Running Head: DESIGNING PROGRAMS WITH A PURPOSE

Designing Programs with a Purpose: To Promote Civic Engagement for Life

Robert G. Bringle, Morgan Studer, Jarod Wilson, Patti H. Clayton, & Kathryn Steinberg

Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis

Contact information:

Robert G. Bringle, Ph.D. Phil.D.
Chancellor's Professor of Psychology and Philanthropic Studies
IUPUI Center for Service and Learning
801 West Michigan Street, BS 2010
Indianapolis, IN 46205

rbringle@iupui.edu
317-278-3499

Abstract

Curricular and co-curricular civic engagement activities and programs are analyzed in terms of their capacity to contribute to a common set of outcomes associated with nurturing civic-minded graduates: academic knowledge, familiarity with volunteering and nonprofit sector, knowledge of social issues, communication skills, diversity skills, self-efficacy, and intentions to be involved in communities. Developmental models and assessment strategies that can contribute to program enhancement are identified.

Designing Programs with a Purpose: To Promote Civic Engagement for Life

Increasing numbers of high school seniors and entering college students report that they have volunteered during the past 12 months (e.g., increasing from 67% in 1990 to 76% in 2001; Dote, Cramer, Dietz, & Grimm, 2006; Monitoring the Future, 2008; Sax, 2006-7). The most dramatic increases have been for episodic volunteering, with smaller increases for regular volunteering. For most of these entering college students, the volunteering is situationally determined (e.g., course requirements, involvement in religious organizations, student groups) rather than being activities that are generated by the individual (Bringle & Hatcher, 2010; Sax, 2006-7). Many college campuses have a long tradition of providing opportunities for students to volunteer in communities through student organizations; faith-based activities and organizations; fraternities and sororities; orientation and welcome week activities; and student government. However, according to national surveys of college students (Sax, 2006-7), participation in volunteering is greatest during high school, and then drops off during college. In the post-college years, rates of volunteering increase, but the level never returns to rates in high school.

During the past two decades, higher education has been exploring additional ways for structuring civic engagement activities for students both through curricular and co-curricular programs (e.g., Bringle, Games, & Malloy, 1999; Boyer, 1994, 1996; Calleson, Jordan, & Seifer, 2005; Colby, Ehrlich, Beaumont, & Stephens, 2003; Edgerton, 1994; Harkavy & Puckett, 1994; O'Meara & Rice, 2005; Rice, 1996; Sandmann, Jaeger, & Thornton, 2009). The intent of these programs is to take advantage of the community-based experiences that entering college students bring to campus, provide multiple opportunities for them to continue civic engagement activities, deepen the integrity of those experiences, link the service activities to their educational

experiences in ways that enrich and inform their preparation for their post-graduate journeys, and develop life-long habits of engagement. Each campus considers its community context, the nature of entering students, its institutional strengths, and available resources when determining how program development can contribute to the overarching goal for producing civically-oriented and civically-involved graduates. The purpose of this article is to detail a case study of multiple interventions at Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis (IUPUI) that collectively contribute to that goal.

Institutional Description

IUPUI is a commuter campus of over 30,000 students, approximately two-thirds of whom are undergraduate students. IUPUI has a large representation of professional schools (e.g., medicine, nursing, dentistry, business, law, engineering), emphasizes the life sciences, is a major research university, and is situated in the center of the state's business, population, and government. Furthermore, IUPUI takes seriously its mission to be civically engaged. To promote civic engagement, IUPUI formed the Center for Service and Learning (CSL), a centralized unit in Academic Affairs that parallels a Center for Teaching and Learning and a Center for Research and Learning (Bringle & Hatcher, 2004; Bringle, Hatcher, & Holland, 2007). CSL contains offices focused on service learning, co-curricular service, community-based Federal Work Study, and community partnerships.

What IUPUI Students Bring to Campus. Because IUPUI has a large number of professional programs, a survey of a sample of 550 entering IUPUI students was analyzed according to the following groups: prospective business majors, prospective professional school majors, and prospective liberal arts, science, and humanities majors. Consistent with past research by others, 25% of these entering students had not volunteered in the past 5 years. In

addition, during the last year, 25% of the students had volunteered 20 hours or more (Bringle, 2005).

The survey included the Volunteer Functions Inventory (VFI) (Clary, Snyder, Ridge, Copeland, Stukas, Haugen, & Miene, 1998), which provides a measure the following six functions that are served through volunteer activity:

1. Values: the degree to which volunteering expresses altruistic and humanitarian concern for others.

2. Understanding: the degree to which volunteering provides opportunities for new learning experiences and to use knowledge, skills, and abilities.

3. Social: the degree to which volunteering allows the person to be with friends and receive the recognition of others.

4. Career: the degree to which volunteering promotes clarity about vocational choices.

5. Protective: the degree to which volunteering allows the person to avoid guilt and better cope with personal problems.

6. Enhancement: the degree to which volunteering promotes an individual's sense of personal growth and positive feelings.

