

Memo

To: Amy Banes-Berceli, Associate Provost
Kathy Daily, Office Assistant, Provost Office

From: Rebecca Cheezum, Committee Chair

Date: July 11, 2023

Re: Annual report for Senate Service Learning Committee

I. Intro:

The 2022-2023 academic year marked the first year of the Senate Committee on Service Learning. This report provides a brief summary of the committee's activities and also includes the minutes from our meetings. The minutes from the final meeting have not yet been approved.

II. Committee charge:

Rationale: To support the use of service learning as a high impact practice and community engagement efforts courses will now be able to be designated on a student's transcript with a service learning attribute. In order for this attribute to be added to a course the syllabus must be reviewed. This requires a faculty led review process similar to our GEN ED committee processes. The workload of the GEN ED committee is too great to add this to their charge so this new committee was created to manage this process.

Charge:

- 1. To recommend to the Senate policies and requirements for service learning courses;*
- 2. function as a curriculum committee for the review of courses seeking the service learning designation;*
- 3. respond to Petitions of Exceptions relating to those policies and requirements;*
- 4. function as the assessment committee for courses designated as service learning courses;*
- 5. report yearly to the Senate on the committee's activities.*

Committee activities:

1. The committee met about once a month throughout the academic year
 2. We developed a form that faculty can use to have a course they teach designated as service learning.
 3. The committee discussed options for noting service learning on the transcript. The committee is leaning towards a badging option.
 4. We developed an assessment rubric to assess whether a course should be designated a service learning course.
 5. The committee has decided to be inclusive and supportive in the assessment approach. If a course does not meet the committee's criteria for a service learning course, members of the committee will reach out to the applicant to offer technical assistance and support for the faculty member to adjust their course (or provide more documentation to the committee) so it meets criteria.
 6. The committee developed a simple reporting process.
 7. The committee decided to strive for having the application process built into Curriculog, but will use Qualtrics as a standby
- III. Leadership next year: I served as chair for the first year, but I only had a 1-year term. I have volunteered to extend my term and serve as chair for next year. I will be prepared to chair the first meeting and let the committee confirm whether they want me to serve as chair or we will hold an election to identify a new committee chair.
- IV. Agendas & Minutes for meetings

Senate Service Learning Committee

Meeting Agenda

September 20, 2022

Join via Zoom

<https://oakland-edu.zoom.us/j/98053975411?pwd=VS9ld1dnMG1hbVAvTGtwRUYvWVltUT09>

1. Introductions
2. Reviewing the Committee Charge (See below)
3. Establishing next steps
4. Setting timeframe for next meeting

Committee charge:

Rationale: To support the use of service learning as a high impact practice and community engagement efforts courses will now be able to be designated on a student's transcript with a service learning attribute. In order for this attribute to be added to a course the syllabus must be reviewed. This requires a faculty led review process similar to our GEN ED committee processes. The workload of the GEN ED committee is too great to add this to their charge so this new committee was created to manage this process.

Charge:

- 1. To recommend to the Senate policies and requirements for service learning courses;*
- 2. function as a curriculum committee for the review of courses seeking the service learning designation;*
- 3. respond to Petitions of Exceptions relating to those policies and requirements;*

4. *function as the assessment committee for courses designated as service learning courses;*
5. *report yearly to the Senate on the committee's activities.*

Senate Service Learning Committee

Meeting Agenda

September 20, 2022

Present: Diane Baldwin, Meaghan Barry, Nancy Bulgarelli, Becca Cheezum (chair), Tanya Christ, Susanne Condron, Jon Davidson, Caress Dean, Huirong Fu, Deidre Hurse, Julie Kruse, Kristin Landis-Piwowar, Enrique Rios-Ellis.

1. Introductions

Becca Cheezum - Chair of Public & Environmental Wellness Department in School of Health Sciences & Associate Professor in the Public Health program. I do service learning in some of my courses.

Nancy Bulgarelli - one of the Health Sciences librarians. We do outreach with schools and think in the context of what kind of experience it can be for the students. I have a tiny bit of understanding of what goes into SL.

Deidre Hurse - OUWB - oversee course in med school that has a service learning component. Still learning and getting to know the community and know what it is like

Meaghan Barry - Chair in Art and Art History program. Created a class called Community Design so students work as real graphic design agency who do work for nonprofits. In other courses throughout graphic design program, colleagues have service learning for folks around campus or community.

Susanne Condron - work in Office of Institutional Research & Assessment - assessment coordinator. Part of my work is tracking the Service Learning Courses and projects that are going on on campus. This has been an ad hoc way of doing things. They've tried to engage faculty to report what they are doing, such as through surveys or as they hear about things. List of courses or activities that are engaging students in this way. Glad to see an actual committee where this will be more formalized and systematic. Important to be able to report all the great

work faculty are doing. Also worked with Gen Ed committee as assessment coordinator - we may model some of our processes off of that committee.

Tanya Christ - Department in Reading and Language Arts. Started doing SL in Baldwin Center and now in 4 school districts. Expanded to all undergraduate courses. Reaching hundred of students.

Caress Dean - School of Health Sciences, Director of Public Health Program. Our program is community-based engagement. I've also interacted with a few of you, for leadership academy, to see how faculty engaged with community

Diane Baldwin - Campus Community Engagement Coordinator at the Provost office. I've worked with most of the people on the committee before. She has a lot to share what they've done with service learning in the last couple of years. Excited to us move the needle forward nad institutionalize it.

Julie Kruse - faculty member in School of Nursing. I teach community health and population health nursing. We have great opportunities for service learning. At my former institution, we did SL with homeless shelters and Habitat for Humanity.

Kristin Landis-Piwowar- Associate Provost My role is to see how we can identify these courses and have them coded in the catalog and how it is noted on transcripts.

Huirong Fu - School of Engineering - I'm not sure why I was selected to this committee. I do not have direct SL experience, but I am director of the ** center and the program coordinator of cyber security. I work on several projects, a K-12 project, and outreach to K-12 students and teachers in area of cyber security. I host undergraduate research program. I also have service scholarship for graduate students.

Jon Davidson - I am the associate registrar for technology and electronic processes. I help with systems integration and have some experience during SL pilot phase getting that noted on transcript. Feasibility of things that might want to get tried as far as getting SL integrated into our systems. Also, in prior life, I was an admissions director at U-M Flint and during that time the university went very heavily into community engagement and service learning. It's one of 7

public universities in the state of Michigan. I got to witness the use of that in appealing to students and attracting students. Students got passionate about that - it was a differentiator.

