEwan, 2001).

Many of the documented benefits of service-learning programs cannot be measured monetarily (e.g., communication skills, personal and interpersonal development); however, there are ways to evaluate multiple measures of the effectiveness of alternative approaches (e.g., documented learning outcomes compared to traditional lecture courses, retention of students taking service-learning courses compared to those who do not, etc.) and fiscal reasoning models to eliminate options that exceed the institutional budget.

Conclusion

There are many reasons service-learning initiatives in higher education may be adopted and implemented. Based on the research examined for this study, service learning is one way through which higher education institutions can fulfill their role in preparing civically responsible graduates, it is a way through which relationships with the surrounding community can be improved, it can improve student learning outcomes, it can assist in securing external funds for service-learning research and projects, and it can foster collaboration across the institution and the community (Furco & Holland, 2009). Furthermore, service learning has been found to aid in student recruitment and retention (Holland & Hollander, 2006; Vogel & Seifer, 2011; Yeh, 2010).

Campus Compact (2014) outlined a number of benefits for college and university presidents to become members of its organization, including improved retention of faculty and students; subgrants to support service-related efforts; access to service-learning program models, syllabi, and resources; publicity highlighting the president's leadership in engagement initiatives; training, resources, and awards for faculty, staff, and students engaged in service; and professional development and networking opportunities for the president. Engagement has increasingly been seen and used as strategy to restore the ideal of higher education's producing

civically-minded and engaged citizens, as well as a measure of the quality of the institution (Holland & Hollander, 2006). Engagement, including service-learning, in higher education is viewed as prestigious. This is evident by the many entities which now include engagement in their assessment and classification of institutions as they rank them for various purposes: The Carnegie Foundation ranked and classified US institutions with indicators of community engagement; *The Princeton Review* included a variation of engagement in its review process; and *U.S. News and World Report*'s included engaged learning in its assessment of institutions. Moreover, three regional accreditation associations added criteria for assessment related to engagement initiatives (Holland & Hollander, 2006).

The creation of the elective Carnegie Community Engagement Classification was meant to secure the place of service and engagement in higher education. Community engagement, which includes service-learning, was defined by the Carnegie Foundation (2014) as the "collaboration between institutions of higher education and their larger communities (e.g., local, regional/state, national, and global) for the mutually beneficial exchange of knowledge and resources in a context of partnership and reciprocity."

The Carnegie Community Engagement Classification consisted of three categories for which an institution could apply: 1) curricular engagement, 2) outreach and partnership, and 3) curricular engagement and outreach and partnership. The application process was a significant amount of work, although applicants said they needed to gather the data anyway. Service learning and community engagement efforts were not often assessed properly, if at all, and the opportunity to secure this classification was worth the extra work (Driscoll, n.d.). There were 119 institutions who received this classification as of 2008 (Campus Compact, 2014). Driscoll (n.d.) noted that institutions of higher education sought the new elective Carnegie classification

for a variety of reasons, including national recognition, positive connection to the Carnegie name, opportunity to honor their engaged scholars, positive association with community members and stakeholders, prospect of securing grant funds, and response to accountability critics. Some applicants admitted to using the application process as proof to administration and campus leadership that they needed to dedicate resources to campus engagement efforts (Driscoll, n.d.).

Furco and Holland (2009) reported that higher education leaders are paying more attention to the higher profile of service-learning and have questioned its "potential, liabilities, and overall value to core academic and scholarly activities" (p. 54). Administrations questioned how much internal support would be needed in order to sustain service-learning programs, ultimately, questioning the costs relevant to the return on investment.

CHAPTER THREE

Research Methods

The purpose of this descriptive case study was to investigate how higher education administrators perceive the costs and satisfaction associated with service learning in the curricular and cocurricular areas of their institutions. To this purpose, a survey questionnaire was designed and distributed to the college presidents, provosts/chief academic officers, vice-presidents of finance, and vice-presidents/deans of student affairs at institutions affiliated with the five Independent College and University organizations in Kentucky, North Carolina, Tennessee, Virginia, and West Virginia. This population of 123 member institutions is comprised of 14 different Carnegie Classifications: two schools are Bac/A&S; 39 institutions are Bac/Diverse; 33 are Bac/A&S; 12 are Master's M; seven are Master's S; 11 are Master's L; two are DRU; one is RU/H; three are RU/VH; six are Spec/Health; one is Spec/Law; and two schools each are identified as Spec/Arts, Spec/Faith, and Spec/Med. Eighty-six percent of these institutions overtly state service or citizenship in their mission statements, core values, or institutional goals or purpose statements, and 34 % are members of Campus Compact (Campus Compact, 2015).

This chapter will begin with a rationale for the study and continue with a discussion of the research questions and research design, including how the sample was derived. The data collection and data analysis methods will be described and the chapter will conclude with a discussion of the limitations of the study.

Rationale for the Study

This study discusses the various costs of and satisfaction with service-learning initiatives as perceived by higher education administrators. A cost-utility (CU) analysis was used because it

allowed administrators to weigh the importance of established effects of service learning including student learning, student recruitment, retention, and institutional fundraising (Jacoby, 1999; Mundy & Eyler, 2002; Rubin, 1996; Weerts, 2007). It is within the context of economic instability in higher education that the study examined the cost-utility of service-learning courses and programs in higher education. No previous studies were identified that explored factors which might explain how administrators determine which benefits are perceived to exist and to what level those benefits must rise for institutions to make an investment in service-learning courses and programs.

Research Questions

1) Do administrators perceive a difference in student-learning outcomes between service-learning courses and conventional courses? Research question 1 will be answered by analyzing responses to question 5 on the survey instrument.
2) To what extent, if any, do administrators perceive the existence of a service-learning requirement contributes to student recruitment? Research question 2 will be answered by analyzing responses to questions 6, 7, and 8 on the survey instrument.
3) To what extent, if any, do administrators perceive the existence of a service-learning requirement contributes to student retention? Research question 3 will be answered by analyzing responses to question 9 on the survey instrument.
4) To what extent, if any, do administrators perceive the existence of a service-learning requirement contributes to fundraising? Research question 4 will be answered by analyzing responses to questions 10 and 13 on the survey instrument.
5) Do administrators perceive there are financial benefits for the university from the implementation of service-learning courses and/or programs? Research question 5

will be answered by analyzing responses to questions 11, 12, 14, and 15 on the survey instrument.

Research Design

This descriptive study focused on the perceptions of selected administrators regarding the costs and benefits of service-learning initiatives at institutions in five Appalachian states that are affiliated with their respective Independent Colleges and Universities associations. An electronic survey was administered to college presidents, provosts/chief academic officers, vice-presidents of finance, and vice-presidents/deans of student affairs including questions in three primary formats – multiple choice, Likert scale, and open-ended. Multiple choice and Likert-scale responses were used for the quantitative portion of the study, while open-ended questions provided data for a limited qualitative analysis.

The survey instrument was developed by the researcher based on an extensive review of the literature. Specific areas for examination were: (a) administrators' perspectives on the perceived financial benefits, if any, that accrue to the institution from the implementation of service-learning courses and programs; (b) the level of financial benefit perceived to be necessary in order to justify the costs of service-learning courses and programs to the institution; and (c) whether service-learning requirements are perceived to contribute to student learning, recruitment, retention, and fundraising. The survey responses were used to examine any relationships that may exist between and/or among administrators' perceptions of the curricular and cocurricular benefits of service-learning and financial benefits to the institution, the level of funding justified to secure the outcomes of service learning, contributions to student recruitment and retention, and ability to secure funds for the institutions. The study also reported the institutions' Carnegie Classifications, membership in Campus Compact, use of "service" in

mission and/or purpose statements posted on their websites, and whether those factors appear to have any impact on the administrators' perceptions of service learning.

Sample

In order to garner responses from a diverse regional sample of four-year private institutions, a survey was sent to the college presidents, provosts/chief academic officers, vice-presidents of finance, and vice-presidents/deans of student affairs at institutions affiliated with 123 member institutions of statewide Independent College and University organizations. This sample consisted of all such institutions located in five states (i.e., Kentucky, North Carolina, Tennessee, Virginia, and West Virginia) minus two: the researcher's recent employer and the lone two-year institution holding membership in North Carolina Independent Colleges and Universities' association; 86% have overtly stated "service" or "citizenship" in their mission statements, core values, or institutional goals or purpose statements; 34% of them hold membership in Campus Compact, and the population is comprised of 14 different Carnegie Classifications.

Most research on service learning is focused on student outcomes, while the effect(s) of service learning on community partners has a growing body of research and studies on service-learning outcomes as they relate to faculty and institutions are largely in the developmental stage. Among the studies that are missing is, as Bringle and Steinberg (2010) have argued, an examination of "how institutional support and infrastructure for service-learning results in improved capacity for … benefit" – to students, faculty, institutions, and community partners (p. 438). The data collected in this study begins to address that deficiency in information by establishing an initial account of administrators' perceptions of the costs and benefits of service-learning programs in this set of institutions.

Instrumentation

A researcher-generated survey titled the "Service Learning Cost Utility Scale" was created to collect administrators' demographics and institutional demographics, and measure any relationships that may exist between administrators' perceptions of the benefits of service-learning and financial benefits to the institution, the level of funding justified to secure the outcomes of service learning, contributions to student recruitment and retention, and ability to secure funds for the institutions. A field test of the survey instrument, using a panel of administrators in institutions with service-learning programs, was conducted to ensure that the survey sent to the larger population was sufficient to answer the research questions and that the questions were properly phrased (i.e., free of bias and not confusing). The survey instrument was administered electronically using the web-based Survey Monkey survey tool. Potential respondents were contacted via email and provided with a link to the online survey.

The first section of the survey was designed to obtain data to categorize respondents based upon their roles within their respective institutions, and the types and sizes of institution with which they are affiliated. The remainder of the survey relied on Likert-type scales to collect information regarding relationships that may exist between administrators' perceptions of the benefits of service-learning and financial benefits to the institution, the level of funding justified to secure the outcomes of service learning, contributions to student recruitment and retention, and ability to secure funds for the institutions.

Data Collection

A pilot study was conducted in June 2015 using SurveyMonkey.com. The survey contained 21 questions and included feedback prompts for participant comments. The pilot study utilized a convenience sample of senior level administrators from private institutions of higher

education associated with the Association of Independent Colleges and Universities of Ohio and adjustments were made to the survey after evaluating the information gathered. Following IRB approval, the revised survey was sent to each of the college presidents, provosts/chief academic officers, vice-presidents of finance, and vice-presidents/deans of student affairs at all 123 institutions with membership in an Independent College and University organization in Kentucky, North Carolina, Tennessee, Virginia, and West Virginia. The survey was administered using SurveyMonkey.com and accessible via a link in the email sent to each administrator. One reminder email was sent and administrators were given a total of four weeks to complete the survey. At the end of the final week the collection period was closed.

Data Analysis

Survey data from multiple choice and Likert scale questions were entered and analyzed using SPSS to produce both descriptive and comparative statistics from survey responses. Qualitative data were subjected to an emergent category analysis and subsequently processed in SPSS. The qualitative component of this study was limited in scope and intended to elicit any further insights administrators may have had related to specific research questions. These findings are summarized along with quantitative findings in the sections that follow. Descriptive statistics and frequencies were utilized to provide an overview of all data collected on the survey.