The strongest motive for volunteering reported by IUPUI students was values, followed by understanding, enhancement, career, protection , and then social (Bringle, 2005). These results suggest that students arrived at IUPUI with a strong intrinsic interest to help others. Furthermore, these students reported that their development, both cognitive and personal, were strong motives and were stronger motives than the more pragmatic motives of furthering their career, reducing personal guilt, and making friends. Furthermore, when motives were examined

by intended major (Business vs. Professional vs. Humanities/Arts/Science), there were no differences on the motives of Understanding, Protective, Social, Career, or Enhancement. Both business majors and other professional majors scored lower than arts/sciences/humanities on Values, but Values was still the strongest motive for volunteering for those two groups of students (Bringle, 2005).

Interest in Types of Service. In the same survey, respondents indicated their interest in different types of service opportunities that colleges might make available. The most interest was in one-time service activities (30% saying "very interested"), followed by service as an option in a course (28%) and paid community service (27%). International service (19%), service learning classes (12%), and long-term immersion community service (8%) had the least interest (Bringle, 2005).

A separate analysis focused on Morton's three types of service: charity (providing direct service to another person), project (implementing or participating in service programs through community service organizations), and social change (transformational models of systemic change) (Bringle, Hatcher, & MacIntosh, 2006). Respondents had the strongest preference for Charity, the lowest preference for Social Change, with Project being intermediate.

There are two contrasting implications for the finding that social change produced the least interest. First, if Morton is correct that a student's preference should be honored, the presence of service activities focused on social change should be proportionately lower than the other two types of service in service-learning courses and community service programming. However, Boyte (1991) has suggested that community service as it is typically structured, is not be the best way to have students become familiar with politically-oriented, justice-oriented, and advocacy-oriented activities and outcomes that are aligned with social change. Therefore, to

correct for this deficiency, disproportionately more attention could be given to programming that increases IUPUI students' familiarity with, competency in, and motivation to work towards social change.

The Purpose: Civic-Minded Graduates

As Cunningham (2006) notes:

One of [the] goals is the broad-based education of students to be effective and engaged citizens in our democratic society, and to be good citizens in our increasingly international world. Civic learning outcomes from higher education are difficult to document, but they are one of the most important social and civic contributions our colleges and universities provide to our society. (p. 4)

CSL designed and implemented diverse programs with the goal of providing educationally-meaningful community service activities to students, as well as faculty and staff, in the community. All of the CSL programs described below been driven by one common purpose: to produce civic-minded graduates. In order to make explicit the nature of civic-mindedness, CSL examined the goals and objectives of the individual programs to determine if there was a common set of goals. In addition, the extant literature on civic learning was reviewed, conversations were held with informed scholars in the field, and measurement strategies on civic learning outcomes were reviewed. This inductive approach led to delineating a set of core elements for CMG. From the perspective of higher education, a *civic-minded graduate* (CMG) is assumed to be "a person who has completed a course of study (e.g., bachelor's degree), and has the capacity and desire to work with others to achieve the common good" (Bringle & Steinberg, 2010, p. 429). Civic-mindedness includes the disposition to be knowledgeable of and involved in the community, and to have a commitment to act upon a sense of responsibility as a

member of that community. Civic-mindedness is viewed as distinct from an internal or self orientation, family orientation, or a corporate/profit orientation.

CMG is comprised of a set of students' knowledge outcomes (cognitive), dispositions (affective), skills, behavioral intentions, and behaviors. This includes seven elements that we have identified as the most central components to be manifested in a CMG, and which can be fostered through undergraduate education that includes service learning and community service. The core elements of the CMG domain include:

1. *Academic Knowledge and Technical Skills*: In receiving a college education, civic-minded graduates will have acquired advanced knowledge and skills in at least one discipline that are relevant to their involvement in community issues.

2. *Knowledge of Volunteer Opportunities and Nonprofit Organizations*: Civic-minded graduates will understand ways they can contribute to society, particularly through nonprofit organizations and volunteering.

3. *Knowledge of Contemporary Social Issues*: Civic-minded graduates have an understanding of the complex issues encountered in modern society, both at the local and national levels.

4. *Listening and Communication Skills*: In order to help solve problems in society, civic-minded graduates have the ability to communicate well with others. This includes written and spoken proficiency as well as the art of listening to divergent points of view.

5. *Diversity Skills*: Civic-minded graduates have a rich understanding of, sensitivity to, and respect for human diversity in the pluralistic society in which they live. This can be fostered by students' interactions with persons in the community who

are different from themselves in terms of racial, economic, religious, or other background characteristics.

6. *Self-Efficacy*: Civic-minded graduates have a desire to take personal action, and also have a realistic view that the action will produce the desired results.

7. *Behavioral Intentions → Civic Behavior*: Behavioral intentions can be viewed as predictors of behaviors. Civic-minded graduates have intentions to be involved in community service in the future. One of the clearest ways that students can manifest these attributes is by choosing a service-based career, or by manifesting civic dimensions to a career in any field.

CMG has been assessed using multiple methods (survey, written narratives scored with a rubric, interviews) that can provide information for participants in CSL programs, in service learning courses, and for institutional-level assessment of outcomes across all degree programs, including graduate and professional programs. Evidence on the validity of these measures of CMG includes convergence across methods, higher scores for students with more community service involvement, correlations with a measure of integrity (Bringle, Hatcher, & MacIntosh, 2006), and nonsignificant correlations with a measure of social desirability (Steinberg, Hatcher, & Bringle, in press).

