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ABSTRACT

This study focuses on the nature of the partnership development between three community service agencies and an institution of higher education for the delivery of service-learning experiences. The specific partnerships are between agency members of The United Way Chapter of Licking County, State of Ohio, the American Red Cross Licking County Ohio Chapter, Sharon Glyn Senior Apartments and faculty members of the Newark campus of The Ohio State University. In addition to interviewing the Director of the service agencies in each of these three settings, interviews were conducted with service agency supervisors, and the three faculty members from the Newark campus who designed service learning based experiences within their respective courses. An extensive overview of the research concerning civic engagement and the role and basic concepts of service-learning on the college and university campus, building a service-learning partnership, and partnership development theories and processes is included.

From the point of view of service agencies and higher education faculty members, this study has seven primary foci: 1) To develop an understanding of the nature of service-learning partnerships with a regional (branch) campus located in a small rural town as understood by three participating community services organizations, and three participating higher education faculty members, 2) To develop an understanding of how service-learning partnerships are established/formulated, 3) To develop an understanding of how service-learning partnerships are maintained, 4) To develop an understanding of how service-learning partnerships are renewed, 5) To develop an understanding of how
service-learning partnerships are changed, 6) To develop and understanding of the impact(s) service-learning partnerships have on the participating community service agencies staff/employees, physical facilities and services provided, and 7) To understand potential differences made on each of the six previous questions by the type and variation of service provided within the service-learning partnership. Qualitative inquiry is utilized to understand the patterns of meaning of these foci from the point of the faculty participants as well as the service agency and their staffs across three kinds of agencies.
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CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION AND STATEMENT OF PROBLEM

Abstract

From the point of view of service agencies and higher education faculty members, this study has seven primary foci: 1) To develop an understanding of the nature of service-learning partnerships with a regional (branch) campus located in a small rural town as understood by three participating community services organizations, and three participating higher education faculty members, 2) To develop an understanding of how service-learning partnerships are established/formulated, 3) To develop an understanding of how service-learning partnerships are maintained, 4) To develop an understanding of how service-learning partnerships are renewed, 5) To develop an understanding of how service-learning partnerships are changed, 6) To develop and understanding of the impact(s) service-learning partnerships have on the participating community service agencies staff/employees, physical facilities and services provided, and 7) To understand potential differences made on each of the six previous questions by the type and variation of service provided within the service-learning partnership. Qualitative inquiry is utilized to understand the patterns of meaning of these foci from the point of the faculty participants as well as the service agency and their staffs across three kinds of agencies.
Introduction

As recently as 1998, leaders at the National Society for Experiential Education stated there was a lack of information about effective processes for building meaningful, reciprocal partnerships in service-learning programs. The scholarly work that has been completed on campus-community partnerships is heavily weighted toward student outcomes and the role of the curriculum (Jacoby, 1996 p.92). The educational side of service-learning partnership tends to dominate the research. This study will focus on the nature of service-learning partnerships between community agencies and higher education faculty members, with particular emphasis given to the voice of the community agency partner. Specifically, this study will focus on three community service agencies who partner with three higher education faculty members of The Ohio State University-Newark in offering service-learning experiences. The following service agencies shall constitute the community partners of this study: 1) The American Red Cross of Licking County, 2) Sharon Glenn Senior Apartments, and 3) The United Way of Licking County. The higher education faculty members of The Ohio State University-Newark involved in this study represents the educational disciplines of English, Sociology, and Education.

The study was prompted by my interest in service-learning initiatives and their impact on college student’s development; however, more importantly, it was prompted by my desire to investigate the nature of the experience of community service agencies within service-learning partnerships. I shall therefore examine, from the community
service agency’s perspective, the rationale behind and outcomes expected in establishing a service-learning partnership, the process of forming, maintaining, renewing, changing, and evaluating a service-learning partnership, and then finally any perceived impact(s) a service-learning partnership has upon the participating community service agency. This chapter presents a statement of the problem, describes the purpose of the study, and provides an overview of the study.

**Statement of the Problem**

Giles and Eyler (1998) developed the “top ten unanswered questions in Service-Learning.” Within this publication, the authors identified items or areas within the Service-learning field that had been invariably ignored in the research related to Service-learning. According to Giles and Eyler, there had been a lack of attention paid to the creation and sustainability of partnerships between institutions of higher education and the community. The very partners that had been sought to create a mutually beneficial and symbiotic relationship had not been a facet of study. No significant attention had been devoted to the study of partnership generation as it relates to the thoughts, feelings, hopes, aspirations, commitments, trials, tribulations, and/or successes of the participating partner organization(s) and higher education representatives. Giles and Eyler asked: “What elements and types of community partnerships are important for effective service-learning”? This specific question alludes to the fact that there is very limited empirical
information related to an understanding of “partnership” from the participants’ perspective(s). To delve into such a question, an understanding of the partnering process from the participants’ perception and in that agency’s and faculty members’ “voice” is essential. This study will seek to examine in-depth the process of partnership development between three community service agencies in the Licking County Ohio area and three higher education faculty members of The Ohio State University-Newark. I will attempt to develop an understanding of the rationale as to why leaders of the participating community service agencies and participating faculty members engage in the service-learning experience. In addition the researcher hopes to understand the nature of the experience of participating community service agencies’ personnel, facilities and organizational product within that service-learning process. I also seek an understanding of how participating community service agencies, guide, mold and/or nurture the service-learning partnership that has been formulated. In addition, the researcher desires to understand what, if any, impacts were made on the agencies participating in these service-learning experiences. Finally, I shall explore how the type of service performed within the service-learning experience may delineate difference in the experiences of the participating community service agencies.
Service-Learning

Service-learning is an education methodology which basically combines community service with specific, structured academic content and processes. Jacoby (1996) defines Service-learning in the following manner: “Service-learning is a form of experiential education in which student’s engage in activities that address human and community needs together with structured opportunities intentionally designed to promote student learning and development. Service-learning includes the key concepts of the reflection and reciprocity.” Jacoby and Associates (1996) explain Service-learning as a form of experiential education, based on pedagogical principle that learning and development do not necessarily occur as a result of experience but as a result of reflection explicitly designed to foster learning and development. In Service-learning, there is reciprocity between the “server” and the person or group “being served”. When structured correctly, all parties in service-learning serve and are served, and all learn from one another. The term “community” in the definition of service-learning can refer to local neighborhoods, the state, the nation, and the global community. The human and community needs that service-learning addresses should be identified and defined by the community themselves.

Similar to Jacoby and Associates (1996), The National and Community Service Act of 1990 describes Service-Learning as:
“A form of experiential education which addresses human and community issues and needs. Learning occurs through active participation in thoughtfully organized service. The experience includes structured reflection linking experience to learning. Service in coordinated in true collaboration with schools and community (reciprocity). The process linked to curriculum and/or co-curriculum but must include structured time for students to think, talk, or write about what happened during actual service work. Efforts lead to acquisition of new skills, knowledge, leadership competencies and sense of caring and social responsibility”.

It is experiential education integrating class learning to community issues or needs. It highlights reflection by the students on the integration of the two worlds. It must be a true collaboration between the university and the service agency. It results in learning new skills, knowledge, leadership competencies and a sense of social commitment.

Curricular Design

According to Enos & Troppe (1996), there is currently a wide variety of curricular designs available for course instructors who have selected to integrate a Service-learning into their methodology. Several factors seem to influence the variation of curricular design chosen. These include the learning objectives of the course, prior experience of the instructor with the service learning or university-community partnerships, and the number of student enrolled in the course, and the type of service provided by the community agency or agencies involved. There are six curricular service options currently incorporated by higher education instructors, which will be briefly summarized.
Independent study option. Students arrange for and negotiate a defined service component and a learning documentation process from some sort of service experience with an instructor. This is typically described as an “Independent Reading and Research” option for or it can be an additional credit option negotiated as part of a regular course by a given student. Some departments create what is referred to as a “service learning option” for students involved in a service-learning venture which is officially documented on the student’s transcript. This design does however make group reflection difficult and monitoring of students a challenge.

Required within a course. All students enrolled in the course are involved in service as an integrated requirement of the class. The expectation is clearly marked and stated from the beginning of the course. A clear rationale is provided to students relaying why the service is valued and required. With all students involved in service, it is easier to design coursework, (i.e., class discussions, writing assignments, exam questions) that incorporate course goals with the service experience. In this structure, class sessions can involve the service agency personnel and service site visits. Faculty members often report that required service makes it easier to build community partnerships because a consistent number of students are involved each semester/quarter.

Another factor, however, is whether the class itself is required in a major or an elective. If required, students are not voluntarily engaging in service learning. They are
required to do so. This could effect the students’ behaviors at the service site and in reflection sessions.