Enrique Rios-Ellis - I teach in the School of Music, Theater, Dance. Teach classes in music field and coordinate the Jazz Program. I also developed a SL class in the arts: community engagement and the arts. I used to teach at Cal State-Monteray Bay; the whole university had a very strong service learning program, and I was teaching the SL class in the music department. He has brought something similar to OU, though they did not have enough students.

2. Reviewing the Committee Charge

Committee charge:

Rationale: To support the use of service learning as a high impact practice and community engagement efforts courses will now be able to be designated on a student's transcript with a service learning attribute. In order for this attribute to be added to a course the syllabus must be reviewed. This requires a faculty led review process similar to our GEN ED committee processes. The workload of the GEN ED committee is too great to add this to their charge so this new committee was created to manage this process.

Charge:

- 1. To recommend to the Senate policies and requirements for service learning courses;*
- 2. function as a curriculum committee for the review of courses seeking the service learning designation;*
- 3. respond to Petitions of Exceptions relating to those policies and requirements;*
- 4. function as the assessment committee for courses designated as service learning courses;*
- 5. report yearly to the Senate on the committee's activities.*

Diane Baldwin provided some context on how this committee came to be: Before the pandemic hit, she was working with Dean Corcoran about capturing the good work the university was

doing and trying to collect data and highlight it. During the pilot, they asked people who do SL - are you teaching any classes that we can tag as a SL class. They did fall and winter classes and put them on the website and put some student reflection pieces. The students had their transcripts marked with the SL notation.

Susanne Condron added that we may want to do this the way Gen Ed does its work to make sure they are listed in the catalog and make sure students get credit for gen ed (but noted we could choose to do it a different way). Gen Ed process is: faculty fill out a form when they want their course to be considered as a gen ed course. They attach a syllabus and an assessment plan and potentially some assignments. For SL, the assignment or reflections may be part of what is required. Review to see if it meets desired outcomes or certain criteria. Once a course is approved, there are processes with the registrar's office to make sure that they are noted as such. If a course is not approved at first there can be a revise & resubmit process.

Kristin Landis-Piwowar explained that the pilot took a lot of work from a lot of different people. There is a lot happening on the backend. If a course is assigned as a SL course. There is a lot more to it to make that come to fruition. The idea that we would be aligning these courses for Carnegie. The assessment piece is pretty huge. We need to make sure that what we call a community engaged really meet the guidelines. That may be a subgroup of a formalized SL committee or maybe a separate group. But this needs to be a vetted process.

Becca asked: Can you provide the language that is required from a Carnegie Classification?

Diane Baldwin responded that Carnegie is due in May. There are different assessment sections of the Carnegie. There is a SL drive and Diane can add a drive for our committee. The definition, the form that they drafted, and the service learning website and then the Carnegie

There is a Carnegie Classification Task Force, and there is another committee which is the Committee on Civic Engagement. These committees are pulling people together who are already doing this work on campus so we have that knowledge spread out.

This is for graduate & undergraduate

What is desired from this committee's work:

They would like to find the courses that are always taught and mark them in the catalog as such. They want to have quality that the classes that are tagged SL meet the definition of SL.

They want to be able to communicate between this committee and the registrar in line with deadlines. We want to sync it all up.

There is a working definition for service learning that is approved by Senate. Diane will provide it.

Meaghan Barry participated in the pilot program and the form was great. Not all sections do the course, but there was agility to have the designation for some sections but not all.

Jon Davidson - How we accomplished that during the pilot phase. This is a course attribute, like they use for gen ed. There was an attribute created, but this does not get it on the students transcript. This designation was added as a comment. That was functional for the pilot, but it is not to scale. So, what was used in the pilot is scalable enough, but is not done yet. Benefits of course attributes. Those attributes can be associated on the level of the course and then the level of the section. The most challenging part is getting that noted on the transcripts, but that can be scaled.

Petitions of Exceptions - if a student thinks a class meets the requirement, usually at a course at another university, they can file a petition of exception and the committee would also review those.

Kristin L-P thinks we should be thoughtful about whether this is something that the committee will take on or consider whether you can give the criteria to an academic advisor or admissions group and have them make the decision for them? She does not think we should have droves of students filing petitions of exceptions for SL.

Jon Davidson -- If we wanted to designate transfer courses, we could, but it would be a different mechanism. You can indicate the attribute, making it viewable and useful.

Diane Baldwin - Someone needs to educate the campus body about what SL is and what it is not.

Julie Kruse - a fair amount of education - there is a lot of service learning that is going on, but people are not recognizing it.

Tanya Christ - Can we have a mechanism by which students and faculty ask for referrals of classes that may meet the criteria.

Enrique Rios-Ellis - at previous institution, if it was a SL course, there had to be 27-30 hours of service learning. There should be reciprocity - the organizations get the help and the students gain the experience.

Diane Baldwin - thanks for saying that about mutually beneficial. There is some existing data. A couple hundred courses have been identified on campus with a range of what SL entails. This is sporadic data, but gives us a glimpse. Andrea will be using data from 2021-2022 school year for the Carnegie Classification application, so this will not impact the Carnegie Classification this round.

Huirong Fu - The Cyber Security Program has a community service component, including camps for kids and teachers.

Diane Baldwin shared the following links to materials that may be relevant to our work:

Link to SL definition:

https://docs.google.com/document/d/1pcvOfAWfbR9PsgKy9xNisnztedda_mYh3/edit?usp=sharing&oid=118313804479515477514&rtpof=true&sd=true

Link to course form used for pilot:

https://docs.google.com/forms/d/1RJCeY7ub_JhcSmwGgCchvnagbvMYbNpWld-n38u7EDk/edit

Community engagement website/SL course highlights from the pilot:

<https://www.oakland.edu/community/service-learning-course-highlights/>

Carnegie application assessment doc for SL: <https://docs.google.com/document/d/10-TOIs00nKO7hglA0Wy6llpFCMzZof1SbyQieUC2bKY/edit?usp=sharing>

3. Establishing next steps

Quick overview of what our tasks

Overall, this committee will be responsible for developing a process of identifying courses that are service learning, creating a process for courses to apply for this designation, developing a review process, and planning an assessment process.

The group discussed the possibility of designating courses for fall semester. We determined this would not be possible to create the full process in this timeline, so any designation of fall courses as SL courses would need to be completed on an ad-hoc basis.

Becca will send out minutes next week and a Doodle poll to set up a meeting for in about a month. Becca will send out a draft work plan before our next meeting that we can use to start the process of building a plan for our committee's work for the year.