Developmental Models of CMG

Although there are many ways in which individuals can develop civic habits (e.g., Colby & Damon, 1992; Flanagan & Levine, 2010), education provides an opportunity to have tremendous, but underdeveloped and underutilized influence on the civic development of many if not all students. We presume that CMG is a useful and meaningful benchmark in the journeys of students through their post-secondary educational experiences. Furthermore, research

demonstrates that collegiate community-based experiences have a lasting consequence because students are most likely to continue volunteering after college (Sax, 2006-7).

Figure 1 makes explicit the integration of the (a) self with both the (b) civic and (c) student roles. Greater integration is indicative of persons who see themselves as being defined by their role as a student (pursuing studies to improve their capacity to engage in a career or profession; the studies are part of their life-long journey), and involved in their communities (the person and the roles of student/professional/career is engaged in and committed to making a difference and improving the lives of others). The degree of overlap of the circles in the Venn diagram is indicative of the degree of integration with the self. The task of faculty and staff is to determine which theories are most relevant to designing and refining interventions that will lead to increasing the intersection of the three circles. There are numerous candidates for theories that are applicable to deepening the civic journey of students, and three that are particularly relevant are highlighted here.

_____

Insert Figure 1 about here

_____

Self-Determination Theory. CMG aspires to having students demonstrate internalization of civic skills and motives in a manner that is integrated with their sense of educated self. Deci and Ryan's Self-Determination Theory (SDT) provides a framework for examining the internalization of motivation (Deci et al. 1999; Deci & Ryan, 2000)**.** They posit a continuum of different types of motivation:

1. Amotivation: the activity is not interesting, there are no skills that lead to the behavior, or that the behavior will not lead to a desirable outcome.

2. External regulation: behaviors are performed to meet external demands or to obtain an external reward, behaviors are externally regulated. Thus, for this type of motivation, extrinsic rewards can modify responses and control behavior. However, the behavior is likely to cease when the contingencies are discontinued.

3. Introjected Regulation: behaviors are performed to avoid guilt, or to enhance the ego and feelings of self-worth. There may be some internal regulation, but the behavior is not an integrated part of the self.

4. Identification: behavior is performed because the person identifies with its importance, indicating more internalization of motive.

5. Integrated Regulation: behaviors are fully assimilated with the self-concept and are consistent with other values and needs (i.e., other goals), but are still done because of its relationship to other outcomes.

6. Intrinsic Motivation: behaviors are self-determined, fully integrated, and inherently satisfying.

Assuming that college students are well distributed across this motivational continuum for civic matters as well as for their educational preparation for careers (Flanagan & Levine, 2010), educators need to be aware that different interventions may be appropriate for motivating students at different points on the continuum. For example, students unmotivated to participate in community service may be motivated by external rewards, instrumental value, and external requirements. However, because these inducements only produce temporary involvement, the critical issue for educators concerns how to design activities that produce the development of autonomous regulation of civic engagement for unmotivated students. Furthermore, educators do

not want to create circumstances that undermine intrinsic motivation that already exists in students.

According to Deci and Ryan (Deci et al., 1999; Deci & Ryan, 2000), there are three factors that lead to internalization:

1. Relatedness: developing a sense of belongingness and connectedness to other persons, groups, and society.

2. Competence: developing an understanding of the activity and goal, and seeing that they have the relevant skills to succeed and sense satisfaction.

3. Autonomy: Controlling environments can promote relatedness and competence, and yield introjected motivation. However, intrinsic motivation, according to self-determination theory, only occurs when autonomy is present.

Thus, according to the application of this theory to CMG, the circles will increase their intersection when curricular and co-curricular educational experiences are guided by these qualities. Concerning relatedness, Eyler and Giles' (1999) research found that service learning produced higher levels of student/student and student/faculty interaction than traditional classes. This can also happen in other community service programs. Furthermore, students in community service programs develop social connections to community service providers and to persons served, supporting the movement of motives from extrinsic to intrinsic.

Identifying community service activities that are appropriate for the skills and knowledge of students is also a critical element to developing self-efficacy and intrinsic motivation. Finally, designers should select activities that promote perceptions of choice and autonomy among students (Morgan & Streb, 2001). However, according to SDT, autonomy does not have to be present throughout the entire experience for all students. Competence and relatedness are more

important for starting and supporting movement toward integration. Autonomy is most important for completing the move to integration, not necessarily starting the movement. Furthermore, choice can influence the perception of autonomy is various ways. For example, requiring community service in a service learning course may be perceived by students as an option (e.g., students can choose where they do their service; students can choose to drop the class or switch sections). In contrast, voluntary or optional service in a class may not be perceived as an option, depending on the attractiveness of the alternative choice (Bringle, 2005).

