1. Executive Summary

2010-11 was a flagship year for the Office of Service Learning in terms of visibility, recognition, and quality of program activities. This year, service learning operations have continuously improved in the following areas: media and publicity, tracking and assessment, faculty development, development of community partnerships, and student leadership development. After two previous years marked by dramatic growth, numbers of service learning courses and students have stabilized to levels which are more sustainable over the long term given the program’s current staff and budget. Although one issue continues to be an increasingly troublesome cause for concern (transportation), feedback from students, faculty and community partners continues to be overwhelmingly positive.

2. Unit Identification or Profile Summary

2.1 The Office of Service Learning supports the development and implementation of service learning and community-based learning experiences in academic courses and programs of study at Loyola University New Orleans. Our goal is to bring education to life by connecting the classroom to community needs. OSL supports and enacts Loyola’s Jesuit mission of forming students toward social responsibility and a concern for justice and the common good.

2.2 OSL reports to the Office of Academic Affairs, Senior Vice Provost for Academic Affairs. OSL was established at Loyola in 2001. After a three year post-Katrina hiatus, OSL operations were re-launched in August 2008. OSL does not oversee extracurricular, non-course based service activities at Loyola, although OSL staff work closely with those who do. Because OSL focuses strictly on academic, course-based service activities, its primary clients are Loyola faculty members. Students are secondary clients of OSL in the sense that they engage OSL’s services when they take a course with a service learning component. Currently, faculty members at Loyola opt to include service learning in their courses for pedagogical reasons. There are no university-wide service learning requirements at Loyola at this time. OSL’s goal is to give faculty members a wide range of well-supported choices so they are free to craft the most appropriate and engaging service learning experience for students in their course. At the same time, OSL aims to give students the supports they need to successfully undertake and complete a wide range of different kinds of service learning activities. OSL is located on the first floor of Bobet Hall.

2.2.1 1 full-time director. 1 Federal Work Study student worker (8-10 hours/week). 1 full-time Americorps/VISTA is currently placed in OSL and serves as program coordinator. This is not a Loyola position and is not reflected in FRS or payroll records. This position is federally funded.
This position expires in August 2011 with no possibility of renewal. See 5.1 for placement and status of Community Engagement Research Director.

2.2.2 In 2010-2011, 32 Loyola faculty members taught a service learning course. 12 were full-time extraordinary faculty. 3 were part-time adjunct faculty. 10 were tenure-track faculty. 7 were tenured faculty. 12 of these faculty members taught a service learning course for the first time in 2010-2011. Service learning courses were taught in 16 different departments and programs (15 undergraduate programs and 1 graduate program). In 2010-2011, service learning expanded into five new departments which had not previously formally offered service learning courses (theater, management/MBA, undergraduate business administration, philosophy, and music industry studies).

2.2.3 In 2010-2011, 704 undergraduate students did service learning for an academic course.

2.2.4 In 2010-2011, 8 graduate students did service learning for an academic course.

2.2.5 NA

2.2.6 NA

3. Assessment

3.1 OSL regularly administers a triad of surveys. Service learning students are surveyed twice per year, once at the end of each semester. A sample of service learning faculty is surveyed each semester. Finally, community partners are surveyed annually. Survey results are published and shared widely with community partners, students, faculty and the wider community. Internally, results are used to review service learning courses, assess the viability of community partnerships, and plan faculty training and development offerings. Beginning in 2010-2011, student surveys are now disaggregated to produce individualized reports for faculty members and for service learning agencies. These reports compare students enrolled in an individual faculty member’s course or those serving at a particular partner agency with the general pool of SL students. In 2010-2011, these reports were provided to faculty members and partner agencies to aid continuous improvement. Aside from this triad of surveys, OSL’s other important assessment mechanism is regular meetings with constituent-specific leadership councils. OSL’s Community Partners Council (CPC) meets quarterly with OSL staff to provide feedback and input about how OSL can responsibly collaborate with stakeholders in the wider community. OSL’s Student Leadership and Advisory Board (S-LAB) meets 5 times per semester, 10 times per year. At least 2 meetings are specifically devoted to assessing the effectiveness of S-LAB and member roles. Finally, the Service Learning Faculty Advisory Committee (SLFAC) meets 4-5 times each year to review and approve service learning policies and procedures at Loyola and advise OSL staff on faculty concerns. Finally, OSL staff conduct site visits with active partner agencies at least once per year and sometimes as often as three times per
year. These meetings serve many purposes, but one main purpose is to assess the viability and sustainability of partnerships.

3.2 OSL’s goals for 2010-2011 included: (a) developing an awards program to recognize outstanding service learning contributors; (b) consulting about the possible development of a Faculty Fellows program; (c) expanding training opportunities for S-LAB student leaders and exploring compensation/stipends for S-LAB; (d) consulting with other stakeholders about possible transportation solutions; (e) streamlining tracking and assessment efforts within the unit; and (f) consulting with other Loyola units about resource development, funding, and donor relationships. All of these goals support OSL’s primary strategic priority: enhancing the quality of service learning at Loyola (as this is distinguished from, but also related to, the quantity of service learning at Loyola). This strategic priority is derived from and directly supports all three of Loyola’s current strategic priorities: (a) enhancing Loyola’s national stature and reputation, (b) increasing student retention; and (c) enhancing Jesuit values. In 2010-2011, Loyola’s service learning program has made significant contributions to all three of these university-wide priorities, largely because of its strategic focus on enhancing program quality.

3.3 Student learning outcomes for 2010-2011 included: (a) understanding the distinction between service/volunteerism and social change/social justice; (b) awareness of and attention to social problems; (c) ability to make connections between classroom material and out-of-class service learning experiences; (d) understanding causes of social problems; (e) understanding social justice; (f) critical examination of personal values and beliefs; and (g) awareness and appreciation of diversity.