Senate Service Learning Committee

Meeting Agenda

October 27, 2022

3:00 PM

Via Zoom: <https://oakland-edu.zoom.us/j/97485144753?pwd=MjRkRjk0TVB0a3pUZDN0U3h3RTNTQT09>

1. Review & approve minutes from September meeting
2. Brief re-introductions
3. e-Space established ([Senate Service Learning Committee](#))
4. Review & modification of [draft work plan](#)
5. Review [service learning definition](#)
6. Review [form used previously](#)
7. Modify form
8. Adjourn

Committee charge:

Rationale: To support the use of service learning as a high impact practice and community engagement efforts courses will now be able to be designated on a student's transcript with a service learning attribute. In order for this attribute to be added to a course the syllabus must be reviewed. This requires a faculty led review process similar to our GEN ED committee processes. The workload of the GEN ED committee is too great to add this to their charge so this new committee was created to manage this process.

Charge:

- 1. To recommend to the Senate policies and requirements for service learning courses;*
- 2. function as a curriculum committee for the review of courses seeking the service learning designation;*
- 3. respond to Petitions of Exceptions relating to those policies and requirements;*
- 4. function as the assessment committee for courses designated as service learning courses;*
- 5. report yearly to the Senate on the committee's activities.*

Senate Service Learning Committee Meeting

Thursday, October 27, 3:00 – 4:00 pm

Meeting minutes

In attendance:

Rebecca Cheezum, Diane Baldwin, Deidre Hurse, Kristin Landis-Piwowar, Alison Woerner, Caress Dean, Huirong Fu, Bridget Kies, Catlin Demsky, Jon Davidson, Julie Kruse, Megan Barry, Susanne Condron

1. Rebecca Cheezum called the meeting to order at 3:02
2. The minutes were approved without revisions : [Senate Service Learning Committee Meeting Minutes 09-20-2022](#)
3. Brief re-introductions: We spent time getting to know each other and highlighting our experience with service learning.
 - a. Members who missed 1st meeting were invited to do more formal introductions:
 - b. Alison Woerner discussed service learning and examples of existing SL examples such as [Take Root](#)
 - c. Bridget Kies discussed her experience with service learning and the structure of adding service learning credit to courses by adding 1 credit if students complete a service learning project at a previous institution.
 - d. Catlin Demsky discussed her passion for service learning and highlighted the opportunity for adding service learning to the business school.
4. The e-Space was established to help us stay organized and will serve as a space for resources etc. <https://espace.oakland.edu/course/view.php?id=1769>
5. Rebecca Cheezum led a discussion around our Mission and suggested we start thinking through a work plan. She provided a draft work plan to start the discussion.
 - a. The work plan will help us meet the April timeline for the report to the Senate.
 - b. The agreed-upon goal for October is for all of us to become familiar with the definition.
 - c. Kristin Landis-Piwowar noted changes that were grammar related and noted that the registrar's office should get involved sooner.
 - d. Jon Davidson noted that the draft charge suggested that the indication to show up on the transcript has yet to be settled. He discussed the difference between noting SL for a course and indicating it on the transcript. "Recorded" means noted in the information system as a course attribute. There is some contention on the process of how this would be carried out. The pilot notation on the transcript was manual and had some other feasibility challenges.
 - e. Julie Kruse asked about the benefit of having the attribute on the transcript. Kristin Landis-Piwowar suggested that the benefit would be so future employees could quickly determine SL Courses/Experiences.

- f. We discussed the option of Micro-attributes. There are no policies for micro attributes currently.
 - g. Jon Davidson suggested we add discussing the process and explore options for if SL should be noted on the transcript to the work plan.
 - h. Rebecca Cheezum noted we have an open (Voting) student position that the Student Congress should appoint.
 - i. Diane Baldwin suggested a co-curricular transcript that could capture service learning, and other attributes may be an option, but we currently do not have a co-curricular transcript. - Rebecca Cheezum cautioned that a co-curricular transcript might be outside the charge of this group. Jon Davidson noted that the registrar's office has been thinking about this; however, our current Banner system does not have that capability.
 - j. Noted changes to be made to the work plan:
 - i. Course transcript and attributions to be addressed parallel to other work
 - ii. Row 14- whether students should... moved up earlier
 - iii. Move the assessment to next semester so that we can focus on the application currently
 - iv. Rebecca Cheezum will re-address the work plan per the feedback offline before our next meeting.
 - k. Diane Baldwin posed the question about capturing the work going on currently.
 - i. Rebecca Cheezum suggested we review the form and that we adopt it at our next meeting in November. - She will provide a google document of the form before our next meeting:
 - ii. Jon Davidson explained that the attribute could be assigned SL at the course level (Preferred) and the section level. It is also stored in the course's academic history. The attribute has to be noted before grades are submitted. We would need to have the courses designated as early as possible. Considering if a student withdrew then technically a grade was given.
 - iii. Susanne Condron noted the value of having an assessment process. Diane Baldwin mentioned there might be some existing documents already existing related to assessment, and Rebecca Cheezum asked that the documents be shared with us in e-space. Diane Baldwin discussed the process for the piolet, noting there was a non-formal assessment that used the form as a checklist. This could serve as a starting point for assessment.
6. We started to review the service learning definition: We should all be familiar with it. Bridget Kies asked why there is no min number of service hours. Diane Baldwin noted there is a recommendation of 30 hours. Bridget Kies the challenges with no minimum. It is within this committee's charge to suggest changes for future iterations of the definition. Kristin Landis-Piowar provided the version approved at the April 26th Faculty Senate Meeting

This is the current version:

Service Learning is a course-based, credit bearing educational experience in which students participate in a semester-long service partnership that: (a) meets a community-

defined need or aspiration; (b) requires student reflection on their service experience, to foster a deeper self awareness of how their respective discipline impacts issues of social equity; and, (c) supports ongoing, reciprocal campus-community relationships demonstrating OU's commitment to stewardship of place.

To be designated as a service learning course at OU, the class must:

- Directly and explicitly link the service experiences to the course learning objectives.
- Engage students in reflection aimed at connecting their service experience(s) to course content and life experience, including exploration of individual and social group identities, and systemic/institutional change.
- Include tracking* of student service hours and faculty/staff-community partner preparation (hours), as well as an assessment of student reflection, quality of service (incorporating feedback from partners), and the impact of service-related learning outcomes on community partner(s) and/or community(ies) served.
- Involve the student in the practice of culturally respectful engagement and reciprocal decision making processes that build upon community strengths and assets.
- Incorporate different types of service to meet/address diverse learning styles, needs and related accommodations.