Intergroup Contact Hypothesis. One of the key determinants of future helping and altruism is empathy. How can empathy be developed to the point that persons regularly engage in their communities in constructive ways? Community service activities typically place students in unfamiliar community settings in which they interact with persons with whom they differ on several characteristics (e.g., age, class, race, education) and for whom they may have prejudices and stereotypes. The intergroup contact hypothesis posits that interactions between individuals who are different can produce empathy, understanding, and more positive attitudes if certain conditions are present in the context and in the interactions: (a) pursuit of common goals; (b) interactions provide a basis for friendship; (c) there is equal status among the participants; (d) the individuals contradict stereotype; (e) long-term contact occurs; and (f) norms support non-prejudicial orientations (Hewstone & Brown, 1986). When community service activities can be designed to incorporate these qualities, then college students will develop greater interest in, empathy for, and motivation to continue interacting with these persons and their communities (Astin, Vogelgesang, Ikeda, & Yee, 2000). However, community service activities do not necessarily contain these elements (Bringle, 2005; Erickson & O'Connor, 2000) and the activities could potentially produce the opposite effects.

Self-Authorship and Learning Partnerships Models. Baxter-Magolda and King (2004) suggest that college learning outcomes should include: (a) cognitive maturity; (b) an integrated identity; and (c) mature relationships. Effective student development in these three areas enables effective citizenship. The developmental foundation for achieving maturity in these outcomes lies in self-authorship, the "capacity to internally define a coherent belief system and identity that coordinates mutual relations with others" (Baxter-Magolda & King, 2004, p. xxii). At the beginning of the developmental journey toward self-authorship, students are dependent on others for values, answers, decisions, and identity. In the middle phase, students begin to form their own views and their own identity, questioning authority but still relying heavily on external sources for knowing and decision-making. Self-authorship is achieved when students "view knowledge as contextual, view identity as internally constructed, and achieve the capacity for mutual negotiation in relationships" (Hodge, Baxter Magolda, & Haynes, 2009, p. 18). These stages reflect progress toward attributes associated with a civic-minded graduate.

The Learning Partnerships model (Baxter-Magolda & King, 2004; Hodge, Baxter-Magolda & Haynes, 2009; King, Baxter-Magolda, Barber, Brown & Lindsay, 2009) aspires to structure students experiences in college to develop self-authorship. This cognitive development model views learners as intellectual partners with faculty and staff. Reflection exercises are considered important throughout college (Ash & Clayton, 2009; Ash, Clayton, & Atkinson, 2005), which makes this model particularly applicable to service learning and community engagement activities. In the Learning Partnerships model, university personnel intentionally design programs and curricula to move students from reliance on external authority for information and decisions, to defining their self-identity (beliefs, values, and social relations) by

assuming more responsibility for themselves, accepting more challenges, and sharing authority and expertise.

Integration Across Developmental Models. No one of these developmental models has provided a singular guide for designing programs that contribute to civic growth. However, each does have qualities that are implicit in CSL programs, can be applied to other program development, and that provide a basis for developing testable hypotheses about why change occurs. All three of the models stress the importance of relationships to change. In addition, they also highlight particular qualities that are important to those relationships (e.g., the importance of norms and expectations about the nature of the relationships; connections; cooperative relationships that have common goals). However, even though relationships are important, students will grow and change when they attribute a sense of autonomy and choice for what they are undertaking and view themselves as intrinsically responsible for their learning. Furthermore, the theories highlight the importance of putting students in activities at which they can have successful experiences that contribute to outcomes. Finally, self-determination theory posits that different interventions need to be designed for students who are at different stages in their civic development.

<div align="center">

Center for Service and Learning: Service Learning

</div>

As a commuter campus, the most important activities for IUPUI students occur in the classroom. National Survey of Student Engagement results for IUPUI students indicate that they spend significantly fewer hours per week participating in co-curricular activities, compared to students at peer institutions and at research universities. Thus, the best way for IUPUI to civically engage the most students in educationally meaningful service is through the classroom.

The primary approach to increase service learning was through faculty development activities (Bringle & Hatcher, 1995; Bringle, Hatcher, & Games, 1997; Bringle, Hatcher, Jones, & Plater, 2007: Bringle, Games, Ludlum, Osgood, & Osborne, 2000) that were shaped primarily by the experiential learning theory of Kolb (1984). Accordingly, faculty development activities have included abstract conceptualization (e.g., lectures, workshops, symposia), active experimentation by faculty (e.g., Engaged Department Institutes, 3-year Engaged Department grants), providing concrete community-based experiences for faculty (e.g., participation in campus-wide community service activities, faculty displays at an annual Civic Engagement Showcase), and reflective activities by faculty (e.g., presenting at campus teaching symposia, scholarship on service learning, conducting research on service learning).

Center for Service and Learning: Work in the Community

IUPUI undergraduate students work significantly more than students at peer institutions (e.g., 15% work on campus; 57% indicated they work off campus; ~20% report holding two or more jobs). Because work is so important to IUPUI's undergraduate students and because research indicates that campus-based employment improves retention, IUPUI created the Office of Community Work-Study within CSL to coordinate the use of Federal Work-Study (FWS) funds to support campus-related employment in the community.