3.4 Service learning students were surveyed twice in 2010-2011, once at the end of each semester. There were 65 questions soliciting a mixture of open-ended qualitative responses, multiple choice responses, ranked responses, and Likert scale responses. Students provided feedback on (a) service learning courses, (b) service learning agencies, (c) scheduling and transportation, (d) learning and developmental outcomes; and (e) overall satisfaction. See 7.1. The survey was reviewed in preparation for 2010-2011. Modest adjustments were made to capture data on students’ transportation needs. A sample of service learning faculty were surveyed at the end of each semester. There were 25 questions on this survey. This survey was reviewed and substantially revised for 2010-2011. In response to feedback from faculty, new focus areas were developed, including: (1) determining whether and how faculty members include service learning on their CVs; (2) determining the degree of significance assigned by faculty members to various incentives and challenges of teaching a service learning course; (3) determining the effect of these incentives and challenges on the likelihood of faculty members’ continuing or discontinuing their engagement with service learning; and (4) determining how faculty members perceive the relationship between SL and their other teaching, research and service activities.
See 7.2. Finally, **community partners** were surveyed in May 2010 and May 2011. In May 2011, this survey contained 46 questions soliciting a mixture of open-ended qualitative responses, single-answer multiple choice responses, ranked responses, and Likert scale responses. This survey was reviewed and substantially revised in 2010-2011. In response to Carnegie Foundation rubrics for measuring community engagement and a study of best practices, the survey shifted to focus on measuring the impacts of service learning partnerships. Questions fell into the following categories: (1) basic agency information (staff, sites, budget, current and future volunteer needs); (2) recruitment of students; (3) preservice requirements; (4) performance of Loyola students; (5) supervision and hours-tracking; (6) quality and quantity of communication with Loyola; (7) impact of partnerships on agencies’ clients, staff, capacity, resources, and overall development; and (8) perceived mutuality and value of partnerships. See 7.2.

Other assessment activities conducted in 2010-2011 included: 5 CPC meetings (see 3.1); site visits with 43 community-based organizations; 2 S-LAB meetings devoted to assessment (SWOT analysis to mark S-LAB’s first 14 months in existence); and 5 SLFAC meetings.

**3.5** All assessment activities listed in 3.1 and 3.4 are directly related to community-based learning and community-engaged activities. All assessment mechanisms are focused on measuring outcomes and impacts related to community work.

**3.6** Findings from 2010-2011 **student surveys** show excellent progress on most student learning outcomes. A few highlights: 69% of respondents A/SA that SL made them feel “empowered to make significant changes in social problems.” 74% A/SA that SL encouraged them to be more involved in efforts for social change. 90% A/SA that SL made their class more interesting. 80% A/SA that classroom material helped them understand their SL activities and 72% said the reverse was also true (SL activities enhanced their understanding of classroom material). 67% A/SA that “after my SL experience, I have a better understanding of the root cause of social problems.” 55% disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement: “SL didn't require me to learn much about the social problem addressed by my agency.” 58% A/SA that they “have a better understanding of social justice now than I did before.” Results from May 2011 community partner surveys are currently being analyzed. Data will be reported in next year’s annual report. May 2010 **community partner surveys** showed overwhelmingly positive satisfaction rates among partner agencies and indicated that Loyola’s commitment to service learning is making a significant impact in the larger community. A few highlights: 81% said SL students made valuable contributions to their agency; 78% said partnering with Loyola’s SL program helped them complete important projects; 77% said it helped them achieve strategic goals. 95% say they feel their feedback and input are important at Loyola, and that they enjoy a good level of trust with Loyola. One **cause for concern** raised in both the student and the community partner surveys is **transportation.** 27% of community partners indicate that Loyola’s lack of transportation resources for SL students is a problem for them, both in recruiting SL students and maximizing the
value of their contributions. 33% of SL students agreed that “transportation was a factor in choosing my agency.” 38% agreed that “transportation is a factor in my interest in taking another service learning course in the future.” The issue of transportation must be addressed university-wide. Faculty survey results from 2010-2011 indicate that faculty development goals are being achieved. Faculty members feel strongly committed to SL because it enhances their teaching and learning and heightens student engagement. Faculty members demonstrate good knowledge of best practice in SL and feel confident implementing SL. A few highlights: While 48% of faculty report that it is more work to teach a SL course, 92% say it is more gratifying. 68% indicate that the extra time required to teach a SL course is “not at all likely” to prevent them from teaching another one in the future. 76% say their experience with SL gave them new teaching ideas; 76% report that SL helped their students be more engaged during class time. When asked if students dropped their class because of SL, 84% responded “none.” Faculty members reported that the following incentives would be the most important in encouraging them to continue teaching SL courses: support and encouragement from the provost; recognition in RPT decisions; recognition in salary and merit raise decisions; and funding for supplies and equipment. One challenge concerns the connection between service learning and scholarly research. Only 32% say SL generated new ideas for scholarly work and only 20% report that SL has actually helped them with a scholarly project. On the other hand, only 8% report that SL has “inhibited scholarly work.”

4. Summary of Achievements

4.1 OSL provided oversight, management and leadership for 787 distinct service learning experiences in 2010-2011. 712 Loyola service learning students documented 21,132 hours of service learning (avg. 29.7 hours per student) for 72 different courses and worked with 62 different community partners. According to Independent Sector and the Corporation for National and Community Service (the federal government’s service arm), the in-kind value of Loyola’s service learning contributions in 2010-2011 was $395,379. OSL contributed important data and information to Loyola’s application for the Carnegie Classification for Community Engagement (awarded to the university in December 2010). Loyola was named a “Best College for Service Learning” by U.S. News & World Report. Loyola was one of only 29 universities in the United States so honored, and was the only Jesuit institution on the list. OSL, with the support of the Provost, launched the Service Learning Faculty Advisory Committee (SLFAC) in 2010-2011 to review, approve, and advise OSL staff on service learning policies and procedures. SLFAC members come from all 4 major undergraduate colleges. SLFAC met 5 times in 2010-2011. In addition, OSL re-tooled its faculty development offerings to provide a topical series of workshops throughout the year based on expressed faculty interests.
4.2 NA. Service learning faculty had many outstanding achievements in 2010-2011, many of which are traceable to or rooted in their engagement with service learning. These will be reported by their departments and colleges.