*Tracking service hours will happen via a shared, online tool (possibly GivePulse) as of Summer 2022.

Service learning courses may:

Include one or more service experience(s), provided that experiences are linked in terms of course content and learning outcomes, and that students engage and exit community service projects in ways that are defined by the partners involved

Although there is no minimum number of service hours required in a designated SL course, student service hours must be measured and the service experience must comprise interactions over time, e.g., spanning approximately 5-7 weeks over one 16 week course. Best practices indicate that a quality experience developed over time (No one and done) facilitates relationship building, demonstrates commitment, and supports the self-reflective process necessary for transformative learning. Any specific, required number of service hours should be determined by the instructor, based on community partner(s) input. Service activities will be mutually agreed upon by the student, SL faculty, and the community partner(s).

*Note: The university is in the process of establishing a Senate Service Learning Committee which will oversee these courses and their approvals.

Instructions:

To submit your course for the service learning designation in Banner, please complete the attached eform and submit your syllabus to the Senate Service Learning Committee. The form will include the course title, number, section number, credit hours, number of required service learning hours, contact information, and semester(s) offered. To facilitate ongoing tracking, OU service learning students will be asked to provide basic contact information for the service learning site(s). This information will be used to demonstrate ongoing stewardship of place as well as to strengthen ongoing campus-community relationships with diverse community stakeholders.

7. Rebecca Cheezum noted we would not have a December meeting, so we should review the form offline to maximize our time in November. The meeting was adjourned at 4:03 pm.
8. Next Meeting Tuesday, November 15 · 9:00 – 10:00am

Zoom Link: <https://oakland-edu.zoom.us/j/94284361468?pwd=b202WmNGV1VwVWt2QTdCT2xJeld5Zz09>

Senate Service Learning Committee

November 15, 2022

9:00 AM

Via Zoom: <https://oakland-edu.zoom.us/j/94284361468?pwd=b202WmNGV1VwVWt2QTdCT2xJeld5Zz09>

Meeting Agenda

1. Review & approve minutes from October meeting
2. Welcome to student member: Lance Markowitz
3. Review form used previously and Document of Becca's notes comparing form to SL definition
4. Modify form
5. Selection process & criteria
6. Assessment procedures
7. Review & modification of [draft work plan](#)
8. Next meeting - TBD
9. Adjourn

Senate Service-Learning Committee Meeting minutes

November 15, 2022, 9:00 AM

Via Zoom: <https://oakland-edu.zoom.us/j/94284361468?pwd=b202WmNGV1VwVWt2QTdCT2xJeld5Zz09>

In attendance:

Becca Cheezum, Diane Baldwin, Deidre Hurse, Ali Woerner, Caress Dean, Bridget Kies, Catlin Demsky, Jon Davidson, Julie Kruse, Susanne Condron, Nancy Bulgarelli, Tanya Christ

1. The meeting was called to order at 9:01 by Becca Cheezum.
2. The minutes were approved with revisions to spell Julie's name correctly: [Updated Senate Service Learning Committee Meeting Minutes 10 27 2022.docx](#)
3. Student member Lance Markowitz will meet with Rebecca Cheezum offline as he could not attend today. They will discuss, amongst other things, student perspectives on the SL notation on the transcript.
4. We reviewed the form used previously and the SL definition and Service-Learning Course Form.
 - a. We discussed ensuring that the faculty on record's name is captured in the form. Some disciplines may require the instructor to complete the form, but some may have chairs or support staff complete the form. There was consensus that we should capture info for the person completing the form if it is not the instructor. It was suggested that we add a check box that opens to collect contact information of non-instructors completing the form. Also, there was a consensus to change the document to reflect the course instructor's contact instead of just "Name," etc.
 - b. We discussed the ideal format. Two forms may be duplicative, but we need a way to distinguish the SL distinction. Reconstructing the survey in Qualtrics would increase the functionality of the survey and allow for one link. Susanne Condron offered to help Becca Cheezum with the transition to Qualtrics.
 - c. John Davidson noted that if the SL designation is for the course, it can be done annually, but if it's at the section level, it has to be done every term and CRN. Tanya Christ suggested that we should send a yearly check. John Davidson cautioned there is no way to associate the instructor with CRN in Banner, so we would have to use a data collection mechanism.
 - d. Becca Cheezum asked if there is something we could learn from the affordable textbook attribution. She recommended that we reach out to inquire about their process.

- e. If the designation is at the section level, the recertification each semester will be laborious. Ideally, it should be a relatively straightforward process.
 - f. With regard to what needs to be collected, it was noted that the Course number, Section, and CRN need to be separate.
5. The question If not all boxes are checked then does the course qualify for SL was posed to the group.
- a. Diane Baldwin stated that the form was initially intended to get base data and not to be punitive.
 - b. There was discussion that recommended feedback be given to help advise faculty on how to achieve SL designation if not deemed appropriate based on the information provided in the form.
6. Diane Baldwin suggested that the definition provided should be swapped with the current definition in the form. Susanne Condrón noted that the definition is not explicitly inclusive of assessment. Nancy Bulgarelli Suggested the third bullet could be separated to better capture assessment. Tanya Chris suggested including a question on the form like “How do you assess the course?” There was some discussion on whether or not to add that directly to the form or collect it separately.
7. Next Steps
- a. Becca Cheezum will take the lead on making the changes to the form. We will plan to meet for a longer time to get the form completed for the winter semester.
 - b. Our next meeting will be in January and should be blocked for longer to finalize the form, etc.
 - c. There was an agreement that we would have to start disseminating the form next semester, and the work plan should be updated to reflect the winter dissemination of the form.
8. Selection process & criteria – Tabled.
9. Assessment procedures - Tabled
10. Next meeting - TBD (January)
11. Adjourned at 9:59 AM

Senate Service Learning Committee

January 17, 2023

Meeting Agenda

1. Is anyone willing to take minutes for the meeting today?
2. Approval of minutes from 11/15/2022
3. Meeting scheduling
 - Thursday, February 9th 10am-12pm
 - Wednesday, March 8th 12pm - 2pm
 - Thursday, March 30th 10am - 12pm
 - Wednesday, April 19th 12pm - 2pm
4. Review of draft [application form](#)
5. Options for being on transcript
 - a. Badging (Tricia Westergaard)
6. Meeting adjourn

Senate Service Learning Committee

January 17, 2023

1. Approval of minutes from 11/15/2022 - Minutes were approved
2. Meeting Scheduling - Future meetings for Winter 2023 will be on the following dates:
 - Thursday, February 9th, 10 am -12 pm
 - Wednesday, March 8th, 12 pm - 2 pm
 - Thursday, March 30th, 10 am - 12 pm
 - Wednesday, April 19th, 12 pm - 2 pm
3. Becca Cheezum met with the Student member Lance Markowitz, and he will try to attend the next meeting.
4. Review of draft Service Learning Course Form - The committee spent most of the time discussing the service learning application form, which faculty or departments will submit to propose their course as a designated service-learning course.