Assumptions and Limitations of the Study

The limitations of this study are primarily those common to survey research. The findings are limited to the perceptions of college presidents, provosts/chief academic officers, vice-presidents of finance, and vice-presidents/deans of student affairs at institutions affiliated with Independent College and University associations in five Appalachian states who respond to the

survey rather than being generalizable to their larger populations. Those who responded may do so out of a particular bias, either positive or negative about/receptive or non-receptive toward service learning. While the researcher's academic experience and employment in the education field can constitute a source of empathy and provide an experiential background to be effective in eliciting and understanding respondent's perceptions, it can also be viewed as a limitation in that it is a potential source of bias.

The study is also limited by the validity of the survey instrument, which was field tested with a representative population of administrators at institutions with membership in the Association of Independent Colleges & Universities of Ohio but was also in its initial use nonetheless. Assumptions are made that participants responded to the survey items truthfully, although it is acknowledged that individual biases of respondents may affect the objectivity of their responses to the questionnaire. While the items on the survey instrument are based on congruence with the reviewed literature, there may be other issues of importance to service learning which will not be included.

CHAPTER FOUR

Presentation and Analysis of Data

The data for the study were collected using an instrument created by the researcher and administered using the Survey Monkey website. The instrument (see Appendix C) was designed both to address the research questions and to establish a basis for the perceptions of selected administrators regarding the costs and benefits of service-learning. The research questions, listed below, were linked to the concepts of service learning explored in Chapter 2.

1) Do administrators perceive a difference in student-learning outcomes between service-learning courses and conventional courses?
2) To what extent, if any, do administrators perceive the existence of a service-learning requirement contributes to student recruitment?
3) To what extent, if any, do administrators perceive the existence of a service-learning requirement contributes to student retention?
4) To what extent, if any, do administrators perceive the existence of a service-learning requirement contributes to fundraising?
5) Do administrators perceive there are financial benefits for the university from the implementation of service-learning courses and/or programs?

The study was non-experimental and primarily quantitative in nature, so most findings cited in this chapter are descriptive and analyzed numerically. Open-ended options within some questions provided data for a limited qualitative analysis.

Sample and Demographics

The sample for the study was a cross-section of administrators including the college presidents, provosts/chief academic officers, vice-presidents of finance, and vice-

presidents/deans of student affairs at institutions affiliated with 123 member institutions of statewide Independent College and University organizations located in five states (i.e., Kentucky, North Carolina, Tennessee, Virginia, and West Virginia) minus two: the researcher's recent employer and the lone two-year institution holding membership in North Carolina Independent Colleges and Universities' association. A list of the institutions identified by the researcher as holding membership in statewide Independent College and University organizations in the five-state sample is provided in Appendix E. Of the sample, 86% of the institutions overtly stated "service" or "citizenship" in their mission statements, core values, and/or institutional goals or purpose statements, and 34% held membership in Campus Compact. The sample was comprised of institutions with 14 different Carnegie Classifications.

The data collected in this study addressed the meagerness of information in the extant research regarding administrators' perceptions of the costs and benefits of service-learning programs in this set of institutions. Potential survey participants were identified through an extensive search of institutional and organizational websites for employee directories, organizational charts, and contact information. The search yielded direct contact information for a total of 698 individuals and an email invitation with a link to the online survey was sent to each address. A follow-up email was sent approximately two weeks later to the same individuals.

The survey remained available to potential respondents for approximately four weeks, during which time 99 completed surveys were returned. As seen in Table 1, the distribution across administrative classes provided fairly even representation across the administrative positions included in the study with the exception of vice presidents of finance. Respondents represented presidents, provosts, deans of student life, and vice presidents of advancement, enrollment, finance, and student life. The survey did not ask respondents to identify their

institutions or report the states which their institutions are located. Therefore, there was no way of knowing which institutions were represented in the sample.

Table 1

Composition of Survey Sample

Administrator Role	*n*	Percent
President	10	10.1%
Provost	27	27.3%
VP of Advancement	14	14.1%
VP of Enrollment	10	10.1%
VP of Finance	2	2.0%
VP of Student Life	22	22.2%
Dean of Service Learning	14	14.1%
Total	99	100%

Forty percent of respondents indicated that they have worked at their institutions for fewer than five years, while the remainder have served for six years or more. Table 2 provides a breakdown of survey participants' employment at their current institutions.

Table 2

Composition of Survey Sample's Years Working at Current Institution

Years at Institution	*n*	Percent
Less than One Year	3	3.0%
1-5 Years	37	37.4%
6-10 Years	20	20.2%
11-15 Years	12	12.1%
16-20 Years	11	11.1%
21-25 Years	8	8.1%
More than 25 Years	8	8.1%
Total	99	100%

Of the 99 participants, only 88 responded to the final survey question asking them to enter the approximate number of full-time equivalencies (FTE) for undergraduates at their institutions. Nearly two-thirds of respondents reported FTEs of 1500 undergraduate students or fewer with a mean of 1603.5 FTEs and a mode of 1400 FTEs. Table 3 provides a breakdown of the FTEs for respondents' institutions.

Table 3

Full-Time Enrollment (FTE) by Institution

FTE Enrollment	*n*	Percent
1000 or Fewer	34	38.7%
1001-1500	23	26.1%
1501-2000	16	18.2%
2001-2500	4	4.5%
2501-3000	5	5.7%
3000 or Greater	6	6.8%
Total	88	100%

Institutional Information

Fifty-eight percent of respondents reported offering service-learning experiences via academic majors and/or minors while 78% reported offering individual academic service-learning courses at their institutions. Service-learning experiences garnered through participation in student life organizations or associations and student life programs and events were reported to be offered by 78% of respondents. Percentages in Table 4 total more than 100 percent because respondents were asked to mark all that apply.

Table 4

Service-learning Experiences Offered

Service-learning Experiences	*n*	Percent
Academic majors or minors	*57*	57.5%
Individual academic courses	78	78.7%
Student Life organizations or associations	78	78.7%
Student Life programs or events	78	78.7%

Respondents reported that service-learning experiences were funded in a number of ways at their institutions. Institutional funds were cited as the source used most frequently to fund service learning experiences, while corporate sponsorships and major gifts were used the least. Table 5 highlights the breakdown of how service learning experiences were funded. Percentages in Table 5 total more than 100 percent because respondents were asked to mark all that apply.

Table 5

Funding of Service-Learning Experiences

Service-learning Experiences Funded	*n*	Percent
Institutional funds (budget)	82	82.8%
Grant funds	43	43.4%
Foundation/endowment	32	32.3%
Corporate sponsorship	14	14.1%
Major gifts	16	16.2%
Tuition	31	31.3%
Student fees	32	32.3%
Student-led fundraising	43	43.4%

Administrators reported that the primary reason their institutions reduced support for service learning courses and programs over the past five years was due to budget cuts (50%). However, eight respondents reported that their institutions either had not reduced support over the last five years or they had increased it.

Table 6

Primary Reason for Reduction in Support of Service Learning Over Last Five Years

Primary reason	*n*	Percent
Budget cuts	32	50%
Redirection of student fees or tuition	1	1.6%
External foundation or grant support ended	12	18.7%
Sponsorship discontinued	3	4.7%
Major gifts not renewed	1	1.6%
Other	15	23.4%
Total	64	100%

Administrators were asked whether the costs of initial service-learning course development, faculty and staff time spent developing service-learning courses and in the supervision of students' service-learning experiences, and the ongoing resource needs of offering service-learning experiences, were minor or major considerations when deciding to implement service-learning pedagogy and/or programs at their institutions. Table 7 shows these responses in frequencies. Fifty-seven percent of respondents reported that costs for ongoing resource needs, such as supervision, supplies, and transportation, was a major consideration when implementing service-learning pedagogy or programs at their institutions. Further analysis revealed that less than a quarter of provosts reported that the initial course or program development was a major consideration when calculating the costs of service learning courses and programs, and less than a third of provosts reported that faculty and staff time in the development of those service learning courses or programs was a major cost consideration.

Table 7

Cost Considerations Made for Service Learning Pedagogy/Programs Implementation (Percent)

Cost Considered	*n*	Not considered at all			Major consideration
Initial course/program development	78	1 (1.3)	8 (10.3)	38 (48.7)	31 (39.7)
Faculty/staff time in development	77	1 (1.3)	8 (10.4)	36 (46.8)	32 (41.5)
Faculty/staff time in supervision	78	1 (1.3)	8 (10.3)	36 (46.1)	33 (42.3)
Ongoing resource needs	77	0 (0)	9 (11.7)	28 (36.4)	40 (51.9)

Eighty-six percent of respondents reported that their respective institution's mission, vision, value, or purpose statement explicitly stated "service" or "citizenship" development. This was consistent with the researcher's findings from data-mining the institutions' websites. Also consistent with the researcher's findings via data-mining, 34% of administrators reported that their institutions held membership in Campus Compact. Thirty-one percent reported that their institutions did not hold membership in Campus Compact while 26% reportedly did not know whether their institution held membership in Campus Compact.

Respondents were asked about whether their institutions provided service-learning scholarships to prospective students or financial aid to current students engaged in service experiences. Fifty-nine percent of administrators reported that their institutions provided service-learning scholarships in order to attract new students who had past and/or current service involvement. Twenty-four percent of respondents said that their institutions offered financial aid for current students who were engaged in service activities.

Respondents were asked whether their institutions' marketing or public relations offices were kept informed of student and faculty service-learning accomplishments in order to keep the

college or university name in the press. Seventy-one percent of administrators reported that their marketing or public relations offices were kept informed of service-learning accomplishments for positive press purposes.

Findings

Research Question One: Do administrators perceive a difference in student-learning outcomes between service-learning courses and conventional courses?

The first research question sought to determine the extent to which administrators agreed or disagreed with the statements about differences in student-learning outcomes between service-learning courses and conventional courses. Participants were asked to review a list of seven statements and to rate each using a one-to-four Likert-type scale, with "one" indicating that the participant strongly disagreed with the statement, and "four" indicating that the participant strongly agreed with the statement. Table 8 below lists the extent to which the respondents agreed or disagreed with each of the seven statements about their perceptions on the differences between service-learning and conventional courses.

Administrators were asked whether they perceived students who participated in service-learning courses had a deeper understanding of course concepts than students in traditional courses. As can be seen in Table 8 below, nearly 94% of respondents agreed or strongly agreed with this statement. When administrators were asked if they perceived service-learning courses to produce stronger student learning outcomes than traditional courses, 85% agreed or strongly agreed. All but one respondent agreed or strongly agreed that service-learning provided more opportunities for students to integrate, synthesize, and apply knowledge than traditional courses offered.

Table 8

Differences in Student Outcomes Between Service-Learning Courses and Traditional Courses (Percent)

Service-learning student experience	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
Deeper understanding of course concepts	0 (0)	6 (6.2)	57 (58.8)	34 (35)
Stronger student learning outcomes	0 (0)	14 (14.4)	58 (59.8)	25 (25.8)
More opportunities for integration/application	0 (0)	1 (1)	58 (59.8)	38 (39.2)
Deep, meaningful learning experiences	0 (0)	3 (3.1)	52 (53.6)	42 (43.3)
More appreciation for diversity	1 (1)	15 (15.5)	43 (44.3)	38 (39.2)
Better interpersonal skills	0 (0)	21 (21.6)	54 (55.7)	22 (22.7)
Higher level of motivation in service-learning courses	2 (2.1)	29 (29.9)	48 (49.5)	18 (18.5)

Fifty-seven percent of both vice-presidents of student life and deans of service learning strongly agreed that service-learning provided students with greater opportunities for learning than traditional courses while all presidents and provosts participating in the study agreed or strongly agreed with the statement. Table 9 arrays those responses as frequencies.