Community Work-Study provides FWS-eligible students with a different type of employment opportunity by emphasizing the civic aspects of their work in local non-profits and government agencies in roles that may traditionally be filled by volunteers. The opportunity to work in the community provides students with the ability to do service-related work while also receiving the funds they need to go to school. Community Work-Study does not involve students in "voluntary service," because students receive financial compensation for their work. However,

the arrangement creates a different relationship between the agency and the student from that of

a volunteer (which is discretionary and can be easily terminated by the student) to one of an

employee that entails accountability, sustained immersion in the organization, and an expectation

of professionalism. The work performed, however, occurs in a service-related non-profit or

government agency, giving students insight into organized community service and social issues.

Many area non-profit organizations hire IUPUI work-study students who assist in coordinating

or planning events that reach out and bring volunteers to that organization. By working in the

community, students are able to learn about service and see public or non-profit sector work as a

viable career option.

IUPUI commits nearly 33% of FWS funds to community service positions.

Approximately 33% of those community service funds support student tutors in the America

Reads*America Counts program, for which FWS funds100% of their compensation. The

America Reads*America Counts experience provides students with more than just a job in the

community. As part of this program, students regularly attend trainings and participate in

reflection on a weekly basis in order to connect their work and their service.

Falling within the category of Morton's second type of service (projects; implementing or

participating in service programs through community service organizations), Community Work-

Study gives students the opportunity to spend a semester or an academic year delving more

deeply into a specific organization's mission as well as the social issue the organization is

addressing. Working daily alongside staff members who are experts in a particular social issue

can be a significant learning experience for a student and encourage a student's personal desire

to engage in future service either as a community volunteer or through choosing a public service

career.

According to the Volunteer Functions Inventory (Clary, Snyder, Ridge, Copeland, Stukas, Haugen, & Miene, 1998), six functions are served through volunteer activity. One of those functions is Career. Understanding that clarification of vocational choices is one of six key motivators for volunteering, Community Work-Study not only allows students to participate in community service, but it does so in an environment which promotes thought towards one's future career and civic involvement.

Center for Service and Learning: Co-Curricular Community Service Programs

Due to IUPUI's nature of having a largely commuter-based student population, co-curricular volunteer programs have had to be shaped by not only the basic needs and interests of these students but also pragmatic issues (school schedule, work schedule, family). In addition to a full course-load, many students at IUPUI hold at least one job. Therefore, the Office of Community Service in CSL has implemented several different ways for students to be able to participate in community service. One example is a student-run program called "Jaguars in the Streets" (JITS). Each month, JITS plans three to four volunteer activities for 10-50 students that focus around a common social issue. In order to offer as many students as possible the ability to volunteer, these events are held at several different times (e.g., some on a weekday during the lunch hour, others on weekends or evenings). Four large-scale days of community service each year, which are planned at different times and days of the week, like JITS activities. Through these community service activities, students have the opportunity to serve with anywhere from 200 to 550 other students, staffs, and faculty of the campus and community. These events are planned by students with staff support, affording students the opportunity to develop leadership and professional skills. To accommodate students without cars—many of whom are international students— on-campus volunteer opportunities are offered. One benefit of IUPUI's metropolitan

location is that there are service sites within walking distance from campus that can be accessed by these students. Students who have children are accommodated either at a location that allows younger volunteers or that creates other activities for the children at the site where the parent is volunteering. The Office of Community Service also provides opportunities for students to participate in Alternative Breaks each fall and spring. Alternative Breaks allow students to become immersed in a social issue during the three to seven days of the trip by offering education, action through volunteering, and reflection.

To increase opportunities for students to become politically involved and focused on social change, IUPUI joined the American Democracy Project, coordinated by the American Association of Colleges and State Universities, and the Political Engagement Project, coordinated by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching and Learning, which make more explicit the importance of civic learning outcomes to increase participation in democratic processes, political activities, and seeking social change.

Each of these programs is different, but one common thread that runs through them all is the strong emphasis placed on understanding and appreciating diversity and social justice by allowing the students the opportunity to learn about whom they are and how they can become social justice change agents. Students are asked to evaluate who they are as a person and begin to understand their privileges and oppressions. In doing this, they can comprehend how they are working for or against the betterment others on various social issues. To help students come to these realizations, self-reflective activities and educational and interactive presentations which focus on a variety of topics are built into some programs. These intentional programmatic components allow students are able to find their passion and their role as a social change agent.

Center for Service and Learning: Community-Based Scholarships

Colleges and universities typically choose to honor only two types of merit with scholarships: academic excellence and athletic excellence. To reflect a strong commitment to civic engagement, IUPUI has committed scholarship funds to recognize students for community service. Named after a prominent community leader, the mission of the Sam H. Jones Community Service Scholarship program is (a) to recognize students for previous service to their high school, campus, or community; and (b) to support their continued community involvement in educationally meaningful service. Goals of the program are to retain students at IUPUI, support academic achievement and success, provide opportunities for involvement in community service, provide financial support, and promote leadership development. Over $400,000 of base institutional funds have been committed to fund two major programs: (a) students who, as part of the program, may take a service learning course, participate in community service, and organize events that involve other IUPUI students in community service; or (b) students who have successfully completed a service learning class and who are chosen by a professor as an assistant to support service learning course activities. Students receiving these scholarships provide important leadership to the campus and community, benefit their community partners through their service, develop strong community partnerships, and grow as students and persons.