Draft [application form](#)

- a. The application will be moved to Qualtrics once it is finalized
- b. Becca Cheezum did a line-by-line overview of the document.
- c. Q9- There was a consensus to have **F**, **W**, and **S** for semesters when the course is offered.
- d. Q11/12/13 Changed to: "What is your process for reflecting and trying to improve the service-learning component in your course?" We all agreed.
- e. Q Does this course offer different service projects for students to choose from?*
Y/N
 - i. There was a discussion if the question is required. – Consensus to remove
 - ii. This may not be relevant. There was a consensus that we may not need to collect the host organization later.
- f. Where will the student work (i.e., tell us about the community partner(s) who will host your students)* *List all organizations-* was added.

- g. How many hours will students work in or with the community during the semester?* - There is a threshold. It was changed to: *How many hours will each student work in the community or on a project in collaboration with a community partner during the semester?* Please include all hours that the students are working on their service learning projects, including prep time or work on projects that may be done at home or on campus.* ____
 - h. There was a discussion on adding a question that captures how much time faculty spend on service-learning.
5. Diane Baldwin – suggested that there be a requirement for faculty to submit a final report. There was a discussion about if this would be ideal. It may disincentivize participation. It may be labor-intensive for the committee and the faculty. There was a general consensus that it was a good idea to ask but not require a large amount of text. The committee could go back to the faculty and ask for more information. There was consensus that we want to know if they have a process, and there was consensus that we may not want to take on the review at this time.
 - a. The discussion on review was tabled.
 - b. Dr. Cheezum confirmed all concerns were addressed.
 6. There was a discussion on future data collection. The database is designed to be real-time.
 7. It was noted that there were 10 classes for the pilot. We do not know how many courses would be submitted if it were opened university-wide. A survey showed about 200+ responses of various CE courses. There will likely be some faculty involvement.
 8. The following is what the committee agreed upon. This can be put into Qualtrics.

Service Learning Course Form

If you have a course that you would like reviewed for the Service Learning designation, please complete the following information. *indicates that question must be completed

- First and Last name of person completing form*: _____
- Email address of person completing form*: _____
- Department or Unit*: _____
- Course prefix*: ____
- Course number*: ____
- Course name*: _____
- Are you the instructor for this course*?

Yes → continue to #8

No → 7a. Please describe your role/relation to the course (e.g., department chair, CT) _____

- Is more than one section of this course offered per academic year*?

No → continue #9

Yes → 8a. Will all sections of this course be designated as service learning courses?

Yes, continue to #9

No → 8b. please list all CRNs for sections that will be SL _____

8c. Is whether the course is SL or not dependent upon the course instructor? (This will require follow-up from SL committee.)

- Please check which semesters this course is offered (check all that apply)*:
 - a. Fall
 - b. Winter
 - c. Summer
- Check all that apply for this course*:
 - a. Directly and explicitly links the service learning experiences to the course learning objectives
 - b. Engages students in reflection aimed at connecting lessons from the service experience(s) to course content and life experience OR asks them to reflect on community impact
 - c. Assesses the learning that occurs as a result of the service experience(s)
 - d. Requires the service experience of all students enrolled in the course (assessment of student learning for the course includes completion of service learning activities)
 - e. Demonstrates reciprocity between the students in the course and the community agency or population being served
- What is your process for reflecting and trying to improve the service learning component in your course?
- How many hours will each student work in the community or on a project in collaboration with a community partner during the semester? Please include all hours that the students are working on their service learning projects, including prep time or work on projects that may be done at home or on campus.* ____
- How many hours do you/does the instructor spend on the students' service learning projects?

- How much additional time do you spend preparing for and implementing your service learning course, as compared with a non- service learning version of the course?
- Where will students work? (i.e., tell us about the community partner(s) who will host your students, list all organizations)* _____
- Please attach your syllabus and any relevant handouts to this form. Be sure that the syllabus clearly articulates how your course does all of the following:
 - Directly and explicitly links the service learning experiences to the course learning objectives
 - Engages students in reflection aimed at connecting lessons from the service experience(s) to course content and life experience OR asks them to reflect on community impact
 - Assesses the learning that occurs as a result of the service experience(s)
 - Requires the service experience of all students enrolled in the course (assessment of student learning for the course includes completion of service learning activities)
 - Demonstrates reciprocity between the students in the course and the community agency or population being served

9. Assessment procedures - Tabled

10. Next meeting - TBD (2/9/23)

11. Adjourned at 9:59 AM

Senate Service Learning Committee

February 9, 2023

Meeting Notes

In attendance:

Becca Cheezum, Deidre Hurse, Catlin Demsky, Julie Kruse, Susanne Condrón, Nancy Bulgarelli, Tricia Westergaard, Meaghan Barry, Ali Woerner, Huirong Fu, Bridget Kies

1. Meeting Called to order at 10:00 Am by Becca Cheezum.
2. Approval of minutes from 1/17/2022
3. Options for being on the transcript
 - a. Badging: Tricia Westergaard informed us that we would soon have a badging option that may have different levels of badging, but the system is being developed.
 - b. We discussed that Badging also requires course designation. Tricia said that some schools have a co-curricular transcript, but we don't have that here. She said we still need to consider the labor of manually adding it to the transcript. So, we would likely focus on giving a course attribute that doesn't appear on the transcript, but a course attribute could be linked to a Badge that students could acquire. Susanne Condrón confirmed with Tricia that we could add the attribute at the CRN level.
 - c. Becca Cheezum- noted that our charge is to focus on the course designation and that Badges may interest students and others. We discussed the benefits of badging and what students and employers may think of the concept. Meaghan Barry noted there is an upcoming push to educate students about the benefits of experiential learning.
4. Application process nuanced situations
 - a. We discussed the form, and there were just a few items we still needed to confirm:
 - i. If someone other than the course instructor submits the application form (e.g., CT or department chair), someone would need to follow up with the faculty. Whoever is doing the assessment would likely follow up. We

discussed that regardless of how the form is filled out, there needs to be ongoing monitoring of the courses each semester. We talked about strategies to capture this. One option was a check box that says the course attribute is for multiple semesters. We discussed if this is something done annually or each semester. We discussed the student experience. Students may want to search for service learning before registering, so the attribute should be added before students enroll. There was a suggestion that it is done for the upcoming academic year so it is present before the full-year registration.