Table 9

Administrators Role and the Perception of Service-Learning Providing More Opportunities for Students to Integrate, Synthesize, and Apply Knowledge than Traditional Courses Offer

Administrator	*n*	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
President	10	0	0	6	4
Provost	27	0	0	22	5
VP Advancement	14	0	1	9	4
VP Enrollment	9	0	0	5	4
VP Finance	2	0	0	1	1
VP Student Life	21	0	0	9	12
Dean of Service Learning	14	0	0	6	8
Total	97	0	1	58	38

A correlational analysis revealed a significant relationship between administrators' roles and their perceptions that service-learning provided more opportunities for students to integrate, synthesize, and apply knowledge than traditional courses. A subsequent linear regression placed the strength of the reported relationship at 68% (via a linear regression that returned an adjusted r^2 value of 68), although there is little reason to expect that one's administrative title has that large an effect on his perception of service-learning students' opportunities to apply course concepts. The reported relationship may be attributable to the dominance of two particular categories of administrator in the sample (i.e., provost at 27% and vice president of student life at 22%), as illustrated in Table 10.

Table 10

Bivariate Correlation Between Administrators Roles and Perceptions of Difference in Student Outcomes Between Service-Learning Courses and Conventional Courses

	Administrative Role	Opportunity for Students to Apply Learning
Administrative Role	--	.006*
Opportunity for Students to Apply Learning	.006*	--

*Correlation is significant at the $p < 0.05$ level (two-tailed)

A second correlational analysis revealed a moderate relationship between administrators' roles and their perceptions of these learning experiences. A subsequent linear regression placed the strength of the reported relationship at 36% (via a linear regression that returned an adjusted r^2 value of 36), although there is little reason to expect that one's administrative title has that large an effect on his perception of service-learning students' deep, meaningful learning experiences. Again, the reported relationship may be attributable to the dominance of provosts and vice presidents of student life in the sample, as illustrated in Table 11.

Table 11

Bivariate Correlation Between Administrators Roles and Perceptions of Difference in Student Outcomes Between Service-Learning Courses and Conventional Courses

	Administrative Role	Deep, Meaningful Learning Experiences
Administrative Role	--	.035*
Deep, Meaningful Learning Experiences	.035*	--

*Correlation is significant at the $p < 0.05$ level (two-tailed)

Further analysis revealed that 97% of respondents agreed or strongly agreed that service-learning provided students with deep, meaningful learning experiences, as can be seen in Table 12 below. Fifty-seven percent of vice-presidents of student life and deans of service learning strongly agreed that service learning provided deep, meaningful learning experiences.

Table 12

Administrators Roles and their Perceptions of Service-Learning Providing Students with Deep, Meaningful Learning Experiences Compared to Traditional Courses Offer (Percent)

Administrator	*n*	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
President	10	0 (0)	0 (0)	5 (50)	5 (50)
Provost	27	0 (0)	2 (7.5)	20 (74)	5 (18.5)
VP Advancement	14	0 (0)	0 (0)	7 (50)	7 (50)
VP Enrollment	9	0 (0)	0 (0)	5 (55.6)	4 (44.4)
VP Finance	2	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (50)	1 (50)
VP Student Life	21	0 (0)	1 (4.8)	8 (38.1)	12 (57.1)
Dean of Service Learning	14	0 (0)	0 (0)	6 (42.9)	8 (57.1)
Total	97	0 (0)	3 (3.1)	52 (53.6)	42 (43.3)

Eighty-three percent of administrators agreed or strongly agree that students who took service-learning courses developed more appreciation for diversity than those who took traditional courses. Administrators also agreed or strongly agreed 78% of the time that students who participated in service-learning courses or programs better developed their interpersonal skills than students who did not take them. Finally, 68% of respondents agreed or strongly agreed that students had higher levels of motivation in their service-learning courses than in their traditional courses.

Research Question Two: To what extent, if any, do administrators perceive the existence of a service-learning requirement contributes to student recruitment?

The purpose of this research question was to determine the extent to which administrators perceived that requiring students to have service-learning experiences contributed to their student recruitment efforts at their institutions. There were two questions on the survey addressing the research question. Respondents were asked to rate, using a one-to-four Likert-type scale, with "one" indicating that the participant perceived the requirement did not contribute to recruitment efforts at all and "four" indicating the participant perceived the requirement contributed to recruitment efforts a lot, six standard student recruitment activities and seven groups targeted in the recruitment process.

Administrators were asked their perceptions of whether a service-learning requirement contributed to six student recruitment activities: recruitment events (e.g. college fairs), prospective students and family visit days, publications (e.g. viewbook, brochures), recruiting pages on institution websites, recruitment emails, and promotional videos. More than 50% of respondents reported that a service-learning requirement contributed moderately to all of the recruitment activities except for the promotional videos (41.6%). Table 13 summarizes these results.

Table 13

Administrators Perceptions of a Service-Learning Requirement Contributing to Student Recruitment

Student Recruitment Activity	Not at All			A Lot
Recruitment events (such as a college fair)	16	51	25	4
Prospective student/family visit days	14	48	27	7
Publications	8	50	25	13
Recruiting page on institution website	10	52	26	8
Recruitment emails	23	49	20	3
Promotional videos	16	40	28	12

Administrators were also asked the extent to which they perceived that their institutions used their service learning programs for recruitment and marketing purposes. The targeted groups included prospective students/families, currently enrolled students/families, faculty, staff, community members, alumni, and potential donors or sponsors. Fifty-one percent of respondents reported that they perceived their institutions used service-learning programs to recruit and market to prospective new students and families somewhat, while 40% of respondents reported these recruiting and marketing efforts were directed toward current students and families. Thirteen percent of respondents perceived that "a lot" of recruitment and marketing efforts were made toward potential donors and sponsors, while 10% of respondents perceived that the use of a service-learning requirement "a lot" of the time for recruitment and marketing efforts toward prospective students and their families. Table 14 summarizes these results. Further survey analysis revealed no relationships between the administrators' roles and a service-learning requirement contributing to student recruitment.

Table 14

Administrators Perceptions of Using a Service-Learning Program Requirement to Target Specific Groups for Recruitment and Marketing Purposes

Target Group	Not at All			A Lot
Prospective student/family	10	50	27	10
Currently enrolled student/family	14	39	37	7
Faculty	17	45	30	5
Staff	26	42	26	2
Community Members	20	32	38	7
Alumni	23	38	32	4
Potential donors or sponsors	8	42	34	13

Research Question Three: To what extent, if any, do administrators perceive the existence of a service-learning requirement contributes to student retention?

Responses to the third research question, which sought to determine the extent to which administrators perceived the existence of a service-learning requirement contributed to student retention, varied by administrative role or responsibility. There was one question on the survey addressing the research question. Participants were asked to review a list of six statements and to rate each using a one-to-four Likert-type scale, with "one" indicating that the participant strongly disagreed with the statement and "four" indicating that the participant strongly agreed with the statement. Table 15 below lists the extent to which the respondents agreed or disagreed with each of the six statements regarding their perception of an existence of a service-learning requirement contributing to student retention.

Table 15

Administrators Perceptions of a Service-Learning Requirement Contributing to Student Retention

Retention/Persistence Factor	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
Faculty contact	0	6	43	46
Peer contact outside of classroom	1	0	48	46
Service-learning experiences for first generation Students	0	14	60	19
Service-learning experiences for freshmen	1	17	57	19
Service-learning associated with degree completion	1	18	57	17
Campus increase in student retention because of service-learning initiatives	6	36	39	9

Administrators responded with "agree" or "strongly agree" 93% of the time when asked whether learning and retention were largely shaped by faculty contact. All but one of the provosts who responded agreed or strongly agreed with the statement. Twenty percent of the vice-presidents of student life, however, disagreed with the statement.

All but one of the 95 respondents of this question agreed or strongly agreed that peer contact outside of the classroom encouraged students to persist in college, and 84% of respondents agreed or strongly agreed that service-learning was associated with retention of first-generation students. Eighty percent of respondents agreed or strongly agreed that service-learning was associated with retention of students during the freshman year, and that service-learning was associated with student persistence to degree completion. Despite administrators' agreeing or strongly agreeing that a service-learning requirement contributes to student retention,

however, nearly 47% of respondents disagreed or strongly disagreed that their campuses had actually increased student retention via service-learning initiatives.

Research Question Four: To what extent, if any, do administrators perceive the existence of a service-learning requirement contributes to fundraising?

The fourth research question sought to determine the extent to which administrators perceived that the existence of a service-learning requirement contributed to fundraising by administrative role or responsibility. There was one question on the survey addressing the research question. Participants were asked to review a list of eleven statements and to rate each using a one-to-four Likert-type scale, with "one" indicating that the participant strongly disagreed with the statement, and "four" indicating that the participant strongly agreed with the statement. Table 16 below illustrates the findings relative to administrators' perceptions of an existence of a service-learning requirement contributing to fundraising efforts.

Table 16

Administrators Perception of a Service-Learning Requirement Contributing to Fundraising

Statement about Fundraising	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
Fundraising efforts must focus on mission and programs	0	0	24	66
Business give to address community needs	0	15	66	9
Foundation support shifted away from service-learning	1	52	31	3
Institution should absorb service-learning funding	0	18	67	6
Foundation support catalyst for vital projects/programs	4	18	53	15
Donors want evidence of gifts making a difference at institution	0	1	38	52
Donors want evidence of gifts making a difference in community	2	14	46	29
Leadership mention service-learning in speeches and fundraising efforts	4	14	53	20
Leverage support from donors by featuring community engagement on alumni publications	2	15	57	15
Funding service-learning helps meet mission statement	0	4	50	37
Investment in service-learning must be measured	0	8	55	25

All respondents agreed or strongly agreed that institutional advancement efforts must be focused on the organization's mission and programs. Eighty-three percent of respondents agreed

or strongly agreed that businesses focus their giving on activities that address community needs met in partnership with their institutions.

Respondents reported that receiving foundation support was often the catalyst for their institution to implement a vital project or program, agreeing or strongly agreeing with the statement 75% of the time. Sixty-one percent of respondents disagreed or strongly disagreed that foundation support had shifted away from service learning and civic engagement in higher education. Eighty percent of all respondents agreed or strongly agreed that funding for service learning and civic engagement initiatives should be absorbed by the institution once foundation support is unavailable for them. It is important to note that the researcher did not distinguish between institutional foundations and external foundations (e.g., Carnegie, Pew, Kellogg) on the survey. Therefore, respondents may have interpreted "foundation" differently when considering responses to survey questions related to that subject.

All but one respondent agreed or strongly agreed that donors wanted to see evidence that their gifts were making a difference at their institutions. Of those respondents, all vice-presidents of advancement agreed with the statement, and 64% strongly agreed. Eighty-two percent of respondents agreed or strongly agreed that donors wanted to see evidence that their gifts were making a difference in the community.

Eighty percent of respondents agreed or strongly agreed that institutional leadership mentioned service-learning in speeches and fund-raising efforts, while 81% agreed or strongly agreed that their institutional advancement programs (e.g., marketing, branding, and fundraising activities) leveraged support from donors by featuring community engagement efforts on their alumni-magazine covers. More than 90% of respondents agreed or strongly agreed that funding

service-learning helped their institutions meet their mission statements, and that an institution's investment in service-learning had to be measured to ensure it was meeting the mission.

Research Question Five: Do administrators perceive there are financial benefits for the university from the implementation of service-learning courses and/or programs?