**Option within a course.** Within this structure, students are provided the option to become involved in the service-learning project, but participation is not required. Typically, a segment of the regular coursework is supplemented by the service-learning component. Hence, service learning is voluntary and usually replaces other assignments for non-service learning enrollees. By not requiring active participation in the service-learning experience by all student enrolled in the course, the number of students who choose service learning is unknown in advance and this potentially limits the positive impact potential.

**Class service projects.** The basic design of a class service project calls for the entire class to be involved in a one-time service project. Often arrangements are made for the specific project prior to the semester and are designated in the course syllabus. This model offers the possibility for faculty and student-to-student interaction based on a common, shared service experience. However, the design of one-time service projects usually has different, more limited expectations and outcomes than ongoing service activities due to the limited investment students can make within the experience itself.

**Disciplinary capstone projects.** Service-learning has been identified as an excellent method to build upon students’ knowledge in a specific discipline as a
cumulative capstone course. Capstone service learning courses allow for the integration of the student’s knowledge of their major with real life issues. The service-learning approach helps “Students to make deep connections between service and their discipline, to understand the relationship of scholarship to service, and to learn how to integrate service into their chosen career” (Enos & Troppe, 1996). Upper-class students are afforded the opportunity to explore ways their disciplinary expertise and competencies can translate into addressing community needs. In-depth and extensive hands-on course content coupled with intense service-learning experiences mark this process. The major drawback of this particular construct is the sheer time intensive design and execution needed by the coordinating faculty member to implement such a program.

**Service research projects.** This type of service-learning class involves students in research within the community. Research results are shared with the community agencies where the research was enacted so that it can be used to address community needs. Forms of action research and participatory action research require a significant amount of time and personal investment to build relationships of trust in the community and to identify common research agendas. However, service research projects can often support the ongoing community based research of faculty. It often requires extending this type of research beyond the confines of the semester or quarter. The potential
drawback of this process may be the lack of opportunity for reciprocal interaction presented to the student.

Service-Learning Typology and Practice

In addition to curricular designs, there are also typologies of service learning emphases and guidelines for effective practice. Sigmon (1994) describes four specific service and learning emphases using a typology. The variation called “service-Learning” means that learning goals and objectives are the primary intent of the experience and thus, service outcomes are considered secondary. The variation named “Service-learning” suggests that the service schema is of central importance and learning outcomes are secondary. The third variation of “service learning” indicates that both the service and the learning elements of the process are considered completely separated from one another. Finally, the variation described as “service-learning” describes a process by which the two measures are of equal weight and merit. It is this final specified relationship that is the object of this study.

In 1989 the National Society for Experiential Education (NSEE) published a ground breaking set of articles designed to spell out guidelines for developing effective service-learning programs. These standards of good practice came to fruition at the 1989 Wingspread conference. These standards were outlined in the Principles of Good Practice for Combining Service and Learning. The Wingspread principles include:
Principle 1: Engages people in responsible and challenging actions for the common good.

Principle 2: Provides structured opportunities for people to reflect critically on their service experience.

Principle 3: Articulates clear service and learning goals for everyone involved.

Principle 4: Allows for those with needs to define those needs.

Principle 5: Clarifies the responsibilities of each person and organization involved.

Principle 6: Matches service providers and service needs through a process that recognizes changing circumstances.

Principle 7: Expects genuine, active, and sustained organizational commitment.

Principle 8: Includes training, supervision, monitoring, support, recognition, and evaluation to meet service and learning goals.

Principle 9: Insures that the time commitment for service and learning is flexible, appropriate, and in the best interest of all involved.

Principle 10: Is committed to program participation by and with diverse populations.

In addition to these principles, the action of the students participating in the process can be viewed as direct, indirect or mixed. Direct service can best be defined as face-to-face interaction with the client population at either the service site or elsewhere. Indirect service occurs when students are not involved in direct contact with the client population. Indirect activities are centered on channeling resources to the problem rather than working directly with an individual who may need the service. Mixed service combines elements of both direct and indirect service. Students will experience face-to-face interactions with a client population and will provide behind the scenes support to a
service organization (Jacoby, 1996, p. 109). From this service experience, the students should garner a measure of understanding related to the community, which they serve, and the particular issue for which their service agency engages. It is also of the utmost importance, as previously discussed by Jacoby, that the student reflect upon their particular experience, relate both service and class content to their personal lives and the academic course work in which they are pursuing. The service-learning experiences are developed through a collaborative process with members and/or organizations within the community and the collegiate educational program. Efforts of service-learning programs rely on the partnerships established and maintained with the community designed for mutual benefit.

**The Nature of Partnerships**

The benefits of collaboration and effective partnering can be viewed in many aspects of our daily lives. Partnerships are generated in all forms and classifications on a daily basis, including corporate mergers, national alliances and coalitions, service programs, and the like. Existing in public and private sectors, partnerships can form between two or more individuals or groups. In other words, partnerships are wide-ranging and diverse. They do not guarantee success and are often undertaken with a modicum of risk. Maximizing the benefits of partnership, while reducing potential liability, is the basic task of any partnering entities. Berquist, Betwee, and Meuel (1995)
have studied corporate partnerships and describe effective partnerships as represented by six lenses: 1) shared direction, 2) structure, 3) systems, 4) operations, 5) competency, and 6) leadership and management. According to the authors, each of these elements is essential to the over-all success of an established partnership. Within the construct of service-learning partnership, each of these lenses can be reviewed when examining the nature of the relationship and subsequent measurement of success of that association. These lenses will be used to investigate service learning in this study and shall serve as dimensions for exploration of the nature of these service learning partnerships.

**Shared Direction**

According to Berquist, Betwee, and Meuel (1995) the nature of partnerships frequently involves several different organizations that may actually compete against one another in a specific market. When engaging in a partnership collaboration, participating members are primarily concerned with improving the quality of the product or service they provide, better serving their mutual customers (clients), and finding ways in which they together can gain a greater share in their “mutual market or broaden the scope of the market” for which they may compete. Typically, a partnership is based on a specific product or service that all members of the partnership share in common, or on a specific customer base that all partners serve.
Within the context of service-learning partnerships, it will be essential to examine both the motivations for the partnership itself and the basic organization foci for each participating group. Understanding the vision, mission, strategies, goals, objectives, and tactics of each participating organization will be critical in reviewing the establishment of shared direction within the service-learning partnership.

**Structure**

Berquist, Betwee, and Meuel describe the traditional organization in the United States as typically being hierarchical in nature. The authors describe this as a potential impediment to true partnership establishment. Berquist, Betwee, and Meuel espouse two relevant types of partnership structure. The first partnership structure is the “partnership of function”. These partnerships are formulated when each participating organization can benefit for pragmatic, logistic reasons and/or because they share interest in the same market/clientele. The second partnership structure is identified as “partnership of commitment”. Within these partnerships there is a recognition of mutual goals and organizational mission and there is a perception of the inherent value of extensive partnership based cooperation and collaboration. This structure is characterized by collaboration and joint development. This latter partnership structure “represents a dramatic rejection of the hierarchical, vertically integrated, stable corporations” that dominate most organizations today.
For the purpose of reviewing service-learning partnerships, organizational structure will need to be examined and reviewed. Issues such as communication flow and access to information (frequency, quality, perceived value) will be analyzed for all participating organizations prior to and during the partnering process. It should be discerned whether these organizations and subsequent partnerships are pyramidal in structure or characterized as flat or networked.

**Systems**

The Berquist, Betwee, and Meuel model describes the systemic nature of organizational design through the lens of what they describe as the “leading part – that component of any traditional system that monitors, controls, and integrates other disparate and often highly specialized components of the system” (30). The concepts of authority, hierarchy, and leadership within the construct of the organization are of central importance when formulating partnership. According to the authors, traditional patterns of administration and information flow, which are marked by top down flow and an authoritarian nature, are not functional in effective partnerships. They contend that information must flow from side to side (partner to partner) rather than from top to bottom. Authority needs to be shared, distributed and flexible amongst the partners.

Organizational systems will be a focus in this study. The management practices of each partnering organization can be a focus of inquiry. Once all parties are engaged in
the partnership, such items as formal written agreements, communication strategies and processes, formal and informal interaction by participants and continuous improvement processes can be examined.

**Culture**

Ray and Rinzler (1993), describe the “new business paradigm” as a shift from competition and power struggle to cooperation and trust. Berquist, Betwee, and Meuel postulate that this shift in social values and culture is reflected in the emergence of our modern society. They go on to share that a recognizing “organizational culture” is of utmost importance when creating effective partnerships. Organizational culture of partnerships can be understood as supportive and safe, or restrictive and insecure. Berquist, Betwee, and Meuel describe the blending of organizational cultures into partnerships. If this blending results in co-creation of culture, taking the best practices of healthy, shared goal oriented competition and cooperation then the partners will be “willing to take risks and to dream – both of which are essential to partnerships”.