- ii. What happens if the course instructor changes once the course is designated SL? There would need to be some department responsibility to ensure the criteria for SL is still present if the instructor changes.
 - iii. If multiple instructors teach the same course and not all use SL, this can be addressed before the course goes live.
 - iv. We should add language for instructors to complete it. We can ask about the intention of the course designation for the next two years. We could have Qualtrics follow up by sending an email to check annually for a status change in the SL.
- b. We discussed the committee's capacity to maintain the administrative aspects of tracking SL. Bridget Kies noted that we should automate with Qualtrics, and we discussed that challenges would happen, but perfection should not be the barrier to moving forward.
5. Susanne discussed some of the processes used in Gen ED. Developing a process for review of applications to designate a course as a Service Learning Course. There is a form with attached documents. The committee assigns groups to review the applications. If the committee has questions, there is some back and forth between the department, faculty, and the committee, and then there is a final decision.
6. We discussed if we should have a rubric to evaluate the application or use a less formal evaluation method. Tanya Christ may offer some insight. She could not be here today. We have [questions](#) that could serve as a rubric that could be used at the start. We revisited the definition, and Catlin Demsky noted that there is no min. hours required.
- a. The first rounds of reviews are offline – Electronic Becca Cheezum will draft a rubric for us to review at our next meeting. We would review as a group if the volume is low but if we have several courses to review. We could create subgroups if there are several courses to review.
 - b. Then, the committee discusses
 - i. Agreement – Those courses get SL designation

- ii. Disagreement or missing documents, there can be a request for more information from the faculty– we will have a vote. Courses needing more support may receive designation after enrollment, which could affect the student experience. We may need administrative support with following up with courses.
- 7. Develop criteria for assessing applications for SL course designation: We discussed criteria such as if the form is complete with the attachments and the other criteria in the application. There is a both-and approach to the courses requesting SL.
- 8. We discussed a deadline. January was discussed.
- 9. Upcoming Meetings – We should discuss assessment and reporting. Susanne will review the Carnegie application requirements.
 - a. Wednesday, March 8th, 12 pm – 2 pm
 - b. Thursday, March 30th, 10 am – 12 pm
 - c. Wednesday, April 19th, 12 pm – 2 pm
- 10. The meeting adjourned at 11:28

Senate Service Learning Committee

February 9, 2023

Meeting Notes

In attendance:

Becca Cheezum, Deidre Hurse, Catlin Demsky, Julie Kruse, Susanne Condron, Nancy Bulgarelli, Tricia Westergaard, Meaghan Barry, Ali Woerner, Huirong Fu, Bridget Kies

1. Meeting Called to order at 10:00 Am by Becca Cheezum.
2. Approval of minutes from 1/17/2022
3. Options for being on the transcript
 - a. Badging: Tricia Westergaard informed us that we would soon have a badging option that may have different levels of badging, but the system is being developed.
 - b. We discussed that Badging also requires course designation. Tricia said that some schools have a co-curricular transcript, but we don't have that here. She said we still need to consider the labor of manually adding it to the transcript. So, we would likely focus on giving a course attribute that doesn't appear on the transcript, but a course attribute could be linked to a Badge that students could acquire. Susanne Condron confirmed with Tricia that we could add the attribute at the CRN level.
 - c. Becca Cheezum- noted that our charge is to focus on the course designation and that Badges may interest students and others. We discussed the benefits of badging and what students and employers may think of the concept. Meaghan Barry noted there is an upcoming push to educate students about the benefits of experiential learning.
4. Application process nuanced situations
 - a. We discussed the form, and there were just a few items we still needed to confirm:
 - i. If someone other than the course instructor submits the application form (e.g., CT or department chair), someone would need to follow up with the faculty. Whoever is doing the assessment would likely follow up. We

discussed that regardless of how the form is filled out, there needs to be ongoing monitoring of the courses each semester. We talked about strategies to capture this. One option was a check box that says the course attribute is for multiple semesters. We discussed if this is something done annually or each semester. We discussed the student experience. Students may want to search for service learning before registering, so the attribute should be added before students enroll. There was a suggestion that it is done for the upcoming academic year so it is present before the full-year registration.

- ii. What happens if the course instructor changes once the course is designated SL? There would need to be some department responsibility to ensure the criteria for SL is still present if the instructor changes.
 - iii. If multiple instructors teach the same course and not all use SL, this can be addressed before the course goes live.
 - iv. We should add language for instructors to complete it. We can ask about the intention of the course designation for the next two years. We could have Qualtrics follow up by sending an email to check annually for a status change in the SL.
- b. We discussed the committee's capacity to maintain the administrative aspects of tracking SL. Bridget Kies noted that we should automate with Qualtrics, and we discussed that challenges would happen, but perfection should not be the barrier to moving forward.
5. Susanne discussed some of the processes used in Gen ED. Developing a process for review of applications to designate a course as a Service Learning Course. There is a form with attached documents. The committee assigns groups to review the applications. If the committee has questions, there is some back and forth between the department, faculty, and the committee, and then there is a final decision.
6. We discussed if we should have a rubric to evaluate the application or use a less formal evaluation method. Tanya Christ may offer some insight. She could not be here today. We have [questions](#) that could serve as a rubric that could be used at the start. We revisited the definition, and Catlin Demsky noted that there is no min. hours required.
- a. The first rounds of reviews are offline – Electronic Becca Cheezum will draft a rubric for us to review at our next meeting. We would review as a group if the volume is low but if we have several courses to review. We could create subgroups if there are several courses to review.
 - b. Then, the committee discusses
 - i. Agreement – Those courses get SL designation

- ii. Disagreement or missing documents, there can be a request for more information from the faculty– we will have a vote. Courses needing more support may receive designation after enrollment, which could affect the student experience. We may need administrative support with following up with courses.
- 7. Develop criteria for assessing applications for SL course designation: We discussed criteria such as if the form is complete with the attachments and the other criteria in the application. There is a both-and approach to the courses requesting SL.
- 8. We discussed a deadline. January was discussed.
- 9. Upcoming Meetings – We should discuss assessment and reporting. Susanne will review the Carnegie application requirements.
 - a. Wednesday, March 8th, 12 pm – 2 pm
 - b. Thursday, March 30th, 10 am – 12 pm
 - c. Wednesday, April 19th, 12 pm – 2 pm
- 10. The meeting adjourned at 11:28