The fifth research question sought to determine the extent to which administrators perceived a financial benefit to accrue to the institution from implementing service-learning courses and programs. There was one question on the survey addressing this research question, asking participants to review a list of six benefits thought to accrue to the university from marketing service-learning courses or programs (Bringle & Hatcher, 1996; Burlingame, 2011; Butin, 2007; Davis, 2011; Eyler & Giles, 1999; Holland & Hollander; 2006, Rubin, 1996; Strickland, 2007; Vogel & Seifer, 2011; Weerts & Hudson, 2009). The question asked participants to rate their level of agreement that each perceived benefit occurred using a one-to-four Likert-type scale, with "one" indicating that the participant strongly disagreed with the statement and "four" indicating that the participant strongly agreed with the statement.

Ninety-seven percent of administrators reported that their institutions experienced improved public relations from marketing their service-learning courses and/or programs, while 79% reported improved student retention and increased support from foundations. Seventy-seven percent of administrators perceived their institutions experienced increased donor giving, 71% perceived an increase in student admissions, and 67% perceived an increase of corporate sponsorship due to promoting service-learning initiatives. Table 17 illustrates the responses to these items.

Table 17

Administrators Perceptions of a Financial Benefit Accrued to the University from Marketing Service-Learning Courses or Programs

Benefit Accrued	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
Increased Student Admissions	5	21	57	6
Improved Student Retention	2	17	57	14
Improved Public Relations	1	2	60	28
Increased Donor Giving	2	19	61	8
Increased Support from Foundations	2	17	59	11
Increased Corporate Sponsorships	1	28	55	4
Total	13	104	349	71

A few participants responded to open-ended questions regarding benefits they thought accrued to the university from marketing their service-learning courses and programs, with one respondent noting among the benefits that there were no expenses associated with the service-learning courses or programs and another agreeing since students donate their time. A third respondent, however, commented, "I don't think the planning team realized the costs associated with service learning because many people perceive service and volunteerism to always be a 'free' thing. This means they rarely fully consider the administrative costs to manage the program, supply cost for completing projects, travel and insurance costs to get students to the project site when necessary, etc."

CHAPTER FIVE

Summary, Findings, and Recommendations

The purpose of the study was to examine, within the context of increasing economic instability in higher education, the various costs and utility of multiple measures of service-learning initiatives as perceived by higher education administrators. A cost-utility (CU) analysis was used because it allowed administrators to weigh the importance of reported outcomes of service learning – including improved student learning, contribution to student recruitment, increased retention, and enhanced institutional fundraising (Bringle & Hatcher, 1996; Burlingame, 2011; Butin, 2007; Davis, 2011; Eyler & Giles, 1999; Holland & Hollander; 2006, Rubin, 1996; Strickland, 2007; Vogel & Seifer, 2011; Weerts & Hudson, 2009) —against the costs of providing a service-learning program. Since no previous studies exploring factors which might explain how administrators determine which benefits and the level to which those benefits must rise for the institution to make an investment in service-learning courses and programs were identified, the data collected in this study begin to address that deficiency in information by establishing an initial account of administrators' perceptions of the costs and benefits of service-learning programs in their institutions. The five research questions, listed below, were linked to service learning as explored in Chapter Two:

1) Do administrators perceive a difference in student-learning outcomes between service-learning courses and conventional courses?
2) To what extent, if any, do administrators perceive the existence of a service-learning requirement contributes to student recruitment?
3) To what extent, if any, do administrators perceive the existence of a service-learning requirement contributes to student retention?

4) To what extent, if any, do administrators perceive the existence of a service-learning requirement contributes to fundraising?
5) Do administrators perceive there are financial benefits for the university from the implementation of service-learning courses and/or programs?

Sample

A survey was sent to the college presidents, provosts/chief academic officers, vice-presidents of finance, and vice-presidents/deans of student affairs at institutions affiliated with the 123 schools with membership in the associations and councils of independent colleges and universities in Kentucky, North Carolina, Tennessee, Virginia, and West Virginia (See Appendix E). The sample for this study was less two institutions, the researcher's recent employer and the lone two-year institution holding membership in North Carolina Independent Colleges and Universities' association, for a sample of 123. This sample was comprised of schools with 14 different Carnegie Classifications: 39 institutions were Bac/Diverse; 33 were Bac/A&S; 12 were Master's M; seven were Master's S; 11 were Master's L; one was RU/H; three were RU/VH; six were Spec/Health; one was Spec/Law; and two schools each were identified as Bac/Assoc, DRU, Spec/Arts, Spec/Faith, and Spec/Med. Eighty-six percent of these institutions overtly stated service or citizenship in their mission statements, core values, or institutional goals or purpose statements, and 34 % were members of Campus Compact (Campus Compact, 2015). Survey invitations were sent to 698 individuals, of whom 99 chose to participate in the study.

Methods

This descriptive case study investigated how higher education administrators perceived the costs and the utility associated with service learning in the curricular and cocurricular areas of their institutions. To this purpose, a survey questionnaire was designed for and distributed to a

sample of select administrators from the 123 schools with membership in the associations and councils of independent colleges and universities in Kentucky, North Carolina, Tennessee, Virginia, and West Virginia (See Appendix E), less two institutions. The sample was comprised of schools with 14 different Carnegie Classifications, 86% percent of these institutions overtly stated service or citizenship in their mission statements, core values, or institutional goals or purpose statements, and 34 % were members of Campus Compact (Campus Compact, 2015).

The researcher-designed survey instrument (Appendix C) was tested for face and content validity through a pilot study of administrators at institutions outside of the study population. The survey was administered to the sample using the Survey Monkey website. Survey invitations were emailed to each of the 698 administrators identified from searching the websites of the 123 colleges and universities in the study sample. A follow-up email was sent approximately 2 weeks after the initial invitation was sent. The survey remained available for approximately 30 days.

Quantitative data were analyzed using the SPSS 22 software package. Qualitative data were subjected to an emergent category analysis and subsequently processed in SPSS. The qualitative component of this study was limited in scope and intended to elicit any further insights administrators may have had related to specific research questions. These findings are summarized along with quantitative findings in the sections that follow.

Summary of Findings

Research Question One: Do administrators perceive a difference in student-learning outcomes between service-learning courses and conventional courses?

Administrators in this study felt that student learning outcomes were stronger in service-learning courses than in traditional courses, but there was no significant relationship between administrators' roles and their perceptions that service-learning courses provided more opportunities for students to integrate, synthesize, and apply knowledge than did traditional

courses. With the exception of one vice president of finance, all of the administrators in the study agreed or strongly agreed there were greater opportunities for students to apply knowledge in their service-learning courses than traditional courses.

Administrators in the study also felt that students taking service-learning courses had a deeper understanding of course concepts as well as stronger student learning outcomes than students taking traditional courses. Finally, administrators felt that students in service-learning courses had a greater appreciation for diversity, better interpersonal skills, and higher levels of motivation than in traditional courses.

These findings fall in line with Eyler and Giles' seminal studies (1999), which reported students' perceptions of a variety of academic and citizenship behavior outcomes for themselves in service-learning courses. Students had self-reported better mastery of subject matter, improved critical thinking ability, an increased appreciation for diversity, and an increased level of tolerance and appreciation of other cultures.

Research Question Two: To what extent, if any, do administrators perceive the existence of a service-learning requirement contributes to student recruitment?

Administrators who participated in this study believed that a service-learning requirement contributed to their recruitment activities somewhat, but not a great deal. More than 50% of administrators surveyed believed that service-learning used at/on recruitment events, prospective student and family days, publications, recruiting pages on campus websites, and recruitment emails had only a moderate influence on recruitment efforts. Administrators generally did not believe their institutions used service-learning requirements or programs to target specific groups (e.g., faculty, staff, community members, alumni, sponsors); however, 13% of administrators reported their institutions use service-learning programs "a lot" for marketing to and recruiting potential donors for these purposes. Fifty-one percent of administrators in this study believed

their institutions used service-learning courses and/or programs to target prospective students and their families "somewhat"; however, only 10% of them believed that their institutions used service-learning requirements or programs "a lot" to target prospective students and their families for recruitment purposes. These findings are in conflict with Vogel and Seifer's (2011) study where students reported that the opportunity to participate in service learning was important when selecting their institution. Furthermore, only 40% of administrators said their institutions used service-learning programs for recruitment and marketing purposes to target current students and their families.

These findings are in conflict with a previous study in which students had self-reported that service-learning opportunities were an important reason they chose their institutions (Vogel & Seifer, 2011) and one in which prospective students were targeted with marketing materials about service-learning courses at the institution for recruitment purposes (Rubin, 1996). Neither do these findings align with a previous report of marketing departments using service-learning accomplishments to keep the institutions name in the press or marketing departments collaborating with service-learning staff to create marketing materials which highlighted service-learning opportunities (Bringle & Hatcher, 2010).

Research Question Three: To what extent, if any, do administrators perceive the existence of a service-learning requirement contributes to student retention?

Overall administrators believed that both learning and retention were largely shaped by faculty contact; however, 20% of vice presidents of student life disagreed with that position. Administrators also reported that peer contact outside of the classroom encouraged students to persist in college. These results support Tinto's (1993) finding that a link between students' broad learning experiences and retention exists. He found that the stronger the connections between and among students and their faculty and peers, specifically outside of the classroom,

the less likely they were to depart the institution. Previous studies highlighted service-learning participants' increase in time spent interacting with faculty and peers outside of the classroom via service learning may increase student-faculty contact and, ultimately, contribute to student retention (Astin & Sax , 1998; Eyler & Giles, 1999).

Eighty-four percent of administrators in this study perceived that service-learning was particularly associated with retention of first-generation students, and 80% of them believed both that service-learning was associated with retention of students during the freshman year and that service-learning was associated with student persistence to degree completion. Service-learning, thus, may be a way for administrators to minimize the conventional departure of one-third of freshman from their original institution (Habley, Bloom, & Robbins, 2012). Despite administrators' belief that a service-learning requirement contributes to student retention, however, only 47% of them said that their campuses had actually increased student retention via service-learning initiatives.

Research Question Four: To what extent, if any, do administrators perceive the existence of a service-learning requirement contributes to fundraising?

All administrators in the study believed that fundraising efforts had to focus on their organizations' missions and programs, and more than 90% felt that funding service learning helped to meet their institutions' mission statements. They also indicated that investments in service learning needed to be measured, and that donors wanted evidence that their gifts made a difference to the institutions and the community. All vice presidents of advancement/ development, whose job responsibilities require that they be attuned to what does and does not appeal to donors, agreed or strongly agreed that donors want evidence that their gifts make a difference at the institution.

More than 80% of administrators think that businesses give to community needs, that their institutions' leadership mentioned service learning in speeches or fundraising efforts, and that their institutions leveraged donor support by featuring community engagement efforts in alumni publications. Three-quarters of administrators in the study agreed that foundation support is often the catalyst for vital projects at their schools and 61% of them disagreed with Ostrander's (2007) finding that foundation support has shifted away from service learning initiatives. Furthermore, 80% of administrators reported that their institutions should absorb the funding for service-learning courses and/or programs once external funding has been exhausted, an interesting finding in today's environment of budgetary cuts and cost containment in higher education.

Research Question Five: Do administrators perceive there are financial benefits for the university from the implementation of service-learning courses and/or programs?

Administrators perceived there were financial benefits for the university from the implementation of service-learning courses and/or programs, the greatest of which was an improvement in public relations (97%) and the least beneficial of which was an increase in corporate sponsorship (67%). The perception by administrators that service-learning provided financial benefit to their institutions was highlighted with 79% reporting improved student retention and increased foundation support, 77% identifying an increase in donor giving, and 71% experiencing an increase in student admissions.