4.3 Kelly Brotzman, director of OSL, won the Coadjutor Optimus award in April 2011. Kelly was selected as a presenter at the Gulf South Summit 2011 in Roanoke, VA and delivered a highly-attended and highly-reviewed presentation at this important regional service learning conference. Kelly was invited to write a review of Loyola’s service learning program for Present Tense, a peer-reviewed journal. Kelly was invited to lead multiple sessions on assessment for the AJCU Service Learning Directors Meeting at Marquette University in June 2011. Kelly also at workshops on assessment (“Measure What You Treasure”) for Loyola colleagues. Joseph Deegan, Program Coordinator, overcame traumatic injuries from a work-related motorcycle accident and eventually rehabilitated to the point that he was able to resume and complete his VISTA term as Program Coordinator in OSL.

4.4 6 students served on S-LAB in 2010-2011. In April 2011, 3 new S-LAB student leaders were recruited. 6 students obtained Federal Work Study-funded jobs at service learning partner agencies.

4.5 OSL provided oversight and collaborative direction for 62 community partnerships with agencies and organizations throughout the greater New Orleans community. These partnerships are the condition for the possibility of all service learning activity summarized in 4.1. According to Independent Sector and the Corporation for National and Community Service (the federal government’s service arm), the in-kind value of Loyola’s service learning contributions in 2010-2011 is $395,379. In 2010-2011, 6 new partnerships were formed with agencies (out of 12 which formally applied to become new partners). A major achievement in 2010-2011 has been the development of a consultative and mutually constructive process for determining when and how to terminate or modify partnerships. 8 partnerships were reviewed on the basis of tracking and assessment data. 6 were terminated or temporarily suspended by mutual agreement. 2 were significantly altered by mutual agreement.

5. Budget for previous year and upcoming year’s goals

5.1 $113,036 salary; $14,900 operating; $127,936 total for FY 2010-2011. NB: The salary total includes Heather Mack, who served Loyola temporarily as Community Engagement Research Coordinator to support the short-term process of preparing and submitting Loyola’s application for the Carnegie Elective Classification for Community Engagement (April 2010-January 2011). Ms. Mack’s position was reclassified in January 2011, and she now serves as Community Engagement Research Director. In this capacity, Ms. Mack does not work directly for OSL or its director. Ms. Mack reports to the Office of the Provost, Senior Vice Provost for Academic Affairs. Her job description includes
meeting the community engagement research and assessment needs of the whole university. A portion of Ms. Mack’s time supports OSL assessment activities (survey design/review and data). However, Ms. Mack is not and should not be considered a full-time employee within OSL.

5.1.1 For the last 3 fiscal years, $5,000 has been allocated to OSL from the QEP budget. This has been used to fund OSL’s faculty development efforts, which are a key priority in Loyola’s current QEP. In 2010-2011, OSL offered a more varied and consistent series of faculty development events than ever before. Outcomes continue to be strong in this area. Continued investment in this area is crucial to OSL’s future growth and improvement. The annual QEP allocation must become a permanent addition to OSL’s budget if faculty development efforts are to continue. Of the remaining $9,900, approximately $2400 was spent on the SERVE Fair. This twice-yearly event is the primary placement mechanism for matching students to community partners. It is indispensable for SL activities to begin in an efficient and orderly manner each semester. Sodexo policies in the Danna Student Center raise costs for this event and create ethical misgivings for OSL staff. Limited equipment in the Danna Student Center also significantly raises costs for this event. Of the remaining $7500, approximately $3000 was spent on office supplies, including not only generic materials (paper, toner, etc), but also printing and duplication costs for OSL’s growing number of publications (brochures, flyers, guidebooks, forms, etc). Of the remaining $4500, approximately $3000 was spent on service learning transportation, i.e., assisting Loyola service learning students in getting to and from community sites. OSL purchased and distributed gas cards and RTA tokens to SL students. These had to be rationed to due limited supply. OSL also administered Cycloserve, an in-house free daily bikeshare service. Maintenance costs for the Cycloserve fleet have increased substantially due to wear and tear. Other transportation expenses include WeCar rental fees and van rental fees charged by other Loyola departments for one-time transportation. Transportation is a university-wide problem at Loyola and must be addressed at that level. Due to the financial complexities involved (insurance, vehicle lease or purchase agreements, route-planning, hiring and paying drivers, etc), a university-wide transportation solution is preferred and indicated by best practice. Transportation supports for SL students must be more extensive and must incorporate comprehensive risk analysis. Of the remaining $1500, approximately $1100 has been devoted to professional development (travel and conference registration fees). Approximately $400 was spent on postage and other necessities for OSL mailings in 2010-2011. In addition to these expenses, OSL annually incurs a number of other costs, including: (1) equipment and supplies for SL projects; (2) books, subscriptions and research materials; (3) travel, mileage and entertainment costs associated with approximately 75-90 community
meetings per year; (4) assessment costs (e.g., software subscriptions). **OSL’s 2010-2011 budget was not sufficient to fund its operations for the fiscal year.** OSL reported a projected shortfall of approximately $1600 to the Provost’s Office in March 2011. $1100 in supplemental funds were secured in May 2011. Loyola’s service learning program is currently **four times larger** than when it was re-launched in 2008. With the exception of the annual $5,000 QEP allocation for faculty development, general operating funds have experienced **-10% growth** during that time (from $11,000 in FY 08-09 to $9900 in FY09-10 and FY10-11).

5.2 Directors of academic support units have not been made aware of the upcoming fiscal year’s salary, operating or total budgets for their units. OSL has not been informed about the outcome of its request for a full-time Assistant Director of Service Learning to replace the soon-to-expire Americorps/VISTA position. OSL has not been informed about its operating budget for the upcoming fiscal year.