Senate Service Learning Committee

March 30, 2023

Meeting Agenda

1. Approval of minutes from 3/8/23
2. Discussion of Carnegie Criteria and how it relates to our work (do we need to revise anything to better align with this criteria) - *See pages 2-3 of agenda*
3. Continued discussion of request from Provost Office
 - a. Service Learning (our charge) vs. Experiential Learning (provost office request) vs. Community-Engaged courses (Carnegie language)
 - b. Can Curriculog operate more like Qualtrics? (Kristin Landis-Piwowar)
 - c. Items to add to questionnaire to address concerns in article previously shared?
See page 4 of agenda and paper attached
4. Discussion: Are internships service learning? (Bridget Kies)
5. Review of application scoring rubric (below) (Becca) – *See page 6 of agenda*
6. Badging vs. other options – do we have a decision? (Becca)
7. Upcoming Meetings
 - a. Wednesday, April 19th 12pm - 2pm
8. Meeting adjourn

Carnegie Criteria

SECTION 8: Outcomes and Impacts

The purpose of the questions in this section is to gather evidence of how community engagement affects four key entities: students, community partners, faculty, and the campus.

When institutions engage with communities, we expect there will be effects on these constituent groups. These expectations may vary from institution to institution and may be implicit or explicit. Outcome and Impact may take many forms including benefits or changes that are in keeping with the goals set for engagement in collaboration with community partners. Thus, there is potential for both expected outcomes and impacts and unintended consequences, as well as positive and negative impacts. This is the section to report data resulting from institutional tracking, monitoring, and assessment of community engagement.

Outcomes are the short-term and intermediate changes that occur in learners, program participants, etc., as a direct result of a community engagement activity, program, or experience.

An outcome is an effect your program produces on the people or issues you serve or address.

Outcomes are the observed effects of the outputs on the beneficiaries of the community engagement. Outcomes should clearly link to goals. Measuring outcomes requires a commitment of time and resources for systematic campus-wide tracking or documentation mechanisms for the purposes of assessment. Outcomes provide the measurable effects the program will accomplish. When outcomes are reached new goals or objectives may need to be set, and when outcomes are not achieved it may be time to analyze why.

Impacts are the long-term consequence of community engagement. Impacts are the broader

changes that occur within the community, organization, society, or environment as a result of program outcomes. While it is very difficult to ascertain the exclusive impact of community engagement, it is important to consider the desired impact and the alignment of outcomes with that impact. Furthermore, institutions can and should be working toward some way of measuring impact as an institution or as a part of a collective impact strategy.

1. Provide an example of institutional, departmental, and/or programmatic learning outcomes for students who participate in for-credit courses that are community engaged, and describe one key finding.

This question focuses specifically on learning outcomes. While there may be co-curricular learning outcomes on your campus, this question is specifically about learning outcomes that are expected from community engagement courses. These community engagement learning outcomes may be specified at the institutional level (for example, as part of the general education curriculum) or they may be community engagement learning outcomes in a department or major, or they may be tied to a community engagement program (for example, a leadership program that involves students from across majors) – or a combination of these. The question is structured in a way that presumes (see question 2 below) that if learning outcomes are being named, then they are also being measured – and the question asks what has been learned from the assessment of community engagement learning outcomes.

2. Describe how institutional, departmental, and/or programmatic learning outcomes for students who participate in for-credit courses that are community engaged are systematically assessed. Include the strategy and mechanisms for assessment in your

description.

For the community engagement learning outcomes tied to courses, how are those outcomes assessed? In other words, how does the campus know that students are achieving the desired learning outcomes of their community engagement courses? How does the assessment happen on an on-going basis? What are the artifacts produced by the students that are assessed? How does that assessment of the artifacts happen – what is the assessment process, and who is involved?

3. Provide examples of changes made to for-credit courses that are community engaged based on the results of institutional, departmental, and/or programmatic learning outcomes assessment.

Based on the assessment processes described in the answers to questions 1 and 2 above, what has been an outcome of that assessment – how has what was learned in the assessment process about the extent to which students were achieving the desired community engagement learning outcomes had an effect on practice?

SECTION 10: Curricular Engagement

The questions in this section use the term “community engaged courses” to denote academically based community engaged courses. Your campus may use another term such as service-learning, community-based learning, public service courses, etc.

1. Provide the definition used for community engaged courses, the standard and required

components for designation of community engaged courses, and the process through which the institution assures fidelity to the definition in those courses.

Curricular Engagement describes the teaching, learning, and scholarship that engages faculty, students, and community in mutually beneficial and respectful collaboration. Their interactions address community-identified needs, deepen students' civic and academic learning, enhance community well-being, and enrich the scholarship of the institution.

The term "community engaged courses" is used in the application to denote academically-based community engaged courses. Other terms may be used by campuses, including service-learning, community-based learning, public service courses, etc.

This question is foundational to understanding the degree to which community engagement is part of the instructional culture of credit-bearing courses across the campus – the extent to which it pervades teaching and learning, and, thus, faculty work in curriculum and pedagogy as well as student learning. The question asks how community engagement is defined; in other words, without some parameters, any kind of teaching and learning that in any way involves the community could be considered. Additionally, it asks how that definition is connected to a course designation.

In other words, how is it decided that a course is community engaged – is it through some process of designation or is it up to a faculty or staff member to claim that a course is community engaged? Without knowing both how community engaged courses are defined and designated, then it is not possible to know the validity of any quantification of community engaged courses.

4. Describe how community engaged courses are noted on student academic transcripts.

Building on the questions above, this question asks about how community engaged courses

show up as academic work on student transcripts.



Service Learning Course Application

If you have a course that you would like reviewed for the Service Learning designation, please complete the following information. *indicates that question must be completed

- First and Last name of person completing form*: _____
- Email address of person completing form*: _____
- Department or Unit*: _____
- Course prefix*: _____
- Course number*: _____
- Course name*: _____
- Are you the instructor for this course*?

Yes → continue to #8

No → 7a. Please describe your role/relation to the course (e.g., department chair, CT) _____

- Is more than one section of this course offered per academic year*?

No → continue #9

Yes → 8a. Will all sections of this course be designated as service learning courses?

Yes, continue to #9

No → 8b. please list all CRNs for sections that will be SL _____

8c. Is whether the course is SL or not dependent upon the course instructor? (This will require follow-up from SL committee.)