Participants also responded to open-ended questions regarding benefits they thought accrued to their universities from marketing their service-learning courses and programs. One respondent noted that there were no expenses associated with the service-learning courses or programs while another reported that students donated their time. However, a third respondent commented, "I don't think the planning team realized the costs associated with service learning

because many people perceive service and volunteerism to always be a 'free' thing. This means they rarely fully consider the administrative costs to manage the program, supply cost for completing projects, travel and insurance costs to get students to the project site when necessary, etc."

Perhaps some administrators have viewed service learning as "free" or have not fully acknowledged the expense of offering service-learning courses or programs; however, they will likely have to account for the costs and benefits of these programs moving forward. Given the current economic environment of decreased funding and increased competition for students, administrators may view service learning as a way through which to compete and survive while adhering to their mission statements.

Discussion and Implications

At a time when changes in our economy have created a new reality for higher education, including decreased funding, escalating operational costs, and greater competition to recruit and retain students, among the things university administrators have to reconsider is the purpose of higher education, including its historical role in developing engaged citizens. Service learning, which has been reported to be an effective pedagogy benefitting students while they are providing a tangible benefit to the community as well as an effective recruiting and retention strategy, (Astin & Sax, 1998; Bringle & Hatcher, 2010; Bringle & Hatcher, 1996; Eyler & Giles, 1999; Hurd, 2006; Jacoby, 2009b; Rubin, 1996; Vogel & Siefer, 2011; Yeh, 2010), could yet fall victim to budgetary constraints – thus undermining one avenue through which institutions have met their historical commitment to service and engagement.

Small private colleges, like those in this study's sample, largely depend on students paying tuition and fees to remain financially viable. Austerity budgets and increased competition

for students from both public institutions and more accessible online programs require administrators to leverage their institutions' unique offerings to potential students and their families. Furthermore, the majority of private non-profit institutions lack national and/or international name recognition or provide their graduates with a notable return on investment (Clark, 2015; Hayes, 2015; Woodhouse, 2015). Given the current environment and the additional challenges private, non-profit colleges and universities face, the study's finding that a service-learning requirement moderately influenced and contributed to six specific student recruitment activities -- recruitment events, prospective student and family visit days, publications, recruiting pages on institutional websites, and recruitment emails – may be notable. This study reported that administrators used service-learning programs for recruitment and marketing purposes by targeting prospective students and their families either some of the time (51%) or a lot of the time (10%). This strategy may be one way for four-year, non-profit institutions to leverage the academic benefits of service learning for recruitment purposes, potentially assisting the institution in enhancing financially stability while addressing higher education's role in civic engagement.

Service-learning scholars have not only reported a link between student recruitment and service-learning, but they also reported a strong association between service-learning experiences and students' transitions from high school to college (Bringle & Hatcher, 1996; Holland & Hollander, 2006). Educational researcher Vincent Tinto, regarded as an expert in the field of higher education student retention, found a link between students' learning experiences and their departure from college, discovering that the stronger the connection between students and their faculty and peers, specifically outside of the classroom, the less likely they were to leave the institution (1993). Other educational researchers have also reported a link between

service-learning and time spent outside of the classroom with faculty and peers from those classes (Astin & Sax, 1998; Eyler & Giles, 1999).

This study found that administrators believed that faculty contact largely shaped retention and that peer contact outside of the classroom encouraged persistence, both supporting previous studies on characteristics of service-learning experiences (Astin & Sax, 1998; Eyler & Giles, 1999). Furthermore, this study discovered that administrators associated service-learning with retention of first-generation college students, freshmen, and all students to degree completion. Knowing that there are fewer students to recruit and fewer who attend college, administrators need to recognize and implement effective retention strategies at their institutions in order to increase their return on investment from the ever-increasing expense of recruitment. Service-learning courses and programs may be one strategy for improving retention, especially for those students deemed most likely to depart the institution (e.g., first generation students, freshmen).

Educational researchers Eyler and Giles, who found that 30% more of the service-learning participants than the non-service-learning participants reported a "close personal relationship with a faculty member," suggested that one benefit of service learning is the creation of student-faculty relationships (1999, p. 52). Despite this study's supporting these earlier finding about student-faculty relationships and improved retention, 47% of administrators reported in the study that their campuses did not increase retention because of service-learning initiatives.

Although private non-profit colleges are largely tuition-dependent, they also rely heavily on fundraising efforts for financial security. This study found that administrators perceived the existence of a service-learning requirement to contribute to fundraising efforts at their institutions, a finding that supports previous research in which institutions touting an engagement

brand were found to have a better chance of securing private and public support and funding than those not branding themselves as leaders in service or engagement (Holland & Hollander, 2006; Weerts & Hudson, 2009).

Administrators in this study also believed that donors want evidence that their gifts make a difference at the institution and/or in the community. This finding supports previous studies' finding that donors are more interested in giving to specific programs with observable outcomes because they are "looking for tangible evidence that their gifts are making a difference" (Grace & Wendroff, 2001; Weerts & Hudson, 2009).

Administrators in this study reported that foundation support is often a catalyst for vital projects, such as service-learning, on their campuses. Moreover, they believed that once implemented using external funding, institutions should absorb the cost of the service-learning programs once that funding stream has been exhausted. This is an interesting perspective given the economic situation most institutions of higher education find themselves in today. Despite Ostrander's (2007) finding that foundation support has shifted away from service-learning, this study found that administrators do not agree that this is so. Knowing that institutions often utilize external funding to initiate new programs and that administrators expect their institutions to absorb the expense to run these programs after the external funding ends, it seems pertinent that administrators evaluate service-learning programs for their effectiveness in retaining students.

One of the study's most important findings was that after weighing various reported effects of service-learning (e.g., student learning, student recruitment, student retention, fundraising), administrators perceived a financial benefit accrued to the institution when service-learning courses and/or programs were implemented. This study found that administrators believed that implementing service-learning courses and/or programs at their institutions

increased student admissions (71%), improved student retention (79%), improved public relations (97%), increased donor giving (77%), increased support from foundations (79%), and increased corporate sponsorship (67%). Clearly, administrators who participated in this study believe that service-learning is worth the investment in a variety of areas including student learning, student recruitment, student retention, and increased fundraising.

Recommendations for Future Research

This study examined administrators' perspectives on the perceived financial benefits that accrued to their institutions from the implementation of service-learning courses and programs, specifically whether service-learning requirements were perceived to contribute to student learning, recruitment, retention, and fundraising. Findings from both the literature review and analysis of survey data unearthed a number of avenues for future research. These include the following.

1. The population of the sample for this study included 123 private, four-year schools in five states with a small survey response rate. To that end, future research might involve a different and larger sample to determine whether the study's findings can be supported.
2. Administrators in this study reported that service learning is not heavily used for recruiting students; however, in previous studies (Jacoby, 2009b; Rubin, 1996; Vogel & Seifer, 2011) students, faculty, and staff reported that service-learning was important to them when selecting a school. To that end, future research might involve an examination of whether other administrators share this particular view. Such a study might explore the prevalence of service-learning activities featured in various recruiting tools (e.g., brochures, viewbooks, websites), question key

administrators to learn the reasons for the inclusion or exclusion of service-learning opportunities in marketing materials at their institutions, and further examine administrators' perceptions of the potential effect(s) of service learning on student recruitment.

3. Administrators in this study validated Tinto's (1993) theory on student retention, but fewer than half of them saw service learning as a venue for engagement that may improve student retention at their institutions. To that end, future research might involve an examination of whether other administrators believe that faculty and peer contact outside of the classroom is an important practice for increasing retention are aware that service-learning substantially increases out-of-classroom contact with faculty and peers. Such a study might examine key administrator' perspectives on practices they believe best contribute to student retention and investigate specifically the extent to which they view service learning as a viable option in the effort.
4. This study found that a majority of administrators believed that their investment in service-learning must be measured; however, it did not uncover specifically how administrators measure these initiatives. Researchers might seek to determine the types of ways in which administrators measure their investments in service-learning and how those results influence further investments, or lack thereof, in service-learning initiatives at their institutions.
5. This study found that more than 80% of administrators believed that donor support from alumni is leveraged by highlighting service learning initiatives. Researchers might seek to corroborate whether service learning does, in fact, lead to increased donor giving on college campuses.

6. This study reported on the perceptions of select administrators from four-year, private institutions in five Appalachian states (i.e., Kentucky, North Carolina, Tennessee, Virginia, and West Virginia). Researchers might replicate the study at four-year public institutions in these same states to determine whether there are differences among administrators' perceptions on service learning as it relates to student learning outcomes, recruitment, retention, fundraising, and accruing financial benefits to the institution.

References

ACT. (2014). Retrieved October 15, 2014 from http://www.act.org/

Ash, S., Clayton, P., & Atkinson, M. (Spring 2005). Integrating reflection and assessment to capture and improve student learning. *Michigan Journal of Community Service-Learning, 11*(2), 49-60.

Astin, A. (1994, October). *Higher education and the future of democracy.* Inaugural lecture as Allan Murray Cartter chairholder, University of California, Los Angeles.

Astin, A., & Sax, L. (1998). How undergraduates are affected by service participation. *Journal of College Student Development, 39*(3), 251-263. Retrieved from http://www.coastal.edu/media/academics/servicelearning/documents/How%20Undergraduates%20are%20Affected%20by%20Service%20Participation.pdf

Atkinson-Alston, S. A. (2013). *California community colleges and entrepreneurial service learning: The effect on student retention and transfer* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from http://gradworks.umi.com/35/54/3554795.html

Ayella, A., Bowman, B., & Decker, K. (2013). Measuring the impact of service-learning in higher education: How personal set characteristics, academic performance, and civic engagement interact in the presence of service-learning (Research Report). Retrieved March 2015 from Kansas Campus Compact website: http://www.k-state.edu/kscc/documents/Ayella_Bowman_Decker.pdf

Batchelder, T., & Root, S. (1994). Effects of an undergraduate program to integrate academic learning and service: Cognitive, prosocial cognitive, and identity outcomes. *Journal of Adolescence, 17*(4), 341-355. Retrieved from http://www.ydae.purdue.edu/lct/hbcu/documents/Effects_of_an_UG_Program_to_Integrate_Academic_Learning_and_Service.pdf

Beal, J. (2012). Academic-service partnerships in nursing: An integrative review. *Nursing Research and Practice, 2012,* 1-9. doi 10.1155/2012/501564

Bejou, D., & Bejou, A. (2012). Shared governance and punctuated equilibrium in higher education: The case for student recruitment, retention, and graduation. *Journal of Relationship Marketing, 11*(4), 248-258.

Bell, R., Furco, A., Ammon, M., Muller, P., & Sorgen, V. (2000). *Institutionalizing service-learning in higher education.* Berkeley, CA: University of California.

Biemiller, L. (2015, March 2). Survival at stake. *Chronicle of Higher Education.* Retrieved from http://ezproxy.marshall.edu:2225/article/With-Survival-at-Stake-Small/190491/

Boyer, E. (1994, March 9). Creating the new American college. *Chronicle of Higher Education,* p. 48.

Braxton, J. M., & McClendon, S. A. (2002). The fostering of student integration and retention through institutional practice. *Journal of College Student Retention: Research, Theory & Practice, 3*(1), 57-71.

Bringle, R., & Hatcher, J. (2009). Innovative practices in service-learning and curricular engagement. *New Directions for Higher Education, 147*, 37-46. doi: 10/1002/he.356

Bringle, R., & Hatcher, J. (1996). Implementing service learning in higher education. *The Journal of Higher Education, 67*(2), 221-239.

Bringle, R., & Hatcher, J. (2000). Institutionalization of service-learning in higher education. *The Journal of Higher Education, 71*(3), 273-290.