5.2.1 To support basic operations in FY 2011-2012, OSL will need an operating budget of at least $17,500. The $5,000 QEP allocation for faculty development should be made a permanent part of OSL’s budget (included in the total of $17,500). Computers and other office equipment will need to be upgraded in FY 11-12. Depending on whether an Assistant Director is hired, computers may need to be purchased. OSL’s director has increasing opportunities to exercise institutional, regional, and national leadership in service learning, thereby raising Loyola’s national profile. These opportunities cannot be seized without additional funding. **Staffing within OSL is simply inadequate** to support its current size and activity level. See 2.2.1. The only other full-time position in OSL is a federally-funded Americorps/VISTA position, which will expire in August 2011 with no possibility of renewal. A junior professional is needed within OSL. A request and position description for an Assistant Director of Service Learning was submitted in writing to the Provost’s Office in February 2011. No decision on this request has been communicated to OSL. To go beyond supporting basic operations and realize a strategic vision, OSL will need the following: (1) an annual operating budget of $22,000-$25,000; (2) a permanent staff of at least 2 full-time professional staff, 1 part-time support staff, and 3 student workers, along with office space to accommodate this; and (3) a university-funded, university-wide transportation program serving the transportation needs of the whole university community. Multiple resource development initiatives are underway with Institutional Advancement to seek outside funding.

6. **Planning and goals for upcoming year**

6.1 Strategic planning in OSL falls into two distinct categories: (1) the formation of long-term goals guiding the design and delivery of OSL’s programs and services;
and (2) strategic planning for community partnerships. The former is derived from institution-wide strategic plans and directly supports Loyola’s strategic priorities. The latter takes place through ongoing consultation with community partners, faculty and students and a process for assessing mutual needs and capacities. Since 2008, there have been two strategic priorities for community partnership formation and development: (1) Latinos and (2) the Freret corridor. These priorities are reviewed and modified approximately every 3 years. In 2011-2012, these priorities will be reviewed and one new strategic focus will be developed in consultation with stakeholders. Candidates include: (a) adult literacy; and (b) arts-based community outreach.

6.2 Since its relaunch in 2008, OSL’s primary strategic priority has been to enhance the quality of service learning at Loyola (as this is distinguished from, but also related to, the quantity of service learning at Loyola). Correspondingly, OSL’s other major strategic priority has been to develop comprehensive assessment tools to help measure and empirically demonstrate the quality of service learning at Loyola. This twin focus has allowed OSL to make significant contributions to all three of Loyola’s current strategic goals: (a) enhancing Loyola’s national stature and reputation, (b) increasing student retention; and (c) enhancing Jesuit values. OSL contributed vital information and data which helped Loyola earn the Carnegie Classification for Community Engagement. Loyola was named a “best college” for service learning by U.S. News & World Report, due in large part to OSL’s strategic focus on program quality. In addition, 91% of SL students report that SL helped them “feel more connected to New Orleans.” Students’ sense of connectedness to the community surrounding the campus is an important factor in retention. Finally, OSL’s student learning outcomes (3.3) are completely formed around Jesuit values. Assessment data (3.6) indicate that OSL is significantly and positively impacting student formation in Jesuit values, student understanding of Jesuit values, and students’ ability to incorporate Jesuit values in their future choices.

6.3 Program goals for 2011-2012: (a) Work to establish more meaningful connections between OSL and the following units/programs at Loyola: Boggs Center, Twomey Center, Intercultural Education, Upward Bound, and JSRI. Current assessment data indicate that community engagement efforts at Loyola are piecemeal, uncoordinated, and extremely de-centralized. This is a problem for community partners and might be an obstacle to continued national recognition (Carnegie). This goal was formed with the intention of contributing to greater cohesion among community engaged units at Loyola. (b) Continue working with Heather Mack and Josh Daly to identify a web-based software or database package which would allow for university-wide tracking and assessment of community engagement. Secure university funds to purchase and/or annually subscribe to an appropriate package. Learn to use the software and incorporate it into OSL operations. Work with Heather and Josh to implement awareness of and active use of the software among other university offices, units and programs. This goal will substantially enrich and widen OSL’s assessment
activities. (c) Work with SLFAC to develop a faculty handbook (or revision of the current Guide for Faculty) to more precisely explain rules, regulations, policies and procedures regarding service learning. This goal was formed due to faculty feedback. Faculty expressed a desire for clear and frequent communication on this. (d) Work to establish a faculty research group specifically designed to provide support and mutual accountability for faculty members working on community engaged or community-based research/scholarly projects (in response to feedback from a recent faculty development event). This is a direct response to faculty feedback, including assessment data from faculty surveys and also from evaluations administered after faculty development events offered in 2010-2011. (e) Through study and research, propose one new “priority area” to guide community partnership development efforts. OSL’s 2 main “priority areas” for the last 3 years have been the Freret corridor and Latinos. Assessment data from 2010-2011 suggests that an added priority area might be needed in order to maximize Loyola’s impact and achieve student and faculty learning goals.

6.4 Student learning outcomes will remain largely the same for 2011-2012. OSL will measure achievement of these outcomes using basically the same tools. Surveys will be reviewed and modified in preparation for 2011-2012. It is likely that slight modifications will be made to focus with greater specificity on how SL makes students aware of and sensitive to diversity.

6.5 The non-Loyola community plays a central role in all stages of planning and assessment within OSL. Quarterly CPC meetings, annual visits with community partners, and community partner surveys provide feedback which is crucial to the planning process. For example, the non-Loyola community will have the single most important voice in determining OSL’s new “priority area” for community partnership formation and development.

6.6 OSL has the following intangible but indispensable resources to accomplish its goals: strong connections to colleagues at Loyola; positive relationships with faculty, and three strong and consistent leadership and advisory bodies. All of these will be crucial to achieving program goals for 2011-2012. In addition, however, OSL will need enhanced tangible assets, monetary and non-monetary, (budget, staff, office space, infrastructure) to accomplish its goals for 2011-2012. See 5.2.1 for a detailed list of these.

6.7 OSL’s assessment plan (see 3.1) will remain unchanged. As usual, surveys will be reviewed prior to administration to capture deeper or more specific data.

7. Appendices

7.1 Data collection tools for student data

2010-2011 Service Learning Student Survey
Administered in Dec 2010 and May 2011 via SurveyMonkey
Welcome! Thanks for telling us about your service learning experience! The information you provide will help us improve service learning at Loyola. Your responses will not impact the grade you receive in the class or your service learning evaluation. Your responses will be kept strictly confidential, so please feel free to answer honestly.