- Please check which semesters this course is offered (check all that apply)*:
 - a. Fall
 - b. Winter
 - c. Summer
- Check all that apply for this course*:
 - a. Directly and explicitly links the service learning experiences to the course learning objectives
 - b. Engages students in reflection aimed at connecting lessons from the service experience(s) to course content and life experience OR asks them to reflect on community impact
 - c. Assesses the learning that occurs as a result of the service experience(s)

- d. Requires the service experience of all students enrolled in the course (assessment of student learning for the course includes completion of service learning activities)
- e. Demonstrates reciprocity between the students in the course and the community agency or population being served
- What is your process for reflecting and trying to improve the service learning component in your course?
- How many hours will each student work in the community or on a project in collaboration with a community partner during the semester? Please include all hours that the students are working on their service learning projects, including prep time or work on projects that may be done at home or on campus.* ____
- How many hours do you/does the instructor spend on the students' service learning projects?
- How much additional time do you spend preparing for and implementing your service learning course, as compared with a non- service learning version of the course?
- Where will students work? (i.e., tell us about the community partner(s) who will host your students, list all organizations)* ____
- Please attach your syllabus and any relevant handouts to this form. Be sure that the syllabus clearly articulates how your course does all of the following:
 - Directly and explicitly links the service learning experiences to the course learning objectives
 - Engages students in reflection aimed at connecting lessons from the service experience(s) to course content and life experience OR asks them to reflect on community impact
 - Assesses the learning that occurs as a result of the service experience(s)
 - Requires the service experience of all students enrolled in the course (assessment of student learning for the course includes completion of service learning activities)
 - Demonstrates reciprocity between the students in the course and the community agency or population being served

Course Number/Name:		2	1	Rating	Reviewer Notes
Reviewer:		Meets OU standards	Does not meet OU standards		
Directly and explicitly links the service learning experiences to the course learning objectives	Step 2				
Engages students in reflection aimed at connecting lessons from the service experience(s) to course content and life experience OR asks them to reflect on community impact	Step 2				
Assesses the learning that occurs as a result of the service experience(s)	Step 4				
Requires the service experience of all students enrolled in the course (assessment of student learning for the course includes completion of service learning activities)	Step 5				
Demonstrates reciprocity between the students in the course and the community agency or population being served	Step 6				
Instructor demonstrates practice of reflection and attempts to improve the service learning component in your course?	Step 6				

DRAFT MINUTES OF FINAL MEETING

Senate Service Learning Committee April 10, 2023,

Meeting Notes

In attendance: Meaghan Barry, Nancy Bulgarelli, Becca Cheezum (chair), Tanya Christ, Susanne Condron, Jon Davidson, Caress Dean, Huirong Fu, Deidre Hurse, Julie Kruse, Kristin Landis-Piwowar, Enrique Rios-Ellis, Ali Woerner, Caitlin Demskey, Tricia Westergaard, Bridget Kies, Jennifer Anderson,

1. Approval of minutes from 3/30/23: Was approved [2023-03-30 Senate Service Learning Committee Meeting Notes.docx](#)
2. Continued discussion of request from Provost Office
 - a. Service Learning (our charge) vs. Experiential Learning (provost office request) vs. Community-Engaged courses (Carnegie language) (Kristin Landis-Piwowar): We opted to keep the existing name of this group as it has been out charge and shaped the work we have been doing
 - b. Can Curriculog operate more like Qualtrics? (Kristin Landis-Piwowar)

We had a process discussion on the next steps on if Qualtrics is more user-friendly. A committee is working on it, but it is still being determined if it can replace Qualtrics. There is also a function of Carriculog that allows for routing, which would be helpful with notifying the chairs etc. There are also some other tools that we could consider that may also have routing. For Gen Ed, the chair enters the information into Carriculog, but our process is a bit more nuanced, so that process may not work. There were questions about the workflow of course-level attributes, which is believed to be feasible. Gen Ed is moving the application to Curriculog to avoid duplication of services.

We agreed to reduce barriers and duplication to try getting it built in Curriculog to see if that option works. Qualtrics is ready to go to serve as a backup. This will be top of the list for us when we meet next.

There is a discussion forum called the parking lot on e-space where we can add things we should address in the future. Jennifer needs to be added to the Espace.

3. Timeframe for the application process
 - a. We reviewed the Process for service learning course designation.
 - b. There will be a call for applications at the beginning of the fall semester. We discussed the due date. It was suggested that we get the word out early from the provost's office so

service learning is on everyone's radar early on. Suggestions included the provost chairs committee, the senate, provost emails, an informational session, and word of mouth to each department. There was an agreement that the applications would have a fall and winter deadline. Fall would be in early October; Winter would be in early January. The goal would be to have it in place before students register. If the volume is low, we may have some wiggle room to be more flexible. We would have a 6-week turnaround time to review. We are aiming to have it done before Thanksgiving. Tentative dates for Fall are October 6th due November 17th. Tentative dates for Winter would be January 19th and it would be due February 26th.

c. We agreed that the call would be for classes in both 23/24 and 24/25.

4. We reviewed the work we have done over the year, found on the bottom of the agenda for this meeting: [2023-04-19 Senate Service Learning Committee Meeting Agenda.docx](#)

. It was read aloud, and we followed through to ensure consensus.

a. There were minor edits to the application process language to reflect what we discussed. (Noted above)

b. We discussed the criteria for passing and came to the consensus that the threshold could be 3, with the expectation that the second year should be a four or better. - We need to be clear about the tiered process upfront, and that language needs to be added to the application.

c. For the application process, we discussed and agreed that we should add the contact of the department chair of the application. To ensure that we have their contact if we can't use Caricolog.

d. There was a note that we may have to reconcile that community partner commitment may be less apparent that far in advance. So we should anticipate some faculty won't know.

e. There was consensus on the reading and understanding of the process.

5. Review committee charge

. We were given time to read the charge, and the floor was open for discussion.

a. There was some discussion about the charge of "functioning as the assessment committee for the course designated as service-learning courses." It was suggested that we have a check-in point post application for instructors, it was suggested that we have instructors use the rubric as a guide for the reflection, and/or share an example of an assignment, and/or update the community partners and/or reflect on the time commitment. We also discussed the need for some type of student outcome data. Also, ask them if any changes will result from your reflection on the experience. This needs to be carefully timed concerning post-implantation assessment. We agreed that a two-year report-back period seems reasonable.

b. No other concerns regarding the Charge were raised

6. The meeting was adjourned 1:14 PM