For the purpose of service-learning partnership review, organizational cultures of each partnering group would need to be described. In partnerships, the values, beliefs, and behaviors of each group and organizational leaders need to be understood. Once the partnership has been established, the melding of these organizational cultures would then need explored and patterns described.
Operations

Berquist, Betwee, and Meuel describe three inevitable conflicts among participants when creating partnerships. First, partnerships bring up issues of control and authority and add stress to an organization. Second, conflict arises when partners do not keep each other informed. Third, an “abdication of responsibility” occurs when each partner assumes that the other participating organization(s) has/have taken care of particular operations or problem. To counter these issues, successful partnerships must require “extensive and skillful interactions among the parties involved, and maintain open communication at all cost”. Control and authority are issues that must be repeatedly addressed. Ongoing communication must occur at all levels of the partnership, from formal leaders, to day-to-day operations personnel. Finally, leaders and key administrators of each organization must be dedicated to making decisions and solving problems in a collaborative manner.

When applying this concept to the service-learning partnership process, several key elements of organizational dynamics need to be realized. Both who is responsible for various aspects of the operations of the organization and how these individuals are engaged with their counterparts within the partnering organizations must be reviewed. Such areas as marketing, service production, research and development, servicing and financing must be assessed.
**Competency**

Berquist, Betwee, and Meuel suggest that three competencies are critical to successful partnerships. The three competencies are: 1) Learning; 2) Critical Thinking, and 3) Clarification of Values. Under the category of learning, the authors claim that any partnership will inevitably involve some measure of learning by all parties. Each participating entity will learn from the partnering process in areas such as product development and implementation, business practice, organizational culture…etc. Learning from one another and borrowing best practice examples are valuable products of partnering. Also, the authors describe the inevitability of making mistakes within the partnering process and the critical value of learning from these mistakes. Under the title of critical thinking, Berquist, Betwee, and Meuel describe the necessity of moving past simply learning how the other partnering organization operates to an appreciation and even anticipation of implications of their perspectives, values, beliefs …etc. The partners must learn to think like the other thinks, even if it is a different process from their own. The authors recommend that the leadership among those starting a new partnership should reflect difference in the characteristics of age, and diversity of experience, technical expertise and problem-solving experience in an organization. In addition, Berquist, Betwee, and Meuel, suggest that partnering leaders must “think systemically not only about one’s own organization, but also about the partnership and all other
companies participating in it.” Finally, within the context of clarification of values, Berquist, Betwee, and Meuel state that those participating in a partnership must be clear about their mission and, in particular, about their own personal aspirations and the institutional values of the organizations involved. All partners must be clear about the reasons for establishing the partnership. All participants must readily understand their own and their partner’s values purpose and mission.

The role of competency within the construct of service-learning partnerships will be a focus of this study. Understanding the various roles played by members of each participating organization and the corresponding level of competency each brings to the table, needs to be understood. It is important to review how the relationship between service-driven organizations and a learning process partner is understood by the service organization.

**Leadership and Management**

Berquist, Betwee, and Meuel describe a transformation that is critical for the success of a partnership. They describe the movement from the role of manager, traditionally earmarked by monitor and control of operations to the role and function of leader or one who serves as an integrator of the partnership’s functions and operations. They go on to integrate Kanter’s (1994, pp. 103-104) work to elaborate on the leadership role within partnerships. Kanter describes five integrative functions that must operate in
any successful partnership: strategic, tactical, operational, interpersonal, and cultural. Berquist, Betwee, and Meuel believe that each of these integrative functions require effective leadership in any partnership. To serve the strategic integrative function, various organization leaders participating in a partnership keep in direct touch with one another sharing information and solving partnership problems mutually. In addition, setting basic goals and the measurement of progress to fulfilling these goals, are requirements of both partners. Tactical integration is often provided by mid-level managers or point-persons who develop plans for specific projects or joint ventures of the partnership. To address the need of operational integration, leaders on both ends must provide adequate resources (time, information, expertise) to empower those individuals performing the partnership projects and activities to accomplish their tasks. Leaders at all levels of an organization provide interpersonal integration. The “formal leaders” should be the catalyst to bring people of all levels of the organizations to get to know one another on an informal basis. Multiple forms of “interpersonal leadership” can and do emerge from these interactions and help to make the partnership process a success. Finally, effective leaders of partnerships provide cultural integration. Those individuals who “manage” the partnership must share some basic common values, and be open to differences in values that exist among the partnering organizations. All of these integrations combine to allow the effective leader to manage the process of organizational change. The courage and commitment of leaders in the organization (at all levels) to
realize the necessity of change and to manage the process it produces is of utmost importance.

Within the service-learning partnership development process, the role of leadership and managing change is critical to that partnerships ultimate success. A review of leadership roles and responsibilities as well as who serves those functions will be a focus of study. Recognizing who serves certain key functions, both formally and informally, is also very important. Such roles as human resources, financial resources, time and space allocation…etc all have significant impact on the service-learning partnership endeavor. A review of strategic, tactical, operational, interpersonal, and cultural integrations should be reviewed within the service-learning partnership process. Each of these topical items will be explored via interviews to ascertain the point of view of service site.

**Purpose of the Study**

There is the potential for variations of experiences and interpretations of the partnership process by participating community service agencies and participating higher education faculty members based upon the type of service provided. An examination of direct, indirect, and mixed service (as defined on page 11) is pertinent to the understanding of community service agency and higher education faculty member perspective of service-learning partnerships. The purpose of this study is to explore the
following: 1) The nature of service-learning partnerships as understood by participating community services agencies and higher education faculty members, 2) An understanding of how service-learning partnerships are established by and with participating community service agencies and higher education faculty members, 3) An understanding of how service-learning partnerships are maintained, 4) An understanding of how service-learning partnerships are renewed, 5) An understanding of how service-learning partnerships are changed, 6) An understanding of the impact(s) service-learning partnerships have on the participating community service agencies staff, employees, physical facilities and services provided, and 7) An understanding of the potential differences made on each of the six previous questions by the type and variation of service provided within the service-learning partnership.

The list of questions for which understanding will be sought are as follows:

1. When participating in a service-learning experience, how do community service agency staff and higher education faculty members construct the concept of partnership?

2. What are the rationale or reasons given for entering into a service-learning partnership used by community service agencies and higher education faculty members?
3. What expectations do community service agencies leaders and higher education faculty members have of a service-learning partnership?

4. How are service-learning partnerships formulated with community service agencies and higher education faculty members?

5. How are service-learning partnerships renewed by or with community service agencies and higher education faculty members?

6. How are service-learning partnerships changed by or with community service agencies and higher education faculty members?

7. How are service-learning partnerships molded, guided or shaped by the participating community service agency and/or higher education faculty partner?

8. What, if any, impact(s) do service-learning partnerships have on the participating community service agency’s personnel?

9. What, if any, impact(s) do service-learning partnerships have on the participating community service agency’s physical facilities?

10. What, if any, impact(s) do service-learning partnerships have on the participating community service agency’s product or service?
11. How does the type of service (direct, indirect, mixed) performed within a service-learning partnership play a role in shaping the community service agency’s experience?

12. How do community service agencies and higher education faculty members construct the partnerships shared direction?

13. How do community service agencies and higher education faculty members construct the partnerships structure?

14. How do community service agencies and higher education faculty members construct the partnerships systems?

15. How do community service agencies and higher education faculty members construct the partnerships culture?

16. How do community service agencies and higher education faculty members construct the partnerships operations?

17. How do community service agencies and higher education faculty members construct the partnerships competency?

18. How do community service agencies and higher education faculty members construct the partnerships leadership and management?
Overview of the Study

The American Red Cross, Licking County Ohio Chapter, Sharon Glen Senior Apartments, and The United Way of Licking County, State of Ohio have recently (12 - 16 months previously) entered into a service-learning partnerships with three faculty members of The Ohio State University- Newark representing the academic disciplines of English, Sociology, and Education. These participating entities have each agreed to enter into a partnership for the purpose of implementing service-learning opportunities within the Licking County Ohio community for students of The Ohio State University-Newark. They have all been involved with the service-learning program since its inception.

Within the service-learning experience of the American Red Cross, students perform mixed services. The services they provided brought them into direct contact with the constituents served by the Red Cross of Licking County and they also performed behind the scenes functions for the organization. Service-learning students perform blood drives, collect materials for those affected by disaster situations, draft training documents, and assist with training of adolescence in baby-sitting and CPR. Within the service-learning experience of the Sharon Glynn Senior Apartments, students perform direct services. The service they provide is directly engaging the constituents they serve. Service-learning students perform computer training, spend time in conversation, collect oral histories, conduct crafts, and organize social events with senior residents. Within the
service-learning experience of the The United Way of Licking County, students perform a indirect services. The services they provide are not engaged directly, face-to-face with these constituents. Service-learning students assist with office functions or administrative duties; write publicity and promotion material, and craft documentation for the organization. This study will focus on how each participating agency representative and faculty member understands the nature of service-learning partnerships and how each makes meaning of their experiences. The study will examine partnership rationale, expectation, establishment, nurturment, maintenance, evaluation, and impact from both the community service agency’s and higher education faculty member’s perceptions and perspectives.