General

1. I am a (freshman, sophomore, junior, senior, exchange/transfer/transient/other)
2. Please respond to the following statements (strongly agree, agree, disagree, strongly disagree)
   a. Besides my service learning experience at Loyola, I have other experiences with community service.
   b. I am not usually involved in my community, other than for service learning at Loyola.
   c. In general, I feel knowledgeable about social problems.
   d. Community service is not that important to me.
   e. I think it takes more than service to change society.
3. I took (one, more than one) service learning class this semester.
4. I am answering this survey about the following service learning class: (dropdown list of SL courses)

Your service learning class

1. For this class, I did my service learning with the following agency: (dropdown list of SL agencies)
2. In this class, service learning was (required, optional)
3. I knew this class had a service learning component when I registered for it. (Yes, No, I wasn't sure)
4. I registered for this class because it had a service learning component (SA, A, D, SD)
5. This class was (common curriculum requirement, major requirement, elective, not sure)
6. Have you ever taken a service learning class at Loyola before this one? (Yes, No, Not sure)
7. I intend to stay at Loyola and graduate from Loyola. (Yes, No, Not sure)
8. Which of the following best describes your service learning activities for this class?
   a. I did a service learning placement where I volunteered regularly at an agency throughout the semester
   b. I worked on a project for an agency throughout the semester
   c. I did a one-day service project
   d. Not sure
9. Briefly describe your typical service learning activities.
10. Did students reflect on their service learning activities during class time? Check all that apply.
    a. No
    b. Yes, in class discussions
    c. Yes, in writing assignments
    d. Yes, in projects and presentations
    e. Yes, in other activities
    f. Other (please describe)
11. Please respond to the following statements. (SA, A, D, SD)
    a. My service learning activities were connected to class content.
    b. Service learning made this class more interesting.
    c. Service learning helped me learn more in this class.
    d. The classroom material helped me understand my service learning activities.
    e. My service learning activities enhanced my understanding of the classroom material.
    f. I was satisfied with my service learning experience.
    g. I would like to take another service learning class in the future.
12. Compare this class to others you've taken. How interesting was this course? (Much more, a bit more, about the same, a bit less, much less)
13. How much work was this course? (Much more, a bit more, about the same, a bit less, much less)
14. Please add any comments about your service learning class, especially its connection to your service learning activities.

**Time and Scheduling**

1. How many hours altogether did you spend on the service learning component of this class? (6 or less, 7-12, 13-18, 19-30, 31-50, more than 50)
2. How much time would you have preferred to spend? (no time, a bit less, the same, a bit more, a lot more)
3. Time Requirements (SA, A, D, SD, N/A)
   a. The time requirements for the service learning part of this course were reasonable.
   b. Scheduling my service learning hours was a problem for me.
4. Please add any comments about the time commitment for service learning in this class.

**Transportation**

1. My service learning activities required me to leave Loyola's campus (never, once, multiple times)
2. The primary mode of transportation I used to get to my service learning site was (multiple choice list)
3. How many minutes did it take to get from Loyola to your service learning agency? (less than 20, 20-40, 40-60, more than 60)
4. Please respond to the following questions: (SA, A, D, SD, N/A)
   a. Transportation was a factor in choosing my agency.
   b. Transportation is a factor in my interest in taking another service learning course in the future.
   c. I figured out how I would get to my agency at the beginning of the semester and used that method most of the time.
   d. I was satisfied with the transportation supports provided by the service learning office (streetcar tokens, Cycloserve bikes, gas cards).
   e. Without the transportation supports I received from the service learning office (streetcar tokens, Cycloserve bikes, gas cards), I would not have been able to successfully complete my service learning.
   f. I did not feel safe traveling to and from my service learning agency.

**Your service learning agency**

1. Respond to the following statements (SA, A, D, SD, N/A)
   a. My service learning tasks were interesting.
   b. I felt my tasks were meaningful and worthwhile.
   c. I was satisfied with the communication I had with the agency staff.
   d. My service learning agency responded promptly to my requests for information or feedback.
   e. I received the training that I needed to perform my tasks.
   f. I received good supervision from agency staff.
   g. I received adequate background information from the agency to complete my work.
   h. The tasks that I actually performed at my agency were different than the agency led me to believe.
   i. There was not much to do at my service learning agency.
   j. My service learning agency was pretty well organized.
k. This service learning agency doesn't really need the help of volunteers.
l. I would like to stay involved with this service learning agency after this class is over.
m. My schedule was disrupted because the agency failed to respond to my requests for information or feedback.
n. I was satisfied with this service learning agency.
o. I would recommend this agency to other service learning students and classes.

2. Did you have several agencies to choose from to complete your service learning? (Yes, No, the agency was chosen in advance, Not sure)
   a. When you chose to serve with this agency, how much did the following factors influence your choice? (significantly attracted me, slightly attracted, neutral, slightly deterred, significantly deterred)
      i. The agency's location (or the location of its service sites)
      ii. The agency's mission
      iii. The people served by the agency
      iv. The times of volunteer opportunities at the agency
      v. The tasks I was told I would do at the agency
      vi. Meeting staff members at the SERVE fair on campus
      vii. Communication I had with staff members at the agency
      viii. Information about the agency on Loyola's service learning website
      ix. Information on the agency's website

3. Based on your experience, please rate the environment at your service learning agency (SA, A, D, SD, N/A)
   a. Relationships among staff members are cooperative and collegial.
   b. There is good internal communication among staff members.
   c. The agency shows care and concern for the people it serves.
   d. The agency shows care and concern for volunteers.
   e. The agency is warm and welcoming.

4. Please add any comments about your service learning agency.

Your Overall Service Learning Experience

1. Please respond to the following questions about your service learning experience as a whole -- the class and the service learning activities (SA, A, D, SD)
   a. I enjoyed my service learning experience.
   b. My service learning experience was difficult.
   c. I learned from my service learning experience.
   d. After my service learning experience, I have a better understanding of the root causes of social problems.
   e. I have a better understanding of social justice now than I did before my service learning experience.
   f. Service learning made me feel more connected to the greater New Orleans community.
   g. At times, my service learning experience made me feel powerless against systemic social problems.
   h. At times, my service learning experience made me feel empowered to make significant social change.
   i. My service learning experience helped me examine the strengths and weaknesses of my own views.
   j. My service learning experience exposed me to diversity and diverse perspectives.
   k. Because of my service learning experience, I have considered changing my major or career path.
1. My service learning experience has encouraged me to do more volunteer work in the future.
2. My service learning experience has encouraged me to be more involved in efforts for social change.
3. I believe I helped alleviate the needs of the people served by my agency.
4. I believe I contributed to the welfare of my community.
5. I believe I made a significant impact on the root causes of the social problems.