Center for Service and Learning: Community Partnerships

Many faculty members and departments at IUPUI have examples of community partnerships that contribute to their teaching, research, or service activities. As a centralized unit, the Office of Neighborhood Partnerships in CSL was created to build long-term strategic partnerships with the community. Rather than being a "mile wide, but an inch deep" all over central Indiana, with the help of grants from the Department of Housing and Urban Development a Community Outreach Partnership Center (COPC) was created to focus activities on the near-

Westside neighborhoods adjacent to campus. The activities have focused on various community issues including re-establishing public schools in the neighborhoods, economic development, strengthening the neighborhood association, health issues, programs for youth and the elderly, and contributing to a neighborhood quality of life plan. When possible, CSL staff direct programming (e.g., service learning courses, volunteer activities, tutoring) toward these near-Westside neighborhoods.

The COPC models for the campus many of the qualities that are exemplary of good civic engagement partnerships (Bringle, Clayton, & Price, 2009; Bringle, Officer, Grim, & Hatcher, 2009). For example, prior to the first HUD grant proposal, the campus and community leaders began to forge relationships, conducted asset mapping of the community, and identified community issues for which a partnership was most appropriate. Community members have reported in two formal evaluations that the relationship between IUPUI and the near-Westside neighborhoods is developing qualities that have been identified as underlying good partnerships: (a) closeness, a function of frequency of interactions, diversity of interactions, and interdependency; (b) equity; and (c) integrity (Bringle et al., 2009; Bringle et al., 2009).

As evidence of the success of this strategy, the first school to re-open in the near-Westside neighborhood, George Washington Community High School (GWCHS) was awarded the Inaugural National Community School Award by the National Coalition for Community Schools in 2006 and was recognized by the Knowledge Works Foundation of Cincinnati, Ohio in 2004 as one of the nation's best examples of a school as central to a community. In 2008, the U.S. Department of Education notified GWCHS partners that they were one of ten community schools – the only one in the Midwest – to be awarded $2.4 million over five years in the

nation's first federal full-service community schools funding authorized by Congress. The grant's 5-year evaluation is led by IUPUI's Center for Urban and Multicultural Education.

Center for Service and Learning Programs and Civic-Minded Graduates

Through service learning and other community-based courses, volunteer activities, the Jones scholarship programs, community-based work study, and developing strategic partnerships with the community, CSL has aspired to develop programs that contribute to the civic education of students as well as faculty and staff. Although each component of CSL programming was developed to meet its own goals, CMG is viewed as a potentially integrative aspiration for all programs focused on civic education. As a reflective exercise, each program was reviewed to determine if the CMG conceptual domain was still viewed as aligned with program goals and activities. This process has led to enhancement of many aspects of CSL's current and future programming: (a) common understanding of and appreciation by the staff of the strengths of individual programs; (b) a delineation of knowledge, skills, and dispositions associated with civically-oriented program; (c) development of assessment procedures (scale, narrative analysis with rubrics, interviews) to evaluate CMG (Steinberg et al., in press); (d) the capacity to evaluate CSL programs and provide feedback to program coordinators for program improvements; (e) a framework for enhancing civic learning in service learning courses by more intentionally considering course activities in terms of CMG elements; (f) a procedure for obtaining institutional assessment of students civic outcomes across majors; (g) a way of communicating and discussing civic learning outcomes with various internal and external audiences; (h) a means for conducting research associated with civic growth that can evaluate components of developmental models as programmatic or mediating variables; (i) thinking and planning more intentionally and coherently about civic development; and (j) deepening partnerships with and

the contributions to the community (Bringle et al., 2009). CMG has now become the "North Star" that guides the planning, implementation, and evaluation of all CSL programs and, potentially, all campus civic engagement activities.

Although the CMG was developed within the context of CSL programs, its implications are applicable to programs at other institutions of higher education that intend to contribute to civic growth. The diversity of CSL programs that provided a basis for the development of CMG (e.g., curricular, co-curricular) and the levels of analysis (individual, course, program, major, institution) that provided a contextual basis for its development all contribute to the generalizability of the work to other institutions. Furthermore, the developmental models that are aligned with CMG also provide a basis for program design and research that can contribute to understanding how individuals change over time.

The perspective of the CMG is focused on individual students; however, the developmental models each emphasize the importance of relationships in developing integration of the self with the student's educational experiences and civic experiences. These relationships are important because they can enhance skills associated with working with diverse groups. Also, the analysis to date has focused primarily on the student's experiences in individual courses or programs. An additional way of thinking about the developmental journey for students is how they can grow as a result of participating in a wide range of curricular and co-curricular activities that have the cumulative effect of increasing their engagement in the campus and in the community. Considering how students can progressively enhance their self-awareness of their civic identity and their academic work as preparation for subsequent civic involvement after graduation makes salient the possibility of scaffolding programs sequentially in a coherent, integrated manner. When this is done, then assessment can consider additional ways of capturing

growth that operate at a level that works across programs and courses (e.g., student ePortfolios).

In addition, Hatcher (2007) has developed conceptual analysis and a scale to measure the Civic-

Minded Professional, which is focused on the civic journey of students after their graduation.