Outline of the Presentation

The previous sections of this chapter have presented a statement of the problem, outlined the purpose of the study, and given an overview of the study. The literature that applies to this study, the methods designed to be employed to gather data and later, the findings of the research process and a discussion of the implications of the findings and the resultant conclusion shall comprise the remaining content.

A review of the literature is presented in chapter 2. This review includes literature on the study of outcomes and evaluation in service-learning initiatives.
Chapter 3 addresses the methodology that guided this research process. A detailed discussion of constructivist inquiry and how it will be applied to this process of inquiry is presented. In addition to this, the efforts that were utilized to establish trustworthiness are outlined. This is followed by an explanation of the design study.

Chapter Four outlines the detailed findings of the study. Hence this chapter includes the findings on the research questions, followed by the key categories. Incorporating quotes from participant interviews provides detailed description for the reader to assess the ability to transfer the results of this study to other contexts. I provide a detailed account of what transpired during the data-collection process and identify the various responses of the participants in the study as they relate to the established partnership themes identified by Berquist, Betwee, and Meuel (1995).

Within chapter 5, I discuss the significant findings of the study related to the research questions defined previously. Relationships of findings to existing literature are highlighted. Implications of the study are reviewed. Lastly, I share considerations for future research.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The purpose of this study is to: 1) develop an understanding of the nature of service-learning partnerships as understood by participating community services agencies and higher education faculty members, 2) develop an understanding of how service-learning partnerships are established by and with participating community service agencies and higher education faculty members, 3) develop an understanding of how service-learning partnerships are maintained, 4) develop an understanding of how and when service-learning partnerships are renewed, 5) develop an understanding of the impact(s) service-learning partnerships have on the participating community service agencies staff, employees, physical facilities and services provided, and 6) develop an understanding of the potential differences made on each of the six previous questions by the type and variation of service provided within the service-learning partnership.

Several of the aforementioned purposes need further clarification and key terms need to be defined. The meaning of “nature of service learning partnerships” can best be defined as the how both community service agency personnel and higher education faculty members define and make meaning of partnership development in the context of a service learning initiative. In this study, “established” is defined as the initially created
and implemented service learning partnership coordinated by the two participating entities. The term “maintained” describes the process in each of the two partnering entities engages for the purpose of continuing the service learning process. This will predominately focus on the various roles and responsibilities each undertakes in an effort to sustain the service learning process. The fourth purpose examines how service-learning partnerships are renewed. The terminology of “renewal” describes the process, content, and context the various partners undergo in an effort to renovate and revitalize the partnering process. Here an examination of the various changes to the partnership desired by a party or both parties will be examined. Changes will be viewed as modifications to the initial partnership design and how and when the change process occurs. The term “impact” is defined as any perceived effect, either intentional or unintentional, the service learning partnership had on the participating community agency’s employees, the physical location where the service was performed and/or the services that organization renders to its constituents.

This chapter reviews literature in the following categories: civic engagement and the role and basic concepts of service-learning on the college and university campus, building a service-learning partnership, and partnership development theories and processes. The constructivist nature of this study speaks to the evolving nature of the participating community service agencies’ experiences. The literature review provides
the foundation for the focus and formulation of the research questions at the beginning of the study. The literature review will continue to be an evolving process throughout the progression of inquiry as various participants in the service-learning partnership experience perceive meaning in categories that may extend or add to the review.

Civic Engagement

“Civic engagement” is a term utilized within higher education to address a number of community and social interaction concepts. A comprehensive working definition for the term can be found from the Pew Charitable Trust (pewtrust.org). Civic engagement is defined as

“individual and collective actions designed to identify and address issues of public concern. Civic engagement can take many forms, from individual volunteerism to organizational involvement to electoral participation. It can include efforts to directly address an issue, work with others in a community to solve a problem or interact with the institutions of representative democracy. Civic Engagement encompasses a range of activities such as working in a soup kitchen, serving on a neighborhood association, writing a letter to an elected official or voting.” (p. 4).

Numerous initiatives within higher education have advanced the practice of civic engagement. These initiatives include service-learning, diversity education, public policy, co-curricular activities, faculty reward systems, community-based research, and university-community partnerships. Briefly, each will be described.

Service-learning is defined by Robert Bringle and Julie Hatcher (1995) in their work “A Service Learning Curriculum for Faculty” as a credit-bearing, educational experience
in which students participate in an organized service activity that meets identified community needs and reflect on the service activity in such a way as to gain further understanding of course content, a broader appreciation of the discipline, and an enhanced sense of civic responsibility.

Many institutions of higher education have developed a strong commitment to diversity education. Historically, diversity education in institutions of higher learning has sought to promote cultural awareness, cross cultural dialogue lessen possible prejudices harbored by students and create a campus climate conducive for academic success for all students. Additionally, diversity education hopes to promote a fair and equitable society in general.

Kilpatrick (2000) defines public policy as “a system of laws, regulatory measures, courses of action, and funding priorities concerning a given topic promulgated by a governmental entity or its representatives. Individuals and groups often attempt to shape public policy through education, advocacy, or mobilization of interest groups.” (p. 1).

“Co-curricular activities” and “co-curricular education” are defined as formal and informal out-of-class learning opportunities. These opportunities include but are not limited to involvement with clubs and organizations, workshops, lectures, internships, co-ops, interactions with faculty and others students, cultural events and study abroad.
Faculty reward systems sometimes emphasize service to both the college/university and to the community at large has direct connection to civic engagement initiatives. The National Academy for Academic Leadership (2007) describes faculty reward systems and their importance. They emphasize that the faculty reward system effects how faculty members spend their time. Hopefully, this reward system matches the mission and priorities of the institution. If community development, outreach and engagement, and service are core components of institutional missions, colleges and universities are placing a heavier impetus on those areas when examining faculty rewards. These efforts merge the teaching purpose of colleges and universities and its service responsibilities and can support its research purposes if research is connected with service-learning projects.

The recent work of Strand, Cutforth, Stoecker, Marullo, and Donohue (2003) describes the development of community-based research. They present a model of community-based research (CBR) that engages community members with students and faculty in the course of their academic work. Unlike traditional research, CBR is collaborative and action-oriented and finds its research questions in the needs of communities as defined by the communities. This dynamic research model combines classroom learning with social action in ways that can ultimately empower community groups to address their own agendas and shape their own futures. At the same time it emphasizes the development of knowledge and skills that prepare students for active
civic engagement. It is an approach to civic engagement that is potentially compatible with the mission of research universities as well as other types of universities. The issue for research universities is whether this kind of collaborative, action research will be considered legitimate research for tenure and promotion.

The rise of university-community partnerships has been chronicled in University-Community Partnerships: Current Practices Volume III (January 1999, p. 268). A myriad of university-community partnerships are described. Colleges and universities are redirecting some of their economic and intellectual resources, facilities, and other assets to benefit their surrounding communities in many innovative ways. They are working to facilitate economic development, provide much-needed social services, support public schools, offer technical assistance to community-based organizations, target research that provides guidance for community problem solving, and create opportunities for faculty, students, and community residents to learn from one another. It is important to note that service-learning is chronicled as one of the major types of activity of university-community partnerships with local governments or organizations.

Given these forms of civic engagement, funding of these efforts is also important. In an extensive review of major civic engagement initiatives O’Meara and Kilmer (1999) indicated that Campus Compact, American Association of State Colleges and Universities, and Learn and Serve America made significant contributions by directing
funding to civic engagement programs that engaged college students. Campus Compact is a national coalition of more than 1,100 college and university presidents dedicated to promoting community service, civic engagement, and service-learning in higher education.

The American Association of State Colleges and Universities (AASCU) is an organization of state-supported colleges and universities that offer degree programs leading to bachelor's, master's or doctoral degrees. In addition to recent emphasis on research, members of AASCU work to extend higher education to all citizens, including those who have been traditionally underrepresented on college campuses. By Delivering America’s Promise, these institutions are expected to work for the public good through education and engagement, thereby improving the lives of people in their community, their region and their state. The American Association of State Colleges and Universities represents more than 400 public colleges, universities and systems of higher education throughout the United States and its territories.