2. The people in the service learning office were (very helpful, sort of helpful, not helpful, very unhelpful, don't know)
3. Please add any comments to help the service learning staff improve.
4. What did you enjoy most about your service learning experience?
5. How could your service learning experience have been better? Please comment on any challenges or difficulties you experienced.

7.2 Data collection tools for other data

2010-2011 Community Partner Survey
Administered in May 2011 via SurveyMonkey

About your agency

1. Name of your agency
2. When was your agency established in New Orleans? (less than 1 year ago, 1-3 years ago, 3-5, 5-10, 10-15, 15-20, more than 20)
3. How long has your agency worked with Loyola service learning students?
4. How many staff members work for your agency? (f/t, p/t, other)
5. Is there a staff member at your agency whose job description includes managing volunteers? (No, Yes, Not sure)
6. Briefly describe the population served by your agency.
7. What is your agency's approximate annual operating budget?
8. Does your agency plan to conduct a program evaluation?
   a. No, we don't have plans to conduct a program evaluation
   b. No, we recently completed a program evaluation
   c. Yes, within the next 12 months
   d. Yes, but not sure how soon
   e. Unsure
   f. Other
9. Please anticipate the need your agency expects to have for the following types of volunteers in the next 12 months. (Not a significant need, Somewhat significant need, Very significant need, Urgent need)
   a. Volunteers to work directly with our clients on a regular basis
   b. Large groups of volunteers for one-time projects
   c. Volunteers to help with office/clerical work
   d. Capacity-building help (for example, fundraising or publicity)
10. During the most recent academic year, how did your agency partner with Loyola's service learning program?
    a. Placements: students from different classes came to volunteer at our agency for a certain number of hours.
    b. Projects: students from a particular class completed a project for our agency.
    c. Both
    d. Not sure
e. Other (please specify)

Recruiting

1. Please respond to the following questions about recruitment. (SD, D, A, SA, N/A)
   a. It was difficult for my agency to recruit enough service learning students.
   b. There were more students interested in serving with my agency than we could accept.
   c. My agency accepted all Loyola service learners who expressed interest in serving with us.
2. In the future, how many service learning students would your agency like to host? (More, Fewer, About the same number, None, Don't know)
3. What is the ideal number of service learning students for your agency?
4. Please add any comments about recruitment.

Preservice requirements

1. My agency has the following preservice requirements for volunteers (check all that apply):
   a. Training session(s)
   b. Orientation
   c. Fingerprinting
   d. Background check
   e. TB test
   f. Interview
   g. Resume review
   h. No preservice requirements
   i. Other (please specify)
2. Please rate the amount of effort it took to complete all preservice requirements with Loyola service learners. (much more effort than expected, a bit more, about the same, a bit less, much less, n/a)
3. Please add any comments about preservice requirements.

Student Performance

1. What portion of Loyola service learning students exhibited the following characteristics? (none, very few, some, most, all, N/A)
   a. Adhered to a regular service schedule
   b. Provided consistently high-quality work
   c. Missed scheduled service shifts or appointments
   d. Followed your policies regarding absences or tardiness
   e. Followed instructions well
   f. Demonstrated willingness to learn about your agency
   g. Used their skills to accomplish tasks
   h. Developed new skills to accomplish tasks
   i. Demonstrated commitment to the mission of our agency
   j. Acted in a professional and courteous manner
   k. Acted in a mature, adult manner
2. In general, the performance of Loyola service learning students (exceeded my expectations, met, failed to meet, other)
3. Briefly describe the tasks completed by Loyola service learning students.
4. Please add any comments on students’ performance.

Supervision
1. Which of the following best describes your agency's supervisory arrangements with service learning students?
   a. Students mostly supervised themselves
   b. Our agency didn't supervise students. Students were supervised by their Loyola professor.
   c. Various staff members supervised students depending on day and time
   d. Various staff members supervised students depending on task or activity
   e. The same staff member always supervised service learning students
   f. Each student was assigned to a specific staff supervisor
   g. Other (please specify)

2. Which of the following best describes your agency's approach to monitoring volunteer hours?
   a. We don't keep internal records on volunteer hours
   b. We keep internal records on hours for all volunteers
   c. We keep internal records on hours for Loyola students, but not for other volunteers
   d. Other (please specify)

3. Briefly describe your agency's method of tracking volunteer hours.

4. Did staff members at your agency (No, Yes, N/A)
   a. orient service learning students to policies and procedures at your agency?
   b. work with students to arrange a schedule to complete their service learning work?
   c. work with students to identify their individual skills and interests?

5. Rate the amount of time supervisors spent on the following. (Much less than expected, a bit less, about as much as expected, a bit more, much more, don't know, N/A)
   a. Teaching specific tasks to students
   b. Giving constructive feedback to students
   c. Intervening with underperforming students
   d. Double-checking tasks completed by students
   e. Correcting errors in work completed by students
   f. Planning a thank-you or celebratory event for volunteers

6. How satisfied were you with the following? (Not at all, Somewhat dissatisfied, Basically satisfied, Very satisfied, N/A)
   a. The kind of supervision required by Loyola students
   b. The frequency of supervision required by Loyola students
   c. The frequency of supervision your agency was able to provide to Loyola students

7. Does your agency offer ongoing training and development opportunities to volunteers? (Yes, No, Not sure) If so, did any Loyola service learning students take advantage of these opportunities?

8. Please add any comments about supervision.

Communication

1. How frequently did your agency receive communications from (Never, Once or twice per semester, Every one or two weeks, More than once a week, N/A)
   a. Loyola service learning faculty?
   b. Loyola service learning students?
   c. the Loyola service learning office?