To date, most of the consideration concerning CMG has been focused on students; hence

"graduate." One of the strengths of delineating components of civic-mindedness is that, even

though it was developed with student growth and outcomes in mind, it is not limited to only

students. Thus, civic-mindedness can be a developmental goal for constituencies other than

students who are involved in service learning and civic engagement; for example, faculty,

administrators, nonprofit staff, and community residents (Bringle et al., 2009). How can faculty,

administrators, nonprofit staff, and community residents grow and develop as civic-minded

individuals as a result of intentionally designed interventions? These could include formal

programs (e.g., credit courses, continuing education), acquiring resources to support their growth

(e.g., grant-funded program for strengthening a neighborhood association), creating opportunities

for growth (e.g., grassroots organizing events for residents, collaborative grant writing for

faculty), and developing infrastructure (e.g., community task force focused on a community

issue). The design of any of these strategies should reflect the common elements of the

developmental models and, thus, involve the basic values of working together with diverse

others in a collaborative, democratic manner to produce growth in a way that reflects integrity

(willing to recruit and work with others, commitment to making a difference across time and

place, empathy for others, internalized). Furthermore, as appropriate, they should each involve

critical reflection as a means for generating learning and for capturing learning (Ash & Clayton,

2009; Ash et al., 2005).

Determining how CLS programs can contribute to the deepening of civic-mindedness in each of these constituencies has interesting promise for broadening the examination of the developmental journey beyond students and for greatly enhancing planning new programs, revising existing programs, and evaluating civically-oriented work.

References

Ash, S. L., & Clayton, P. H. (2009). Generating, deepening, and documenting learning: The power of critical reflection in applied learning. *Journal of Applied Learning in Higher Education, 1*(1), 25-48.

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

Astin, A.W., Vogelgesang, L. J., Ikeda, E. K., & Yee, J. A. (2000). *How service learning affects students.* Los Angeles: UCLA Higher Education Research Institute. ERIC ED No. 445 577.

Baxter-Magolda, M. B. (2001). *Making their own way: Narratives for transforming higher education to promote self-development.* Sterling, VA: Stylus.

Baxter-Magolda, M. B., & King, P. M. (2004). *Learning partnerships: Theory and models of practice to educate for self-authorship.* Sterling, VA: Stylus.

Boyer, E. L. (1994). Creating the new American college. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, A48.

Boyer, E. L. (1996). The scholarship of engagement. *Journal of Public Service and Outreach, 1*(1), 11-20.

Boyte, H. C. (1991). Community service and civic education. *Phi Delta Kappan, 72*(10), 765-767.

Bringle, R. G. (2005). Designing interventions to promote civic engagement. In A. Omoto (Eds.), *Processes of community change and social action* (pp. 167-187). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Bringle, R. G., Clayton, P. H., & Price, M. (2009). Partnerships in service learning and civic

  engagement. *Partnerships*: *A Journal of Service-Learning and Civic Engagement*, *1*(1),

  1-20.

Bringle, R. G., Games, R., Ludlum, C., Osgood, R., & Osborne, R. (2000). Faculty Fellows

  Program: Enhancing integrated professional development through community service.

  American Behavioral Scientist, 43(5), 882-894.

Bringle, R. G., Games, R., & Malloy, E. A. (1999). *Colleges and universities as citizens*.

  Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Bringle, R. G., & Hatcher, J. A. (1996). Implementing service learning in higher education.

  Journal of Higher Education, 67, 221-239.

Bringle, R. G., & Hatcher, J. A. (1999, Summer). Reflection in service learning: Making

  meaning of experience. *Educational Horizons*, *77*(4), 179-185.

Bringle, R. G., & Hatcher, J. A. (2000, Fall). Meaningful measurement of theory-based service-

  learning outcomes: Making the case with quantitative research. *Michigan Journal of*

  Community Service Learning, 68-75.

Bringle, R. G., & Hatcher, J. A. (2004). Advancing civic engagement through service-learning.

  In M. Langseth & W. M. Plater (Eds.), *Public work and the academy: An academic*

  administrator's guide to civic engagement and service-learning (pp. 125-145). Boston,

  MA: Anker Press.

Bringle, R. G. & Hatcher, J. A. (2005). Service-learning as scholarship: Why theory-based

  research is critical to service-learning. *Acta Academica Supplementum 3*, 24-44.

Bringle, R. G., & Hatcher, J. A. (in press). Student engagement trends over time. In H. E.

  Fitzgerald, D. L. Zimmerman, C. Burack, & S. Seifer (Eds.), *Handbook of engaged*

scholarship: Contemporary landscapes, future directions: Volume 2: Campus-community partnerships. E. Lansing, MI: Michigan State University Press.

Bringle, R. G., Hatcher, J. A., & Games R. (1997). Engaging and supporting faculty in service learning. *Journal of Public Service and Outreach, 2*, 43-51.

Bringle, R. G., Hatcher, J. A., Hamilton, S., & Young, P. (2001). Planning and assessing campus/community engagement. *Metropolitan Universities, 12*(3), 89-99.

Bringle, R. G., Hatcher, J. A., & Holland, B. (2007). Conceptualizing civic engagement: Orchestrating change at a metropolitan university. *Metropolitan Universities, 18*(3), 57-74.