Bringle, R., Phillips, M., & Hudson, M. (2004). *The measure of service learning: Research scales to assess student experiences.* Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Bringle, R., & Steinberg, K. (2010). Educating for informed community involvement. *American Journal of Community Psychology, 46,* 428-441. doi: 10.1007/s10464-010-9340-y

Bringle, R. G., Clayton, P. H., & Hatcher, J. A. (2013). Research on service learning. In P. Clayton, R. Bringle, & J. Hatcher (Eds.), *Research on service learning: Conceptual frameworks and assessments* (1st ed., pp. 3-25). Sterling, VA: Stylus.

Burlingame, D. F. (2011). Corporate giving and fundraising. In E. R. Tempel, T. L. Seiler, & E. E. Aldrich (Eds.), *Achieving excellence in fundraising* (3rd ed., pp. 138-149). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Butin, D. W. (2006). The limits of service-learning in higher education. *The Review of Higher Education, 29*(4), 473-498.

Butin, D. W. (2007, November/December). Focusing our aim: Strengthening faculty commitment to community engagement. *Change.* Retrieved from http://www.changemag.org/Archives/Back%20Issues/November-December%202007/abstract-focusing-our-aim.html

Campus Compact. (2014a). *List of members by state.* Retrieved October 15, 2014 from http://compact.org/who-we-are/our-coalition/membership/members/

Campus Compact. (2014b). *Statistics.* Retrieved October 15, 2014 from http://www.compact.org/about/statistics/

Campus Compact, Compact Current. (2003, Fall). *Advancing community engagement.* Retrieved October 15, 2014 from http://www.compact.org/current/issues/2003_Fall.pdf

Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, Community Engagement Elective Classification. Retrieved October 2, 2014, from http://carnegieclassifications.iu.edu/

Catterall, J. S. (1998). A cost-effectiveness model for the assessment of educational productivity. *New Directions for Higher Education, 103,* 61-84. doi: 10.1002/he.10305

Clark, K. (2015, March 4). Some small private colleges are facing a "death spiral." *Money.* Retrieved March 15, 2015 from http://time.com/money/3731250/sweet-briar-private-college-death-spiral/

Cox, B. G. (2013). *Academic and social integration of the non-traditional college student: Does engagement affect retention?* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from http://libres.uncg.edu/ir/uncc/f/Cox_uncc_0694D_10449.pdf

Cunningham, A. (2006). *The broader societal benefits of higher education.* Retrieved from https://english.highline.edu/developmental/Broader%20Social%20Benefits.pdf

Curry, J., Rodin, S., & Carlson, N. (2012). Fundraising in difficult economic times: Best practices. *Christian Higher Education, 11*(4), 241-252. doi:10.1080/15363759.2011.559872

Davis, G. P. (2011). Foundation fundraising. In E. R. Tempel, T. L. Seiler, & E. E. Aldrich (Eds.), *Achieving excellence in fundraising* (3rd ed., pp. 150-161). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Dewey, J. (1938). *Experience as education.* New York, NY: Collier Books.

Driscoll, A. (n.d.). *The benchmarking potential of the new Carnegie Classification: Community engagement.* Retrieved from Campus Compact website: http://www.compact.org/resources/future-of-campus-engagement/the-benchmarking-potential-of-the-new-carnegie-classification-community-engagement/4257/

Ehrenberg, R. (2012). American higher education in transition. *Journal of Economic Perspectives, 26*(1), 193-216.

Ehrenberg, R. (2013, May/June). Is the golden age of the private research university over? *Change.* Retrieved from http://www.changemag.org/Archives/Back%20Issues/2013/May-June%202013/golden-age-abstract.html

Enright, W. G., & Seiler, T. L. (2011). The practice of stewardship. In E. R. Tempel, T. L. Seiler, & E. E. Aldrich (Eds.), *Achieving excellence in fundraising* (3rd ed., pp. 268-273). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Epstein, E. M. (1999). The continuing quest for accountable, ethical, and humane corporate capitalism: An enduring challenge for social issues in management in the new millennium. *Business and Society, 38*(3), 253-267.

Eyler, J. (2001). Creating your reflection map. *New Directions in Higher Education, 114,* 35-43.

Eyler, J. (2002). Reflection: Linking service and learning – linking students and communities. *Journal of Social Issues, 58*(3), 517-534.

Eyler, J., & Giles, D. E., Jr. (1999). *Where's the service in service-learning?* San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.

Fain, P. (2012, October). Performing under pressure. *Inside Higher Education.* Retrieved from https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2012/10/22/better-measures-college-performance

Felten, P., & Clayton, P. H. (2011). Service-learning. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning, 128,* 75-84. doi: 10.1002/tl.470

Ferrall, Jr., V. (2011). *Liberal arts at the brink.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Furco, A. (2001). Advancing service-learning at research universities. *New Directions for Higher Education, 2001*(114), 67-78.

Furco, A., & Holland, B. (2009). Securing administrator support for service-learning institutionalization. In J. Strait, & M. Lima (Eds.), *The future of service-learning* (pp. 52-64). Sterling, VA: Stylus Publishing, LLC.

Furco, A., & Moely, B. E., (2012). Using learning communities to build faculty support for pedagogical innovation: A multi-campus study. *The Journal of Higher Education, 83*(1), 128-153.

Gabelnick, F. (1997, January/February). Educating a committed citizenry. *Change, 29*(1), 30-35.

Govekar, M., & Rishi, M. (September/October 2007). Service-learning: Bringing real-world education into the B-school classroom. *Journal of Education for Business, 83*(1), 3-10.

Grace, K., & Wendroff, A. (2001, March 8). High impact philanthropy. (Review of the book *High impact philanthropy: How donors, boards, and nonprofit organizations can transform communities,* by K. Grace & A. Wendroff). *Chronicle of Philanthropy, 13*(10). Retrieved from http://ezproxy.marshall.edu:2117/ehost/detail/detail?sid=6ee7cb6d-f6dc-42d2-b0d9-6ff76517f9a8%40sessionmgr114&vid=14&hid=107&bdata=JnNpdGU9ZWhvc3QtbGl2ZQ%3d%3d#db=aph&AN=4297780

Habley, W., Bloom, J., & Robbins, S. (2012). *Increasing persistence: Research-based strategies for college student success.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Harkavy, I., & Hartley, M. (2010). Pursuing Franklin's dream: Philosophical and historical roots of service-learning. *American Journal of Community Psychology, 46,* 418-427. doi: 10.1007/s10464-010- . 9341-x

Hauser, S. M. (2000). Education, ability, and civic engagement in the contemporary United States. *Social Science Research, 29*(4), 556-582.

Hayes, A. (2015, January 26). Letter from the president. *Inside Higher Ed.* Retrieved from https://www.insidehighered.com/views/2015/06/26/small-private-colleges-need-confront-their-financial-viability-essay

Helgesen, O. (2008). Marketing for higher education: A relationship marketing approach. *Journal of Marketing in Higher Education, 18*(1), 50-78. doi: 10.1080/08841240802100188

Hellman, C., Hoppes, S., & Ellison, G. (2006). Factors associated with college student intent to engage in community service. *The Journal of Psychology, 140*(1), 29-39.

Higher Education Act of 1965, Title IV – Student Assistance. 20 USC 1070. Sec 400-498B (2002). Retrieved from http://www.tgslc.org/pdf/HEA_Title_IV_Oct02.pdf

Holland, B. A. (2001), A Comprehensive Model for Assessing Service-Learning and Community-University Partnerships. *New Directions for Higher Education, 114,* 51–60. doi:10.1002/he.13

Holland, B. A., & Hollander, E. (2006). Campus Compact's 20/20 vision: Celebrating our first twenty years and planning for the next two decades. Retrieved from http://www.compact.org/wp-content/uploads/2009/04/framing_essay.pdf

Horgan, T. R., & Scire, D. (2007). Enhancing access and building a campus culture of civic engagement and service-learning: A dual consortial approach. *New Directions for Higher Education, 138,* 83-94. doi: 10.1002/he.259

Hurd, C. (2006). Is service-learning effective?: A look at current research. Retrieved from http://www.floridacompact.org/forums/viewtopic.php?t=1821

Jacoby, B. (1999). Partnerships for service learning. *New Directions for Student Services, 87,* 19-35.

Jacoby, B. (2009a). *Civic engagement in higher education: Concepts and practices.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Jacoby, B. (2009b). Facing the unsettled questions about service-learning. In J. Strait & M. Lima (Eds.), *The future of service-learning: New solutions for sustaining and improving practice* (pp. 90-105). Sterling, VA: Stylus.

Johnson, N., & Leachman, M. (2013). Four big threats to state finances could undermine future U.S. prosperity. *Center on budget and policy priorities.* Retrieved from http://www.cbpp.org/cms/?fa=view&id=3903

Johnson, N., Oliff, P., & Williams, E. (2011). An update on state budget cuts. *Center on budget and policy priorities.* Retrieved from http://www.cbpp.org/cms/?fa=view&id=1214

Jameson, J. K., Clayton, P. H., & Ash, S. L. (2013). Conceptualizing, assessing, and investigating academic learning in service learning. In P. H. Clayton, R. G. Bringle, & J. A. Hatcher, (Eds.), *Research on service learning: Conceptual frameworks and assessment* (Vol. 2A, pp. 85 - 110). Sterling, VA: Stylus.

Keen, C., & Hall, K. (2009). Engaging with difference matters: Longitudinal student outcomes of co-curricular service-learning programs. *The Journal of Higher Education, 80*(1), 59-79.

Kelderman, E. (2015, January 19). State spending on higher education inches up, but fiscal pitfalls remain. *Chronicle of Higher Education.* Retrieved from http://ezproxy.marshall.edu:2225/article/State-Spending-on-Higher/151251/

Kendall, J. (Ed.). (1990). *Combining Service and Learning: A Resource Book for Community and Public Service.* Raleigh, NC: National Society for Internships and Experiential Education.

Kezar, A. (2002). Assessing community service learning: Are we identifying the right outcomes? *About Campus, 7*(2), 14-20.

Kuh, G. (2008) Why integration and engagement are essential to effective educational practice in the twenty-first century. *Peer Review, 10*(4), 27-28.

Lantta, M. M., *An examination of higher education stakeholders' perceptions on the effectiveness of retention efforts that impact student persistence from freshman to sophomore year.* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from http://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED564786

Levin, H., & McEwan, P. (2001). *Cost-effectiveness analysis (*2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Lounsbury, M., & Pollack, S. (2001). Institutionalizing civic engagement: Shifting logics and the cultural repackaging of service-learning in US higher education. *Organization, 8*(2), 319-339. doi: 10.1177/1350508401082016

Maffeo Jr., G., & Goldsmith, M. (2009). Managing the business of the 3Rs in higher education: recruitment, retention and revenue. *Proceedings of the northeast business & economics association,* 113-114.

Maringe, F., & Gibbs, P. (2009). *Marketing higher education and practice.* New York, NY: McGraw Hill.

Melancon, M., & Frederick, L. (2014). Angling for graduates: Holes in the retention net. *International Journal of Education Research, 9*(1), 125-133.

Morrill Act of 1862. 7 USC. Sec 302-304. Retrieved March 2015 from: http://www.loc.gov/rr/program/bib/ourdocs/Morrill.html

Morton, K., & Troppe, M. (1996). From the margin to the mainstream: Campus Compact's project on integrating service with academic study. *Journal of Business Ethics, 15,* 21-32.

Mpofu, E. (Fall 2007). Service-learning effects on the academic learning of rehabilitation services students. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning, 14* (1), 46-52.