According to their website (http://www.learnandserve.org/about/lsa/index.asp ) Learn and Serve America supports and encourages service-learning throughout the United States, and enables over one million students to make meaningful contributions to their community while building their academic and civic skills. Learn and Serve America provides direct and indirect support to K-12 schools, community groups and higher
education institutions to facilitate service-learning projects. They provide grant support for school-community partnerships and higher education institutions; provide training and technical assistance resources to teachers, administrators, parents, schools and community groups; collect and disseminate research, effective practices, curricula, and program models; and recognize outstanding youth service through the Presidential Freedom Scholarship, President’s Volunteer Service Awards and other programs.

These organizations also helped further the understanding of civic engagement by providing technical assistance and training to higher education personnel responsible for coordinating civic programs for students. Emphasis has been placed on increasing the number of civic-minded students. For example, the America Democracy Project (ADP), an initiative orchestrated by the American Association of State Colleges and Universities, attempts to produce graduates who understand and are committed to “engaging in meaningful actions as citizens in a democracy” (American Association of State College and Universities, 2005, p. 3). The ADP seeks to create an intellectual and experiential understanding of civic engagement for undergraduates enrolled at institutions that are members of AASCU.

A critical publication, *The Engaged University* (Hollander and Saltmarsh, 2000), also contributed depth and breadth to the national dialogue on civic engagement. Hollander and Saltmarsh addressed the basic question of how universities can become
more relevant to society. They approached the question from a political and social-activist position with the intention of leading a movement that “reinvigorates the public purpose and civic mission of higher education” (Hollander and Saltmarsh, 2000, p. 1). Their goal was to help students develop the values and skills associated with citizenship through participation in public and community service. Noting that 70 percent of high school graduates attend college in some form, they wrote, “Higher education therefore has a particular opportunity to educate students on their democratic rights and responsibilities” (Hollander and Saltmarsh, 2000, p. 2). This opportunity may or may not be considered a priority by the institution, depending upon how it defines its mission.

Campus Compact’s Indicators of Engagement (2002) detailed best practices in civic engagement for higher education. The indicators describe themes and components of an institution that could be used to measure a college or university’s level of commitment to civic engagement. The majority of the indicators focus on internal functions at colleges or universities. For instance, do mission and leadership, campus culture, curriculum, faculty roles and rewards, and mechanisms in place focus on civic engagement practice for a given institution? Though Campus Compact’s indicators incorporate an element that encourages public forums and dialogue to engage community members in a process, the primary stakeholder served by the indicators has been institutions of higher education and their internal functions.
Today, civic engagement has become a serious goal for thousands of universities, faculty, and administrators across America. In 2005, the Higher Learning Commission (HLC), an accrediting body for higher education, created and approved civic engagement criteria as part of the accreditation process for colleges and universities. The HLC reviews institutions every ten years to ensure that they continue to meet the criteria for accreditation through a peer review process. The overall accreditation review has two basic components. The institution is required to conduct a thorough self-study to determine if the HLC’s five criteria are satisfied, to assess the institution’s strengths and challenges, and then to file a report on its findings with the HLC. Following this thorough self examination, a team of HLC consultant-evaluators visits the campus to verify the accuracy of the self-study report and offer suggestions concerning the identified areas of concern. One of the five criteria used by the HLC emphasizes civic engagement and community outreach. Known as “Criterion Five: Engagement and Service” (Higher Learning Commission, 2005), the criterion requires that: a) the organization (college or university) learns from the constituencies it serves and analyzes its capacity to serve their needs and expectations; b) the organization has the capacity and the commitment to engage with its identified constituencies and communities; c) the organization demonstrates its responsiveness to those constituencies that depend on it for service; d) internal and external constituencies value the services the organization provides (Higher Learning Commission, 2005). The HLC designed minimal standards and review criteria
to ascertain if “as called for by its mission, the organization identifies its constituencies and serves them in ways both value.” (p.7). To sum up, the HLC has recognized the importance of community outreach, engagement and service by colleges and universities. They set forth minimal standards of such civic engagement initiatives by which colleges and universities could be gauged in order to gain accreditation. This is a significant recognition of the importance of civic engagement activities coordinated and conducted by institutions of higher education.

As was previously indicated, civic engagement encompasses a variety of community and social interaction concepts. Colleges and universities have invested a great deal of time, energy and resources into these activities. There has been a natural progression from general civic engagement to the formation of service-learning initiatives. For the purposes of this study, it is important to develop a clear understanding of both the history and the construct of service learning.

**Service-learning**

Previously, service learning has been defined by Jacoby (1996) and Bringle and Hatcher (1995). Eyler and Giles add to these definitions by saying that “non-course-based programs that include a reflective component and learning goals may also be included under broad umbrella” of service-learning (p. 5). Hence, there are two subtypes of service-learning, one is curricular-service-learning, and the other is cocurricular-
service-learning. In addition, the emphasis placed on service or learning can result in different kinds of service-learning programs. As indicated previously, service learning can be classified as: “service-LEARNING,” which implies that learning goals are primary and service outcomes secondary; “SERVICE-learning,” which implies that the service agenda is central and the learning secondary; “service learning,” which means that the two are viewed as completely separate from each other; and “SERVICE-LEARNING” which means that the service and learning goals are of equal weigh and “the hyphen is essential.” (Jacoby, 1996, p. 4). While the optimal mix is the SERVICE-LEARNING as proposed by many authors (Eyler and Giles, 1999; Jacoby, 1996), the other forms are also categories of the concept.

In service learning, students are performing service while learning their course’s content by working in the community. The key elements of reflection and reciprocity are essential to the service-learning experience. The goal of reflection is to promote student learning about course content and the social issues that underlie the need for service in the first place.

The act of reflection is the foundation of purposeful learning, particularly for experiential and practice-based learning. Reflection is a planned process for reviewing an experience, either while it is going on and/or afterward. A key to reflection is learning how to take perspectives on one’s own actions, thoughts, and feelings—in other words,
examining an experience rather than just living it. Systematically exploring and bringing a sense of inquiry to an experience allows the learning from that experience to be materialized (Amulya, 2004) and analyzing the perspectives of self and others can foster cognitive development (Kegan, 1994).

Reciprocity is the other key tenant of service learning outlined by Jacoby (1996). "Reciprocity suggests that every individual, organization, and entity involved in the service-learning functions as both a teacher and a learner. Participants are perceived as colleagues, not as servers and clients." (Jacoby, 1996 p.36). Students and those served teach and learn from each other. Reciprocity is usually described as a mutuality between the needs and outcomes of the “provider” and the “recipient” in a service-learning relationship. Reciprocity viewed as a standard may or may not be achieved in a given project.

Mintz and Hesser (1996) also describe the centrality of collaboration, reciprocity, diversity and reflection in service learning. These four concepts are essential ingredients in the service learning process. An analysis of these elements follows.

Collaboration. Chrislip and Larson (1994, p.5) describe collaborations as “a mutually beneficial relationship between two or more parties who work toward a common goal by sharing responsibility, authority, and accountability for achieving results”. A true collaborative spirit must exist for each partner in the service-learning
process to feel a sense of responsibility to the project. Each partner must take on a perspective of authority and represent authority where appropriate. Conversely each member must recognize that the other partners also share a point of authority within the process. Finally, each partner is accountable to the others and to the project. Mintz and Hesser (1996, p. 35) state that true collaboration “involves modifying and renegotiating our participation in the languages, values, knowledge, and mores of the communities we come from, as well as becoming fluent in those same elements of the partners and communities with who we collaborate”. In essence, Mintz and Hesser demand that all collaborative partners step into each other’s cultures, purposes and experiences in order to gain perspective and insight from one another.

**Reciprocity.** A core tenant of service-learning is reciprocity (Sigmon, 1979; Porter Honnet and Poulsen, 1989; Howard, 1993). In this process the higher education institution and community service agency serve as “both a teacher and a learner” (Mintz and Hesser, p.36). Essential to the concept of reciprocity is the balance of power and control over learning and service goals between each partner in the service-learning process. Creating opportunities for impact on both the student and the community is critical. An effective program (Sigmon, 1990): 1) allows for those with needs to define those needs; 2) clarifies the responsibilities of each person and organization involved; 3) matches service providers(students) and service needs (needs of community agencies and
their clients) through a process that recognizes changing circumstances; and 4) expects genuine, active, and sustained organizational commitment from both partnering entities.

**Diversity.** In terms of diversity, service-learning allows for all participants to engage in interaction with a wide-range of experiences, perspectives, beliefs, and human characteristics such as race, ethnicity, and gender. In addition, dependant upon the type of service being performed, other differences such as socioeconomic status, age, geographic, sexual orientation, and physical/mental abilities can be explored.

In anthropology enculturation is the process of learning one's own culture while acculturation is the assimilation of one group to another culture's ways. When a student enters a university he or she enters a new community which requires a process of what Bruffee (1995) calls reacculturation. This concept can be expanded to service learning experiences as students move form their university community and corresponding culture to the culture of the organization for which they are providing service.