2. How frequently would your agency prefer to receive communications from (Never, A bit less frequently, The same, A bit more frequently, Much more frequently, N/A)
   a. Loyola service learning faculty?
   b. Loyola service learning students?
   c. the Loyola service learning office?

3. In general, how quickly does your agency respond to communications from Loyola?
   a. Immediately - the same day the communication is received
   b. Within a couple of days
c. Within a week  
d. Within several weeks  
e. It depends (please specify)  

4. How frequently did your agency send communications to (Never, Once or twice per semester, Every one or two weeks, More than once a week, N/A)  
a. Loyola service learning faculty?  
b. Loyola service learning students?  
c. the Loyola service learning office?  

5. In general, how quickly did the following groups respond to communications from your agency? (Never, Within several weeks, Within a week, Within a couple of days, Immediately, N/A)  
a. Loyola service learning faculty  
b. Loyola service learning students  
c. The Loyola service learning office  

6. Rate the amount of time staff members at your agency spent communicating with Loyola (Much less than expected, a bit less, about what was expected, a bit more, much more, N/A)  

7. How satisfied were you with the communication you had with each of the following groups? (VS, U, NSNU, S, VS, N/A)  
a. Loyola service learning faculty  
b. Loyola service learning students  
c. The Loyola service learning office  

8. If someone from Loyola needed to speak with someone from your agency, what would be the best method?  

9. How frequently did communication difficulties disrupt the progress of service learning activities? (Frequently, Occasionally, Rarely, Never)  

10. Please add any comments about communication or suggestions for improvement.  

Impact  

1. Please rate the value of the contributions made by Loyola service learning students to your agency over the last year. (Not valuable, Slightly valuable, Moderately valuable, Extremely valuable). Comment.  

2. Partnering with Loyola's service learning program (SD, D, A, SA, N/A)  
a. Helped us temporarily increase the number of people we were able to serve  
b. Helped us permanently increase the number of people we were able to serve  
c. Helped us temporarily increase the number of services we were able to offer  
d. Helped us permanently increase the number of services we were able to offer  
e. Helped us temporarily increase the value of our existing services  
f. Helped us permanently increase the value of our existing services  
g. Helped us produce new materials  
h. Helped us develop new programs  
i. Helped us identify potential improvements within our agency  
j. Helped us implement improvements within our agency  
k. Eased the workload for our staff members  
l. Allowed our staff members to spend more time on priority projects  
m. Helped us make meaningful progress toward achieving one or more goals in our strategic plan  
n. Increased our organization's visibility  
o. Helped us learn more about how to access Loyola's resources  
p. Facilitated new connections to other community groups  

3. Has your agency been able to use its partnership with Loyola (no, yes, not yet but we plan to, unsure, N/A)
4. Based on your perception, please rate the mutuality of your agency's partnership with Loyola.
   a. The partnership mostly benefits Loyola
   b. The partnership benefits Loyola a lot and benefits my agency a little bit
   c. The partnership benefits Loyola and my agency equally
   d. The partnership benefits my agency a lot and Loyola a little bit
   e. The partnership mostly benefits my agency
   f. Not sure

5. Please comment on the following challenges. (not at all, a little bit, some, a lot, very much)
   a. Supervising Loyola service learners increased demands on staff time.
   b. Scheduling times with Loyola service learners increased demands on staff time.
   c. Tasking Loyola service learners increased demands on staff time.
   d. Filling out Loyola service learning paperwork increased demands on staff time.
   e. Working with Loyola service learners cost our agency money.
   f. Working with Loyola service learners caused confusion at our agency.

6. In the last year, how many Loyola students who worked with your agency (None, 1-2, 2-5, more than 5, Don't know)
   a. expressed interest in continuing to volunteer at your agency after the end of their service learning commitment?
   b. actually continued to volunteer with your agency after the end of their service learning commitment?
   c. expressed interest in working at your agency?
   d. expressed interest in working in the nonprofit field?
   e. asked staff members at your agency about jobs or internships with your agency?
   f. secured a job or internship at your agency?

7. In your experience, how many Loyola service learning students who worked with your agency (none, a few, some, many, all, don't know)
   a. increased their knowledge about root causes of social problems?
   b. increased their awareness of social justice?
   c. felt more connected to New Orleans?
   d. increased their understanding of the challenges of systemic social change?
   e. felt more empowered to contribute to social change?

8. Please rate your agency's partnership with Loyola on the following criteria. (SD, D, Neither, A, SA)
   a. We feel our agency's voice is welcomed and heard at Loyola.
   b. We feel our feedback and input from our agency is taken seriously by decision makers at Loyola.
   c. We feel empowered to participate in decisions about service learning at Loyola.
   d. Loyola consults us about important questions that affect our partnership.
   e. We share a good level of trust with Loyola.

9. What can Loyola do to improve the relationship with your agency?

2010-2011 Faculty Survey
Administered to a sample in December 2010 and May 2011 via SurveyMonkey

Thank you for participating in this survey. Your responses you provide will be used to help the Office of Service Learning meet your needs more effectively.
Your Service Learning Class