Mundy, M., & Eyler, J. (2002). *Service-learning & retention: Promising possibilities, potential partnerships.* Retrieved from http://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED482320

National and Community Service Act of 1990. PL 101-610;sec 100 (21) (A-D). Retrieved March 2015 from: http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/STATUTE-104/pdf/STATUTE-104-Pg3127.pdf

National and Community Service Trust Act of 1993. PL 103-82; sec 119 (b)(3). Retrieved March 15, 2015 from: http://www.google.com/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=1&cad=rja&uact=8&ved=0CB4QFjAA&url=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.gpo.gov%2Ffdsys%2Fpkg%2FSTATUTE-107%2Fpdf%2FSTATUTE-107-Pg785.pdf&ei=q3_7VP_TA8qIsQSsmIEo&usg=AFQjCNFeR2-AGkDKBRf7b3jhIAzUHWOhpg&sig2=XC4NVztlWiaEW22mD90S3g

National Center for Education Statistics. (2014). Retrieved October 12, 2014 from http://nces.ed.gov/

National Service-Learning Clearinghouse. (2013). Retrieved October 12, 2014 from https://gsn.nylc.org/clearinghouse

National Society for Experiential Education. (2014). Retrieved October 2, 2014 from: http://www.nsee.org/

New England Resource Center for Higher Education. (2015). Retrieved from http://nerche.org/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=341&Itemid=92

Ng, I. C. L., & Forbes, J. (2009). Education as service: The understanding of university experience through service logic. *Journal of Marketing for Higher Education, 19*(1), 38-64. doi: 10.1080/08841240902904703

Noel-Levitz, Inc. (2009). *2009 student recruitment practices and strategies at four-year and two-year institutions.* Higher Ed Benchmarks series. Retrieved from https://www.noellevitz.com/documents/shared/Papers_and_Research/2009/StudentRecruitmentPracticesandStrategies09.pdf

Ostrander, S. A. (2007). Innovation, accountability, and independence at three private foundations funding higher education civic engagement, 1995 to 2005. *Nonprofit Management and Leadership, 18*(2), 237-251. doi: 10.1002/nml.183

Palfreyman, D. (2007). Markets, models and metrics in higher education. *Perspectives: Policy and Practice in Higher Education, 11*(3), 78-87.

Pascarella, E. T., & Terenzini, P. T. (1991). *How college affects students: Findings and insights from twenty years of research.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Patton, L. D., Morelon, C., Whitehead, D. M., & Hossler, D. (2006). Campus-based retention initiatives: Does the emperor have clothes? In E. P. St. John & M. Wilkerson (Eds.), *Reframing persistence research to improve academic success* (pp. 9-24). New Directions for Institutional Research, No. 130. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Peterson, T. (2009). Engaged scholarship: reflections and research on the pedagogy of social change. *Teaching in Higher Education, 14*(5), 541-552. doi: 10.1080/13562510903186741

Porter Honnet, E., & Poulsen, S. (1989). *Principles of good practice for combining service and learning.* Racine, WI: Johnson Foundation.

Prentice, M. (2009). Service-learning's impact on developmental reading/writing and student life skills courses. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice, 33*(3-4), 270-282. doi: 10.1080/10668920802580523

Roberts, S. (2011). Traditional practice for non-traditional students? Examining the role of pedagogy in higher education retention. *Journal of Further and Higher Education, 35*(2), 183-199.

Rooney, P. M., & Nathan, S. K. (2011). Contemporary dynamics in fundraising. In E. R. Tempel, T. L. Seiler, & E. E. Aldrich (Eds.), *Achieving excellence in fundraising* (3rd ed., pp. 117-124). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Rosso, H. A. (2011). A philosophy of fundraising. In E. R. Tempel, T. L. Seiler, & E. E. Aldrich (Eds.), *Achieving excellence in fundraising* (3rd ed., pp. 3-9). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Rubin, S. (1996). Institutionalizing service-learning. In B. Jacoby (Ed.), *Service-learning in higher education* (pp. 297-316). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Sallie Mae Bank, (2014). How America pays for college: *Sallie Mae's National Study of College Students and Parents.* Retrieved from http://news.salliemae.com/files/doc_library/file/HowAmericaPaysforCollege2014FNL.pdf

Shaw, J. (2011). What will colleges do when the bubble bursts? *Academic Questions, 24*(4), 438-448. Retrieved from http://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ951390

Shulock, N., & Harrison, M. (1998). Integrating planning, assessment, and resource allocation. *Planning for Higher Education, 26*(3), 29-37.

Stephenson, A. L., & Bell, N. (2014). Motivation for alumni donations: A social identity perspective on the role of branding in higher education. *International Journal of Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Marketing, 19,* 176-186. doi: 10.1002/nvsm.1495

Strickland, S. (2007). Partners in writing and rewriting history: Philanthropy and higher education. *International Journal of Educational Advancement, 7*(2), 104-116.

Tinto, V. (1993). *Leaving college: Rethinking the causes and cures of student attrition.* Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Vander Schee, B. A., (2009). Embracing enrollment management: A comprehensive approach to college student marketing. *Academy of Marketing Studies Journal, 13*(1), 1-18.

Vogel, A., & Seifer, S. (2011). Impacts of sustained institutional participation in service-Learning: Perspectives from faculty, staff and administrators. *Gateways: International Journal of Community Research and Engagement, 4,* 186-202.

Waggaman, J. (2001). Strategies and consequences: Managing the costs in higher education. In J. L. Yeager, G. M. Nelson, E. A. Potter, J. C Weidman (Eds.), *ASHE reader on finance in higher education* (2nd ed.) (pp. 301 – 315). Boston, MA: Pearson.

Walsh, K., Levin, H., Jaye, P., & Gazzard, J. (2013). Cost analyses approaches in medical education: There are no simple solutions. *Medical Education. 47*(10), 962-968. doi 10.1111/medu.12214

Weber, J., & Weber, P. (2010). Service learning: An empirical analysis of the impact of service learning on civic mindedness. *Journal of Business, Society, and Government, 2*(2), 79-94.

Webber, D., & Ehrenberg, R. (2009). *Do expenditures other than instructional expenditures affect graduation and persistence rates in American higher education* (Working Paper 15216). Retrieved from National Bureau of Economic Research: http://www.nber.org/papers/w15216.pdf

Weerts, D. (2007). Toward an engagement model of institutional advancement at public colleges and universities. *International Journal of Educational Advancement, 7*(2), 79-103. Retrieved from http://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ900283

Weerts, D., & Hudson, E. (2009). Engagement and institutional advancement. *New Directions for Higher Education, 147*, 65-74. doi 10.1002/he.359

Weerts, D., & Ronca, J. (2012). Understanding differences in state support for higher education across states, sectors, and institutions: A longitudinal study. *The Journal of Higher Education, 82*(2), 155-185.

Welch, M. (2009). Moving from service-learning to civic engagement. In B. Jacoby, *Civic engagement in higher education: Concepts and practices* (174-195). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Woodhouse, K. (2015, September 28). Closures to triple. *Inside Higher Ed.* Retrieved from https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2015/09/28/moodys-predicts-college-closures-triple-2017

Yeh, T. L. (2010). Service-learning and persistence of low-income, first generation college students: An exploratory study. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning, 16*(2), 50-65.

Zlotkowski, E. (1995). Does service-learning have a future? *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning, 2*(1), 123-133.

Zlotkowski, V. A., Robbins, S. B., & Noeth, R. J. (2004). The Role of Academic and Non-Academic Factors in Improving College Retention. ACT Policy Report. *American College Testing ACT Inc.*, 1-41. Retrieved from http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED485476.pdf

Appendices

Appendix A: Institutional Review Board Approval

MARSHALL UNIVERSITY
www.marshall.edu

Office of Research Integrity
Institutional Review Board
One John Marshall Drive
Huntington, WV 25755

FWA 00002704

IRB1 #00002205
IRB2 #00003206

July 23, 2015

Bobbi Nicholson, Ph.D.
Leadership Studies, MUGC

RE: IRBNet ID# 782800-1
At: Marshall University Institutional Review Board #2 (Social/Behavioral)

Dear Dr. Nicholson:

Protocol Title:	[782800-1] Higher Education Administrators' Perspectives on Service Learning	
Expiration Date:	July 23, 2016	
Site Location:	MUGC	
Submission Type:	New Project	APPROVED
Review Type:	Exempt Review	

In accordance with 45CFR46.101(b)(2), the above study and informed consent were granted Exempted approval today by the Marshall University Institutional Review Board #2 (Social/Behavioral) Designee for the period of 12 months. The approval will expire July 23, 2016. A continuing review request for this study must be submitted no later than 30 days prior to the expiration date.

This study is for student Briana Cicero-Johns.

If you have any questions, please contact the Marshall University Institutional Review Board #2 (Social/Behavioral) Coordinator Bruce Day, ThD, CIP at 304-696-4303 or day50@marshall.edu. Please include your study title and reference number in all correspondence with this office.

Appendix B: Online Survey Consent Form

Higher Education Administrators' Perspective on Service Learning

ANONYMOUS ONLINE SURVEY CONSENT

You are invited to participate in a research project entitled "Higher Education Administrators' Perspective on Service Learning" designed to examine administrators' perspectives on the perceived financial benefits, if any, that accrue to the institution from the implementation of service-learning courses and programs; the level of financial benefit perceived to be necessary in order to justify the costs of service-learning courses and programs to the institution; and whether service-learning requirements are perceived to contribute to student learning, recruitment, retention, and fundraising. The study is being conducted by Briana Cicero-Johns and supervised by Dr. Barbara Nicholson from Marshall University and has been approved by the Marshall University Institutional Review Board (IRB). This research is being conducted as part of a doctoral dissertation.

This survey is comprised of 16 questions. Your replies will be anonymous, so please do not enter your name or your institution anywhere on the form. There are no known risks involved with this study. Participation is completely voluntary and there will be no penalty or loss of benefits if you choose to not participate in this research study or to withdraw prior to completing the survey. If you choose not to participate you may simply decline to complete the online survey. You may also choose to not answer any question by simply leaving it blank. Once you complete the survey, you can delete your browser history for added security. Completing the online survey indicates your consent for use of the answers you provide. If you have any questions about the study or in the event of a research related injury, you may contact Dr. Barbara Nicholson at 304-746-2094 or at bnicholson@marshall.edu.

If you have any questions concerning your rights as a research participant you may contact the Marshall University Office of Research Integrity at (304) 696-4303.

By completing this survey you are also confirming that you are an administrator at a private four-year institution in Kentucky, North Carolina, Tennessee, Virginia, or West Virginia.

Please print this page for your records.

If you choose to participate in the study, you will find the survey at https://www.surveymonkey.com/s/8WQRB8M.

Appendix C: Survey Instrument

Anonymous Survey Consent

You are invited to participate in a research project entitled "Higher Education Administrators' Perspectives on Service Learning" designed to examine administrators' perspectives on the perceived financial benefits, if any, that accrue to the institution from the implementation of service-learning courses and programs; the level of financial benefit perceived to be necessary in order to justify the costs of service-learning courses and programs to the institution; and whether service-learning requirements are perceived to contribute to student learning, recruitment, retention, and fundraising. The study is being conducted by Briana Cicero-Johns and supervised by Dr. Barbara Nicholson from Marshall University and has been approved by the Marshall University Institutional Review Board (IRB). This research is being conducted as part of a doctoral dissertation.