**Reflection.** Hutchings and Wutzdorff (1988) define “reflections as the ability to step back and ponder one’s own experience, to abstract from it some meaning or knowledge relevant to other experiences”. (p. 15). In service-learning, reflection is central to achieve student learning and developmental outcomes. Reflection may occur individually, or through class/group discussions. Journaling and writing papers are two commonly utilized forms of reflection. According to Albert (1996), “Reflection should
be designed to help students recognize and integrate their learning, work on personal
development issues, define their personal service ethic, and deal with their discomfort
and dissonance”. (p.8) Further, dealing with discomfort and dissonance is the starting
point for cognitive development in critical thinking (Rodgers, 1980, Perry 1970, Kegan,
1994, Widick, Knefelkamp, and Parker 1974). It not only raises questions, it helps to
answer them. Service is curriculum”. (p. 12). Reflection facilitates the connection
between the experience and the learning.

During the past two decades, service-learning has dramatically increased both its
presence and its impact on American Higher Education (Boyer 1990, 1994: Ehrlich,
1995; Eyler, 1994; Giles, 1991,1994; Hackney, 1994; Harkavy, 1993; Kendall, 1988,
faculty members and student affairs practitioners are actively engaging in the pedagogy
of extending the classroom walls into the surrounding community. The value of
community service and community engagement has been touted by members of the
Higher Education population for a long time (Boyer, 1994; Rudolph, 1962; Smith, 1994;
Smythe, 1990).

Service-learning on the college and university campus

The concept of service-learning roots runs deep in higher education history. In a
classical work on the history of higher education, Rudolph (1962, p. 177) states “from the
beginning, the American college was cloaked with public purpose, with a responsibility to the past and the present and the future.” (p. 177). The passage of the Morrill Land-Grant Act of 1862 linked higher education and professional and vocational preparation needed by society and included the role of public service. Along with liberal arts and research, it is a third major purpose of a college or university. Hence, the very nature of land grant institutions of higher education involved service and vocational preparation for the public good. Further, according to Boyer (1994), in his work “Creating the New American College”, public service has been constantly reaffirmed through programs such as the National Science Foundation and the G.I Bill.

More recently, the 1960s saw rapid growth and development of service programs geared toward social change. The Peace Corp was developed in 1961 and VISTA (Volunteers in Service to America) was designed in 1965, the later primarily focused on service-oriented work for college students and recent graduates. The Peace Corps is an independent United States federal agency. The Peace Corps Act declared the purpose of the Peace Corps to be:

“to promote world peace and friendship through a Peace Corps, which shall make available to interested countries and areas men and women of the United States qualified for service abroad and willing to serve, under conditions of hardship if necessary, to help the peoples of such countries and areas in meeting their needs for trained manpower.” (p. 4).
Since 1960, more than 187,000 people have served as Peace Corps volunteers in 139 countries (en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Peace_corp). VISTA is an anti-poverty program created by the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 as the domestic version of the Peace Corps. Initially, the program increased employment opportunities for conscientious people who felt they could contribute tangibly to the War on Poverty. Volunteers served in communities throughout the U.S., focusing on enriching educational programs and vocational training for the nation's underprivileged classes (en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Volunteers_in_Service_to_America).

During the 1970s and early 1980s, there was reduced attention given to service within the college and university campus. Coined as the “me generation”, there seemed to be a social backlash to the civic and social justice movements of the 1960s. However, in 1985, Campus Compact and the Campus Outreach Opportunity League (COOL) were created. College and university campuses once again endeavored to emphasize engagement in social service through service-learning efforts. Campus Compact is an organization comprised of college and university presidents who pledge to encourage and support academically based community service at their institutions (Jacoby 1996). COOL on the other hand was formed by recent college graduates with the purpose of encouraging students to serve their communities in a variety of ways.
Throughout the 1990s and continuing today, we have seen a veritable explosion of literature and conferences on service-learning (Bok, 1982 and 1990; Giles, Porter Honnet, and Migliore, 1991; Albert, 1994; Galura, 1995; Smith, 1995; Jacoby, 1996; NASULGC, 1999; Stanton, Giles and Cruz, 1999; Boyte and Hollander, 1999; Checkoway, 2000; Ehrlich, 2000; Neave, 2000 and Hearn and Holdsworth, 2002). The literature and study of service-learning based initiatives included the National Society for Experiential Education’s (NSEE) Research Agenda for Combining Service and Learning in the 1990s. The NSEE is a nonprofit membership association of educators, businesses, and community leaders. Founded in 1971, NSEE also serves as a national resource center for the development and improvement of experiential education programs nationwide (www.nsee.org/).

In addition to the NSEE, several key volumes of service-learning literature developed by the University of Michigan’s Office of Community Service Learning including comprehensive Praxis guides and the Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning. These resources made great contributions to the design of service-learning pedagogy. The Campus Compact produced important resources as well, including Rethinking Tradition: Integrating Service with Academic Study (Kupiec, 1993), Redesigning Curricula: Models of Service Learning Syllabi (Jackson, 1994), Service Matters: A Sourcebook for Community Service in Higher Education (Cha and Rothman,
A significant increase in service-learning on college and university campuses resulted (National Campus Compact Office, 2001). Among the 327 campuses responding to a survey by the NCCO, 14 percent reported a 10 percent or more increase in the number of faculty involved in service-learning initiatives from 2000 to 2001. Within that same study, 51 percent of respondents noted increase of faculty each year engaged in service-learning. Service-learning has increasingly been cited as the central factor for social engagement in higher education (Hollander, Saltmarsh, and Zlotkowski, 2001; Bingle, 2001). Service learning activity has continued to increase on college and university campuses. This is an important development as it relates to this particular study. The exposure of the author of this study to service-learning activities became the impetus to his ever increasing interest in the subject matter.

Benefits of service-learning as pedagogy.

The primary focus of service-learning research has been impact of the pedagogy on the student participant. We will first look at the kinds of variable that have been used as outcome measures. Then we will review the actual outcomes in various studies.

Alexander Astin (1996) explains that the Higher Education Research Institute (HERI) had focused “on how participation in service during college effects the individual
student” (p. 3). HERI examined both long-term and short-term effects of service participation by undergraduates during college. Astin described how their study “developed thirty-four (34) outcome measures falling into three general areas: civic responsibility, academic development, and life skills development” (p. 5). Astin goes on to share that “every one of the thirty-four (34) outcome measures appears to be positively affected by undergraduate participation in Service-learning or volunteer service” (p. 6). Some of the specific outcomes affected by service participation included: persistence in college, interest in graduate study, critical thinking skills, leadership skills, and commitment to promoting racial understanding.

Eyler and Giles’ (1999) research reported findings of a comprehensive study on 1500 students who took an outcome survey and 120 students who were interviewed. The authors classified the outcomes of service-learning programs into four major categories: personal and interpersonal development, understanding and applying knowledge, development of critical thinking and problem solving, and citizenship development.

Kahne and Westheimer’s (1999) classified the goals of service learning into two dimensions: the first was the effect of the service learning on the service-provider, receiver, community or society. The second was the moral, political and intellectual outcome for student participants. For the moral domain, the two levels are giving and caring. While “giving” refers to give something back to their school or community without necessarily understanding the people they are serving, “caring” emphasizes the
understanding of the served and diminishing “the sense of otherness that often separates students—particularly privileged students—from those in need” (p.32). For the political domain, the two levels are responsible citizen/civic duty and critical democrats/social reconstruction. The responsible citizen/civic duty refers to the practice of helping others in the community, and this approach is regarded as a conservative political posture that tries to minimize government as a agent of social change. In contrast, critical democrats/social reconstruction emphasizes critical examination of the root cause of the social problems as well as engagement in complex social issues. For the intellectual domain, the two levels are additive and transformative approach. While the additive approach emphasizes activities that raise self-esteem, increase new experiences, demonstrate scholastic abilities, the transformative approach emphasizes the combination of service and critical social analysis through reflection, where students are asked to consider arguments that conflict with their own predispositions and self interest.

Astin (2000) found that participants in volunteer service continued to feel the effects for at least five years following college. While these are certainly important areas of interest and concern, the focus on the impact of service-learning experiences on students is simply one aspect of the reciprocal relationship.

Given this summary, details of studies on the impact of service-learning on students will now be reviewed. We will start, however, with studies of experiential
learning broadly defined. Ricker (1952) studied college students who were involved in two-month, intensive, full-time summer experiences designed to strengthen humanitarian ideas. The students participated in physical labor in an economically deprived community. Questionnaires were utilized to discover that students became less prejudiced, more democratic, less authoritarian, more service oriented and developed greater ego strength. More recently, in the 1960s, Smith (1966) conducted a study of forty-four Peace Corps volunteers who taught in Ghana during a two-year period. He discovered that during the second year of teaching, participants developed more realism, autonomy, independence, and significantly increased their levels of self-worth and insight. Also, these teachers became more service oriented in their own career aspirations. Further studies conducted included research by Hunt and Hardt (1969) who found that students in Project Upward Bound achieved increases in motivation, self-esteem, and academic achievement.