Bringle, R. G., Hatcher, J. A., Jones, S., & Plater, W. M. (2006). Sustaining civic engagement: Faculty development, roles, and rewards. *Metropolitan Universities, 17*(1), 62-74.

Bringle, R. G., Hatcher, J. A., & MacIntosh, R. (2006). Analyzing Morton's typology of service paradigms and integrity. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning, 13(1),* 5-15.

Steinberg, Hatcher, & Bringle (in press). The North Star: Civic-Minded Graduates. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning.*

Bringle, R.G., Madjuka, R.J., Hatcher, J.A., & MacIntosh, R. (2010). Motives for service among entering college students: Implications for business education. Manuscript in preparation.

Bringle, R. G., Officer, S., Grim, J., & Hatcher, J. A. (2009). George Washington Community High School: Analysis of a partnership network. In I. Harkavy & M. Hartley (Eds.), *New directions in youth development* (pp. 41-60). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Bringle, R. G., & Steinberg, K. (in press). Educating for informed community involvement. *American Journal of Community Psychology, 46*, 428-441.

Calleson, D. C., Jordan, C., & Seifer, S. D. (2005). Community-engaged scholarship: Is faculty work in communities a true academic enterprise? *Academic Medicine, 80*(4), 317-321.

Chism, N., Lees, N. D., & Evenbeck, S. E. (2002). Faculty development for teaching innovation through communities of practice. *Liberal Education, 88*(3), 34–41.

Clary, E. G., Snyder, M., Ridge, R. D., Copeland, J., Stukas, A. A., Haugen, J., & Miene, P. (1998). Understanding and assessing the motivations of volunteers: A functional approach. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 74*, 1516-1530.

Colby, A., & Damon, W. (1992). *Some do care: Contemporary lives of moral commitment*. New York: The Free Press.

Colby, A., Ehrlich, T., Beaumont, E., & Stephens, J. (2003). *Educating citizens: Preparing America's undergraduates for lives of moral and civic responsibility*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Deci, E. L., Koestner, R., & Ryan, R. M. (1999). A meta-analytic review of experiments examining the effects of extrinsic rewards on intrinsic motivation. *Psychological Bulletin, 125*, 627-668.

Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2000). The "what" and "why" of goal pursuits: Human needs and the self-determination of behavior. *Psychological Inquiry, 11*, 227-268.

Dote, L., Cramer, K., Dietz, N., & Grimm, R. (2006, October). *College students helping America*. Retrieved January 27, 2009, from http://eric.ed.gov/ERICDocs/data/ericdocs2sql/ content_storage_01/0000019b/80/27/f5/2c.pdf

Edgerton, R. (1994). The engaged campus: Organizing to serve society's needs. *AAHE Bulletin, 47*, 2-3.

Erickson, J. A., & O'Connor, S. E. (2000). Service-learning: Does it promote or reduce prejudice? In C. O'Grady (Ed.), *Integrating service learning and multicultural education in colleges and universities* (pp. 59-70). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum Associates.

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

Flanagan, C., & Levine, P. (2010). Youth civic engagement during the transition to adulthood. *Transition to Adulthood, 20*(1), 159-180.

Harkavy, I., & Puckett, J. L. (1994). Lessons from Hull House for the contemporary urban university. *Social Science Review, 68*, 299-321.

Hatcher, J. A. (2007, October). *Measuring the concepts civic-minded graduate and civic-minded professional.* Paper presented at the 7th Annual Conference of the International Association for Research on Service Learning and Community Engagement, Tampa, FL.

Hewstone, M., & Brown, R. J. (Eds.). (1986). *Contact and conflict in intergroup encounters*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Hodge, D. C., Baxter-Magolda, M. B., & Haynes, C. A. (2009). Engaged learning: Enabling self-authorship and effective practice. *Liberal Education, 95*(4)*.*

King, P. M., Baxter-Magolda, M. B., Barber, J. P., Brown, M. K., & Lindsay, N. K. (2009). Developmentally effective experiences for promoting self-authorship. *Mind, Brain, and Education, 3*(2)*,* 108-118.

Kolb, D. A. (1984). *Experiential learning: Experience as the source of learning and development.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Monitoring the Future. (2008). *Monitoring the future: A continuing study of American youth*. Retrieved January 27, 2009, from http://www.monitoringthefuture.org/

Morgan, W., & Streb, M. (2001). Building citizenship: How quality service learning develops

civic values. *Social Science Quarterly, 82*(1), 154-169.

O'Meara, K., & Rice, R. E. (Eds.). (2005). *Faculty priorities reconsidered: Rewarding multiple*

forms of scholarship. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Rice, R. E. (1996, January). *Making a place for the new American scholar*. Paper presented at

the AAHE Conference on Faculty Roles and Rewards, Atlanta, GA.

Sandmann, L., Jaeger, A. & Thornton, C. (Eds.). (2009). *New directions in community*

engagement . San Francisco, CA : Jossey-Bass.

Figure 1.

Civic-Minded Graduate as a Function of the Person, Role, and Civic

Identity

Educational
Experiences

Civic
Experiences