This survey is comprised of 16 questions. Your replies will be anonymous, so please do not enter your name or your institution anywhere on the form. There are no known risks involved with this study. Participation is completely voluntary and there will be no penalty or loss of benefits if you choose to not participate in this research study or to withdraw prior to completing the survey. If you choose not to participate you may simply decline to complete the online survey. You may also choose to not answer any question by simply leaving it blank. Once you complete the survey, you can delete your browser history for added security. Completing the online survey indicates your consent for use of the answers you provide. If you have any questions about the study or in the event of a research related injury, you may contact Dr. Barbara Nicholson at 304-746-2094 or at bnicholson@marshall.edu.

If you have any questions concerning your rights as a research participant you may contact the Marshall University Office of Research Integrity at (304) 696-4303.

By completing this survey you are also confirming that you are an administrator at a private four-year institution in Kentucky, North Carolina, Tennessee, Virginia, or West Virginia.

Please print this page for your records.

1

1. Which of the following best describes your administrative role?

- ◯ President
- ◯ Provost/VP of academic affairs
- ◯ VP/Chief fundraising/advancement officer
- ◯ VP/Chief enrollment officer/recruiting officer
- ◯ VP of finance/business administration
- ◯ VP/Chief student life/student affairs officer
- ◯ Dean/Director of service learning/engagement

Other (please specify)

2

2. How many years have you worked at your current institution?

3

3. Service-learning is an educational experience in which students participate in an organized service activity that meets identified community needs and reflect on the service activity in such a way as to gain further understanding of course content, a broader appreciation of the discipline, and an enhanced sense of civic responsibility (Bringle & Hatcher, 1996).

In which of the following areas, if any, does your institution offer service-learning experiences?

- [ ] Academic majors/minors
- [ ] Individual academic courses
- [ ] Student life organizations/associations
- [ ] Student life programs/events
- [ ] I do not know

Other (please specify)

4

4. How are service learning experiences funded at your institution? Check all that apply.

- [ ] Institutional funds (budget)
- [ ] Grant funds
- [ ] Foundation/endowment funds
- [ ] Corporate sponsorships
- [ ] Major gifts
- [ ] Tuition
- [ ] Student fees
- [ ] Student-led fundraising
- [ ] I do not know

Other (please specify)

5

5. In general, to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements?

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly agree
Students who participate in service-learning courses have a deeper understanding of course concepts than students in traditional courses.	○	○	○	○
Service-learning courses produce stronger student learning outcomes than traditional courses.	○	○	○	○
Service-learning provides more opportunities for students to integrate, synthesize, and apply knowledge than traditional courses offer.	○	○	○	○
Service-learning provides students with deep, meaningful learning experiences.	○	○	○	○
Students who take service-learning courses develop more appreciation for diversity than those who take traditional courses.	○	○	○	○
Students who participate in service-learning courses or programs better develop their interpersonal skills than students who do not take them.	○	○	○	○
Students have higher levels of motivation in their service-learning courses than in their traditional courses.	○	○	○	○

6

6. To what extent do you perceive a service-learning requirement to contribute to the following student recruitment activities?

	Not at all	A little bit	A fair amount	A lot
Recruitment events (such as college fairs)	○	○	○	○
Prospective students/family visit days	○	○	○	○
Publications (viewbook, brochures)	○	○	○	○
Recruiting page on institution website	○	○	○	○
Recruiting emails	○	○	○	○
Promotional videos	○	○	○	○

Other (please specify)

7

7. To what extent do you perceive that your institution uses its service learning program to target these groups for recruitment and marketing purposes?

	Not at all	A little bit	A fair amount	A lot
Prospective students/families	○	○	○	○
Currently enrolled students/families	○	○	○	○
Faculty	○	○	○	○
Staff	○	○	○	○
Community members	○	○	○	○
Alumni	○	○	○	○
Potential donors or sponsors	○	○	○	○

Other (please specify)

8

8. To what extent do you agree with the following statements about retention?

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly agree
Learning and retention are largely shaped by faculty contact	○	○	○	○
Peer contact outside of the classroom encourages students to persist in college.	○	○	○	○
Service-learning is associated with retention of first-generation students.	○	○	○	○
Service-learning is associated with retention of students during their freshman year.	○	○	○	○
Service-learning is associated with student persistence to degree completion.	○	○	○	○
My campus has seen an increase in student retention via service-learning initiatives.	○	○	○	○

9

10. To what extent do you agree that the following benefits accrue to the university from marketing service-learning courses and/or programs?

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly agree
Increased student admissions	○	○	○	○
Improved student retention	○	○	○	○
Improved public relations	○	○	○	○
Increased donor giving	○	○	○	○
Increased support from foundations	○	○	○	○
Increased corporate sponsorship	○	○	○	○

Other (please specify)

11

11. If your institution has reduced support for your service learning courses and programs in the past five years, which of the following factors was the primary reason?

- ◯ Budget cuts at the institution
- ◯ Redirection of student fees and/or tuition
- ◯ External foundation or grant support ended
- ◯ Sponsorship was discontinued
- ◯ Major gifts were not renewed

Other (please specify)

12

12. To what extent was the cost of each of the following elements considered when implementing service-learning pedagogy and/or programs at your institution?

	It was not considered at all	It was not considered much at all	It was a small consideration	It was a major consideration
Initial course or program development	◯	◯	◯	◯
Faculty/staff time in development	◯	◯	◯	◯
Faculty/staff time in supervision	◯	◯	◯	◯
Ongoing resource needs (e.g., supervision, supplies, transportation, etc.)	◯	◯	◯	◯
I do not know	◯	◯	◯	◯

Other (please specify)

13

13. Does your institution's mission, vision, value, or purpose statement explicitly state “service” or “citizenship” development?

- ◯ Yes
- ◯ No
- ◯ I do not know

14

14. Does your institution hold membership in Campus Compact?

- ◯ Yes
- ◯ No
- ◯ I do not know

15

15. Which of the following practices, if any, are in effect at your institution?

- [ ] My institution provides service-learning scholarships to attract new students with past and/or current service involvement.
- [ ] Currently-enrolled students are eligible for financial aid that is tied to their participation in service-learning activities.
- [ ] Marketing or public relations offices at my institution keep informed of student and faculty service-learning accomplishments in order to keep the college or university name in the press.

16

16. What was your institution's enrollment for 2014-2015 [undergraduate full time equivalency (FTE)]?

17

This completes the survey. Thank you for participating in my study!

18

Appendix D: Survey Instrument Email

As an administrator at a four-year private institution in Kentucky, North Carolina, Tennessee, Virginia, or West Virginia, you are invited to participate in a research project entitled "Higher Education Administrators' Perspectives on Service Learning."

This research project is designed to examine administrators' perspectives on the perceived financial benefits, if any, that accrue to the institution from the implementation of service-learning courses and programs; the level of financial benefit perceived to be necessary in order to justify the costs of service-learning courses and programs to the institution; and whether service-learning requirements are perceived to contribute to student learning, recruitment, retention, and fundraising.

The study is being conducted by Briana Cicero-Johns and supervised by Dr. Barbara Nicholson from Marshall University and has been approved by the Marshall University Institutional Review Board (IRB). This research is being conducted as part of a doctoral dissertation.

If you choose to participate in the study, you will find the survey at https://www.surveymonkey.com/s/8WQRB8M.

Thank you!

Best Regards,

Appendix E: Institutions Included in the Study

Association of Independent Kentucky Colleges and Universities:

Alice Lloyd College

Asbury University

Bellarmine University

Berea College

Brescia University

Campbellsville University

Centre College

Georgetown College

Kentucky Christian University

Kentucky Wesleyan College

Lindsey Wilson College

Midway College

St. Catharine College

Spalding University

Thomas More College

Transylvania University

Union College

University of the Cumberlands

University of Pikeville

North Carolina Independent Colleges and Universities:

Barton College

Belmont Abbey College

Bennett College for Women

Brevard College

Cabarrus College of Health Sciences

Campbell University

Catawba College

Chowan University

Davidson College

Duke University

Elon University

Gardner-Webb University

Greensboro College

Guilford College

High Point University

Johnson C. Smith University

Lees-McRae College

Lenoir-Rhyne University

Livingstone College

Mars Hill College

Meredith College

Methodist University

Montreat College

University of Mount Olive

N.C. Wesleyan College

Pfeiffer University

Queens University of Charlotte

St. Andrews University

Saint Augustine's University

Salem College

Shaw University

Wake Forest University

Warren Wilson College

William Peace University

Wingate University

Tennessee Independent Colleges and Universities Association:

Aquinas College

Baptist College of Health Sciences

Belmont University

Bethel University

Bryan College

Carson-Newman University

Christian Brothers University

Cumberland University

Fisk University

Freed-Hardeman University

Johnson University

King University

Lane College

Lee University

LeMoyne-Owen College

Lincoln Memorial University

Lipscomb University

Martin Methodist College

Maryville College

Meharry Medical College

Memphis College of Art

Middle Tennessee School of Anesthesia

Milligan College

Rhodes College

Sewanee: The University of the South

Southern Adventist University

Southern College of Optometry

Union University

Tennessee Wesleyan College

Trevecca Nazarene University

Tusculum College
Vanderbilt University
Watkins College of Art, Design & Film
Welch College

Council of Independent Colleges in Virginia
Appalachian College of Pharmacy
Appalachian School of Law
Averett University
Bluefield College
Bridgewater College
Eastern Mennonite University
Emory & Henry College
Ferrum College
Hampden-Sydney College
Hampton University
Hollins University
Jefferson College of Health Sciences
Liberty University
Lynchburg College
Mary Baldwin College
Marymount University
Randolph College
Randolph-Macon College
Roanoke College
Shenandoah University
Southern Virginia University
Sweet Briar College
University of Richmond
Edward Via College of Osteopathic Medicine
Virginia Union University

Virginia Wesleyan College

Washington and Lee University

George Washington University

West Virginia Independent Colleges and Universities:

Alderson Broaddus University

Appalachian Bible College

Bethany College

Davis & Elkins College

Ohio Valley University

West Virginia Wesleyan College

Wheeling Jesuit University

Appendix F: Verbatim Responses to Question Eleven (Other)

1. I’m not sure.
2. Our service learning support has remained the same or increased.
3. N?A
4. We have not reduced support.
5. Has not reduced support.
6. N/A
7. Support has not been reduced.
8. Significant legal/liability issues related to transportation to off-campus sites.
9. We have not reduced support.
10. N/A
11. NA
12. Shift in focus of the institution to more vocation/career-focused initiatives; Service learning initiatives have lost their appeal due to a number of factors, including a graduation requirement for students to participate in a course tied to community service hours (when students aren't interested, they aren't engaged); Not many faculty have a passion for teaching the community service curriculum.
13. Our institution has not reduced support for service learning during the past five years; we have increased such support.
14. Support has increased.
15. Lack of commitment on the part of faculty to provide more service learning courses.

Appendix G: Vita

Briana Cicero-Johns

Education

2016	Ed.D. Leadership Studies	Marshall University Huntington, WV
2004	M.B.A.	West Virginia Wesleyan College Buckhannon, WV
2003	B.S. Education, Life Science	Youngstown State University Youngstown, OH

Work Experience

2015-Present	Program Manager and Data Analyst, Federal Grants Community and Technical College System of WV Charleston, WV
2008-2015	Assistant Professor of Business and Management University of Charleston Charleston, WV
2005-2014	Students in Free Enterprise (SIFE)/ Enactus Advisor University of Charleston/ West Virginia Wesleyan College
2005-2008	Adjunct Business Professor Fairmont State Community & Technical College (Pierpont) Fairmont, WV
2005-2008	Adjunct Business Professor West Virginia Wesleyan College Buckhannon, WV
2004-2008	MBA Marketing Coordinator West Virginia Wesleyan College Buckhannon, WV