Throughout the 1970’s and 1980’s, even more research was devoted to social development and its relationship with experiential learning; however the focus of these efforts were predominantly based on high school programs and students not college students. I will review the studies that involved college students.

A good deal of research has been centered on understanding how service-learning experiences impact college students’ understanding of the larger community. Keene
(1975) examined whether students involved in an elective sociology course where classroom instructions was coupled with five hours of direct experience per week for one semester at agencies, would have a more positive attitude change toward poverty and minority problems than students who took only a required political science and economics course. She found no significant difference in the groups, but the experience was perceived as positive by students, parents, and the community, so it was continued.

Owens (1979) sought to determine whether or not student attitudes toward academic and vocational goals would change in a positive direction after involvement in a year long service-learning program. He concluded that students in the experimental group experienced significantly larger attitudinal changes than did the control group in the areas of more positive self-confidence and more clarity in educational direction and career paths. This service learning program was one year long and not a single term or a one time event. The length of the interaction, therefore, may be an important factor in service learning outcomes for students.

Conrad (1979) chose eleven experiential and service-learning programs from various cities for intensive study. The eleven programs from nine schools involved more than six hundred students in nine experimental and four control groups. The study included community service, outdoor adventure, career exploration and community action foci, and a variety of measures were utilized to assess these experiential learning programs.
Assessment tools were organized according to four categories: Instruments on Social Development (Social and Personal Responsibility Scale, Semantic Differential on Attitudes toward Others, Semantic Differential on Community Participation, and Career Exploration Scale); Instruments on Psychological Development (Rosenberg Self Esteem Scale and Janis-Field Feelings of Inadequacy Scale); Instruments on Intellectual Development (Problem-Solving Inventory); and Instruments on Differential Program Impact (Characteristics of a Community Field Experience Checklist, Experiential Educational Questionnaire). The overall conclusions of the study were that: (1) experiential education and service-learning programs can promote social, psychological and intellectual development, (2) they appear to do so more effectively than classroom-only based programs, and (3) the key factors in promoting growth are significant experiences that provide for the exercise of autonomy, and opportunities for active reflection on the experience.

As was previously mentioned, the 1980’s also saw little service-based research particularly for students at the post-secondary level. The 1990’s saw a reemergence of service-learning programs and activities, and growth in consequent studies and research.

Myers-Liptin (1994) observed the effects of service-learning on students’ level of civic responsibility. The students were from a large, western university. The experimental group consisted of 25 students enrolled in a service-learning program. The
research design for this study also included two nonequivalent comparison groups. There was one comparison group composed of 30 students from a Volunteer Clearing House. In this group, the students were involved in service but did not formally integrate community service into their academic studies. The other nonequivalent control group was composed of a random sample of 150 students from the general student population. This group was obtained by using a stratified systematic sample. The International Understanding Cognitive Scale developed by the Educational Testing Service was used as a pre, middle and post-course measure for this study. The scale consisted of several factors: concern for third world problems, a desire for international peace, a desire to be a member of an organization involved in global issues; a desire to find solutions to global problems and awareness of the prevalence of these problems; a belief in cooperation; and an attitude toward the United States. A pretest was administered to the experimental and the two control groups. Both an initial and a post test were administered to the three groups. The results of the multivariate analysis generally supported the hypothesis that students who were involved in a comprehensive service-learning program will show larger increases in civic responsibility when compared to: 1) students involved in community service but not formally integrating it with their academic course work, and 2) students who are not involved in any community service. As predicted, students in the service-learning program exhibited greater increases in international understanding, civic responsibility, and racial tolerance as measured by several scales. Interestingly, Myers-
Lipton discovered that in the general population, scores for international understanding, civic responsibility, and racial tolerance actually decreased over the study period pointing to a need for increased attention to student development in these areas.

Batchelder and Root (1994) conducted a research study at a private college comparing service-learning students to a traditional class (48 students in each group) and controlled for pre-test differences. The researchers sought to examine the influence of service-learning and varieties of service-learning experiences (the independent variables) had on the following: student moral cognitions assessed through the decision making process students used in response to needs; the level of moral reasoning used; and the development of occupational identity (the dependent variables). The study also tested the hypothesis that students' perceptions of characteristics of service learning courses predicted positive changes in the dependent variables. Student journals were scored for pro-social decision-making, level of pro-social reasoning, and occupational identity processing. In addition, at the beginning and end of the semester students wrote for thirty minutes on their expected Responses to Situations (RS). Their responses were scored on eight dimensions that reflected higher order complex thinking. Finally, students completed an Evaluation of Service-learning (ESL). The study found significant gains for the service-learning students on complex cognitive variables, including a greater resolve to act in the face of acknowledged uncertainty and a greater awareness of the multiple dimensions and variability involved in dealing with social problems. Service-learning
students also significantly increased their pro-social decision making, pro-social reasoning, and occupational identity processing skills. Both on-site supervision and academic factors, such as instruction, were important mediators of these outcomes. The quality of instruction, measured through a combination of questions from the ESL, impacted students' awareness of obstacles to solutions and how to address problems. Likewise, the quality of on-site supervision affected students' complexity of thought and awareness of multiple solutions.

Boss (1994) conducted a study titled The Effect of Community Service on the Moral Development of College Ethics. In this study, one section of a two-section course was selected randomly to complete 20 hours of community service over the semester and to keep a journal as part of the course requirements. Hence, the service learning element became required in one section and the students did not self select the service learning option. The other section formed the comparison group and had different assignments in place of the service requirement. The total sample was comprised of 71 students; 37 females and 34 males. The mean age was 20.3. The researcher hypothesized that moral development would increase more over the course of the semester for the community service group than for the control group. On post-test, students in the service-learning section scored significantly higher on the Defining Issues Test (DIT) than did the control group (pre- to post- mean gain was 8.61 for first group, 1.74 for the second). At the end
of the term, 51% of the students in the experimental group were using principled moral reasoning compared to 13% in the control group. Grades were similar for both classes.

Jordan (1994) examined the relationship between student growth and development and service-learning participation along four dimensions: sense of civic or citizenship responsibility; respect for diversity; development of individual skills such as knowledge and academic concentration; and knowledge of self. Three hundred students from two Virginia Universities were invited to participate in the study. There were 50 students from each school who participated in community service learning with no reflection, while another fifty students representing each school participated in community service learning with reflection. There were 50 students from each school who were the comparison group. They had no community service involvement. Both qualitative and quantitative data were gathered from these students. The dependent variables were the dimensions of growth described above, and the study controlled for race, gender, and previous community service. Participation in community service learning with the two levels of experience defined above was the independent variable. Results from the quantitative analysis did not reveal any significant difference between the groups. There was, however, a difference between genders. In terms of qualitative data, students involved in service-learning and reflection indicated in their journals that their community service experiences contributed to changes in perceptions along three of
the four dimensions of growth: respect for diversity; development of individual skills such as knowledge and academic concentration; and knowledge of self.

Dr. Judy Rauner, Director of the Service Learning Program at the University of San Diego from 1987-2002, conducted research on the impact of service-learning on the development of student leaders (Rauner, 1995). Using a comparative case study approach, this study examined students’ experiences as community service leaders at two California universities over two years. There were four case studies that were analyzed with 58 participating students (14 per case study, per institution, per year). Self-designed surveys and questionnaires, journals, focus group interviews, and observations were used to gather data concerning whether, how, and why student leaders changed their self-perceptions, awareness of cultural diversity issues, moral judgments, decision making processes, learning, and relationships with other students, administrative leaders and community organizations. From various qualitative sources, students reported that they gained self-confidence by meeting time demands, facing complex situations, and increasing their organizational and communication skills. Through immersion in different community cultural settings, students reported that they were forced to confront their stereotypes and they became aware of the vast differences in physical environments and resources available to people. Cross analysis of the two programs indicated differences based upon how long the students served, funding sources, and in the autonomy level of
student leaders. Students raised corrective issues regarding the amount and type of advising that they received as well as the receptivity from community agency personnel to input from the student leaders. Paraprofessional student leaders also questioned whether or not they were able to influence other student volunteers. All of the student leaders felt challenged to continue their involvement as citizens in their world. Hence there appeared to be social awareness changes among student leaders at 2 universities; however, the leaders questioned whether they received adequate advising or supervision and whether community agencies really listen to their feedback. So, an ideal collaboration was not achieved in the perception of the students.