1. Which of the following best describes your role at Loyola? (Tenured, Tenure-track, Adjunct, Visiting, Extraordinary, Emeritus, Other)
2. Which of the following best describes your students' service learning experience this semester?
   a. Placement: Students were placed with a variety of agencies where they volunteered regularly throughout the semester
   b. Project: Students worked together throughout the semester on a project for a single agency
   c. Students did a one-day service activity
   d. Other
3. In the future, which service learning model are you most likely to choose? (Placement, Project, One-Day, Other, Not Sure)
4. Why would you choose this model in the future?
5. In my class this semester, service learning was (optional, required)
6. In the future, I am most likely to make service learning (optional, required, N/A) Why?
7. I feel that students spent an appropriate amount of time on service learning in this course. (SA, A, D, SD)
8. In the future, the amount of time I am likely to have students spend on service learning for this class will be (More, The same, Less, N/A)
9. What percentage was service learning worth in the grading scheme for this class? (0-10%, 11-25%, 26-50%, 50-100%, Extra credit, Other)
10. How would you characterize the process of meaningfully incorporating service learning into a course in your discipline? (Very difficult, Somewhat difficult, Neither difficult nor easy, Somewhat easy, Very easy)
11. Please respond to the following statements about your experience teaching a service learning course. (SA, A, D, SD, N/A)
   a. It was more work for me to design a service learning class than a non-service learning class.
   b. It was more work for me to teach a service learning class than a non-service learning class.
   c. It was more gratifying for me to teach a service learning class than a non-service learning class.
   d. This experience gave me new teaching ideas.
   e. This experience gave me new ideas for scholarly work.
   f. I have a clear understanding of what I want students to take away from their service learning experience.
   g. I felt the students helped people through their service learning work.
   h. I believe the students contributed to positive social change through their service learning work.
   i. I feel that service learning helped students be more engaged during class time.
   j. My service learning efforts were recognized and supported by my department and my college.
   k. Connections to service learning agencies will be valuable to me after this course is over.
   l. I felt confident leading and facilitating discussions about students' service learning activities.
   m. It was difficult to incorporate students' service learning activities into my course.
   n. I felt assignments in which students were asked to reflect on their service learning activities were successful.
   o. It was difficult for me to figure out how to grade the service learning component of my class.
12. What was the best thing about teaching this service learning course?
13. What was the hardest thing about teaching this service learning course?

**Student Experience**

To the best of your knowledge, tell us about your students' experience with service learning this semester.

1. Please respond to the following statements about your students' service learning experience. (SA, A, D, SD, N/A)
   a. Students weren't sure why service learning was part of this class.
   b. Service learning helped my students grow and develop as people.
   c. My students gained a greater understanding of social justice because of their service learning experience.
   d. Students felt like there wasn't a strong connection between service learning and the class.
   e. Agencies had different expectations about service learning than my students or I did.
   f. Agencies were highly invested in the service learning relationship.
   g. Students' service learning work wasn't relevant to the topic of my course.
   h. Students weren't well utilized by agencies.
   i. Service learning inhibited my ability to teach as much content as possible during class time.
   j. Students were confused about how service learning would count in their grade.
   k. Service learning helped my students gain relevant professional (or pre-professional) skills.
   l. My students gained a deeper understanding of social problems because of their service learning experience.

2. Please rate the frequency with which the following issues prevented students from completing the service learning component of your course this semester. (N/A, Never, Rarely, Sometimes, Often, Always)
   a. Legitimate scheduling difficulties
   b. Lack of extra money for incidental costs and supplies
   c. Transportation difficulties
   d. Illness
   e. Family emergencies
   f. Non-school commitments (job, family responsibilities)
   g. No good excuse - students just didn't complete the work
   h. Unsure
   i. Other/s

3. Please rate your experience with the following challenges this semester. (N/A, Not a challenge at all, Minor or rare challenge, Consistent but manageable challenge, Significant challenge, Insurmountable challenge)
   a. Students in my course resisted service learning.
   b. Students dropped the class because of the service learning component.
   c. Students weren't aware that service learning was going to be part of the class until the class started.
   d. Students had problems agreeing on a schedule with their agencies.
   e. Students had transportation problems.
   f. Students had communication difficulties with agencies.
   g. Students did not have the maturity to perform well in their service learning.
   h. Students did not have the skills to perform well in their service learning.
   i. Students were poorly supervised by agencies.
   j. Students' tasks were unclear.
k. Students were assigned irrelevant or inappropriate tasks.
l. Other (please specify)

4. In general, how important do you think the following factors are in creating a successful service learning experience for students? (N/A, Not at all important, Somewhat important, Very important)
   a. Students have direct contact with people in the community.
   b. Students have exposure to unfamiliar conditions or populations.
   c. Students gain valuable professional skills and experience.
   d. Students have the chance to connect course content to the "real world."
   e. Students are well-supervised by community professionals.
   f. Agencies communicate frequently and clearly with me.
   g. Agencies communicate frequently and clearly with my students.
   h. Agencies have convenient schedules.
   i. Agencies are close to campus.
   j. Service learning doesn't take too much time for the students.
   k. Other (please specify)

Incentives and challenges
Please help us understand the incentives and challenges of teaching service learning courses.

1. Have you included your service learning efforts on your CV? (Yes, No, and I don't plan to, Not yet, but I plan to)
2. How would you (or did you) categorize service learning on your CV? (check all that apply)
   a. Teaching
   b. Research
   c. Service
   d. Other (please specify)
3. Teaching a service learning course has helped me (in my research/scholarship, in my teaching, in my service, it hasn't helped me in any of these areas, other)
4. Teaching a service learning course has inhibited my (Teaching of concurrent courses, Development of future courses, Research/scholarship, Service, Other)
5. How important would the following incentives be in encouraging you to teach additional service learning courses in the future? (Not at all important, Not very important, Important, Very important)
   a. Support/encouragement from department and/or college
   b. Support/encouragement from the provost
   c. Recognition in the promotion and tenure criteria
   d. Recognition in salary and merit raise decisions
   e. Course releases
   f. Technical support
   g. Funding for equipment and supplies
   h. More skill-building opportunities for me as a professor
   i. More reflection opportunities for my students
6. How likely are you to WANT to teach a service learning course in the future? (Not likely, Somewhat likely, Very likely, Unsure)
7. Would you recommend service learning to colleagues? (Yes, definitely, Possibly, Probably not, Definitely not, Unsure). Why/Why not?
8. How likely is it that the following challenges will prevent you from teaching a service learning course in the future? (Not at all likely, A little likely, Somewhat likely, Very likely)
   a. Service learning takes time away from my research and scholarly activities
   b. Service learning interferes with my committee work and other university commitments
c. My service learning efforts don't weigh heavily enough in the promotion, tenure, and reappointment process

d. I don't feel I have the skills I need to undertake future service learning courses

e. Dealing with students' issues in service learning courses is too stressful

f. I don't feel there are appropriate community partnerships for my future courses

9. Please share any other comments or suggestions you have for how we can improve Service Learning at Loyola.

7.3 See OSL intranet (www.loyno.edu/servicelearning) for assessment reports.

7.4 See OSL intranet (www.loyno.edu/servicelearning) for other supporting documents.