Greene & Diehn (1995) investigated the effect of infusing a service-learning component into an undergraduate course entitled “Survey of Human Disease”. There were forty students in the survey course on human diseases who participated in this quasi-experimental study that employed a between-group design and was intended to assess the effects of service-learning on perceptions of the elderly. There were twenty four students elected to participate in the service-learning component and were randomly assigned to two groups: one group involved weekly journal writing with written feedback (n=11); the other group involved weekly journal with feedback only given as a check mark (n=13). Sixteen students with no service-learning were the comparison group. Students responded to entrance and exit surveys that measured the degree of stereotypical
perception regarding elderly people in a nursing home. Service-learning students paired with an older adult for a weekly visit. Older adults also completed surveys. Service and non service-learning groups held similarly stereotypical views of the elderly at pretest. The posttest survey revealed that 70.8% of the students involved in service-learning felt the experience broadened their perspectives on aging, and 50% of this group held less stereotypical images of the elderly than at pretest. An analysis of variance indicated that there was a significant difference between service-learning groups who received different types of feedback on their journals. The students receiving written feedback had a significantly greater awareness of the contribution the older adults made to their learning than those who received only a check mark for completion. The design used to investigate the degree to which service-learning impacted students’ stereotype of older adults as being preoccupied with disease was a between-groups design. Between-groups differences were examined using an independent sample t-test. The design employed to investigate the effect of written feedback on journal writing was a between-groups design with one independent variable: type of journal feedback. The question of reciprocity was investigated by reviewing students’ and older adults’ responses to Likert scale items in the exit survey. The authors’ of the study found a possible effect of service-learning on diminishing the stereotype examined, a beneficial effect of journaling with written feedback from the instructor, evidence of reciprocity between server and service recipient, and a very positive response among students and residents to the weekly visits.
McEwen (1996) reviewed and analyzed service learning empirical studies that examined theoretical domains of learning and development. She examined a series of student development outcomes including cognitive development theories, learning styles models, theories of psychosocial development, dimensions of identity development and theories and models of career development. She reviewed a minimum of five studies in each category. She ultimately concludes that service-learning appears to be an intervention that holds great potential for enhancing the learning and development of college students. In the areas of learning and cognitive development, McEwen asserts that students who engage in service-learning may become more critical of themselves and self reflective of their lifestyles, and what they know and believe; move toward more complex levels of moral reasoning; and development and clarity about their faith and spirituality. Potential outcomes related to psychosocial and identity development include increased sense of competence; increased awareness and integration of their emotions; increased autonomy; greater awareness of themselves as a racial being and of their own racial, ethnic, and cultural heritage; greater sense or their place in the United States and our global society; increased tolerance and empathy; greater clarity about their sense of purpose; and development and maturity of their values.

Rhoads (1997) hypothesized that if college students have a deep sense of caring for others; it is more likely that they will interact with others in a meaningful way. Thus, a means to foster a sense of self grounded in an ethic of caring via community service
involvement was explored in this paper. The three objectives addressed in this work were: (1) to advance higher education's understanding of the varieties of learning experiences students have through involvement in community service; (2) to use theoretical discussions of the "caring self" (a combination of symbolic discussions and feminist explanations of self) as a means to interpret findings on community service involvement; and (3) to use interpretations of research to discuss the ideal of community and the role of higher education and community service in advancing community. Data for this paper were gathered over a 6-year period and included interviews, self-designed surveys, and observations of students participating in community service. Several themes emerged from reading this data and were member checked with the students. The themes relevant to the topic of identity exploration included making connections with the self, with community members, and with other volunteers. Students reported that they were rejuvenated by their interactions with other volunteers and that because they were connected to the community, they were able to put faces on the statistics and policy discussions they heard about poverty, homelessness, and the like. It also challenged them to confront stereotypes they had about people and face racism head-on.

Eyler, Giles, and Braxton (1997) in their study entitled “The Impact of Service-Learning on College Students” utilized the Comparing Models for Service-learning FIPSE research project which gathered data from over 1500 students at 20 colleges and universities. T-tests for independent samples compared service and non-service students
on pre-test measures. Hierarchical linear multiple regression was used for analysis of service-learning impact over the semester. Group equivalence was achieved by statistically controlling for rival hypotheses to service-learning impact. Though several studies were included in the project; this study examined the impact of service-learning on outcomes and pre-service differences. Students who chose service-learning differed from those who did not in the target attitudes, skills, values, and understanding of social issues. Participation in service learning and closeness to faculty increased student's belief in personal efficacy and solve problems. Service learning was also predictive of a career of valuing people, of volunteering and of attempting to influence the political system.

Service-learning was also predictive of: students’ post-test assessments of their political participation skills and their tolerance for others, students' ability to place themselves in someone else's shoes, and students’ ability to remain open to new ideas. Finally, service-learning may have also facilitated faculty-student relationships. Based on their findings, the authors recommended including service-learning in the core curriculum rather than keeping it a co-curricular option.

Astin and Sax (1997) reported findings of a national longitudinal study of the potential benefits of participation in a variety of service learning programs on college students after they leave college. They conducted a longitudinal study of more than 12,000 students, who were surveyed at three time points over a nine year period: in 1985, as college freshmen; in 1989, as college seniors; and in 1994, as adults who had been out
of college for five years. Service learning participation was found to have positive outcomes in both attitudes and behaviors. They found positive effects on: 1) student retention; 2) enrollment in post-graduate study; 3) participation in post-graduate volunteer service; 4) alumni contributions and 5) social interaction across ethnic and racial lines. Student participation also positively affected students’ commitment to: 6) participation in community action programs; 7) assisting others who are in difficulty; 8) participation in environmental clean-up programs; 9) promoting racial understanding; and 10) developing a meaningful philosophy of life.

Astin and Sax (1998) reviewed how undergraduates are affected by service participation (not service learning) through a national survey of 42 institutions sponsored by Learn and Serve America (LSAHE). LSAHE programs engage students in tutoring, working with the homeless, the poor and the elderly; improving neighborhood environments and community health; and preventing crime. Using data from the Cooperative Institutional Research Program, a Freshman (CIRP) Survey, SAT and ACT scores, and enrollment data, thirty-five student outcomes were measured in five student cohorts from 1990-1994. Follow-up surveys were also administered to students in 1995. Service participation was the independent variable and control variables included freshmen year pre-tests, service propensity, major, race, ethnicity, gender, and structural characteristics of the institution. Even when controlling for freshmen year pre-tests,
service propensity, academic major, race, ethnicity, gender, and structural characteristics of the institution, all 35 student outcome measures were favorably influenced by service participation. These included academic outcomes (GPA, retention, degree completion, amount of interaction with faculty, and increase in knowledge); civic responsibility (commitment to life goals of helping others, promoting racial understanding); and life skills (critical thinking, interpersonal skills, leadership skills, social self-confidence, knowledge of different races or cultures, and conflict resolution skills). Increases in knowledge, civic responsibility and life skills were measured by student self-report. The analysis also indicated that the more time devoted to service the more positive the effect on students. Whether a student volunteered in high school was the most important predisposing factor for students to participate in college level service-learning. Other factors included leadership ability, involvement in religious activities, commitment to participation in community action programs, tutoring other children, being a guest in a teacher's home, and being a woman.

Osborne, Hammerich, and Hensley (1998) examined four sections of a pharmacy communications class were randomly assigned to service learning or no service-learning conditions (for a total of 95 undergraduate students). Service-learning was the independent variable and was expected positively to impact participating students’ sense of self-worth, cognitive complexity level, social behavior, and sense of competence. Pre-tests indicated no significant difference between samples on scales measuring these
elements. The Self Perception Scale, the Spontaneous Self Esteem Scale, the Remote Associations Test, the Texas Social Behavior Inventory, the Cognitive Complexity Scale and the Rosenberg Self Esteem Scale were used to measure the impact of service-learning and were administered at the beginning and the end of the semester. Service-learning groups showed significant positive improvements when compared to no-service learning groups on cognitive complexity, social competency; perceived ability to work with diverse others; and self worth in social situations. There was no significant change in the Rosenberg Self Esteem Scale, but service-learning students reported a more realistic representation about their sense of self-worth.

A final study conducted in the 1990s was a landmark study by Eyler and Giles (1999) who wrote the text entitled Where's the Learning in Service-Learning? This book summarizes results of three studies designed to assess the impact of alternative models of service-learning on college students. The data sets included: a pre- post-semester survey of about 1500 students (1100 of whom participated in service-learning and 400 of whom did not) from 20 colleges and universities across the US; in-depth pre- and post-semester problem solving interviews with 66 students from 6 colleges and universities; and in-depth interviews of 65 college students from 6 other institutions that explore student views of the nature of reflection in service learning. Results were that service-learning had a positive impact on such outcomes as personal development, social responsibility, interpersonal skills, tolerance and stereotyping, learning, and application of learning. A
second analysis, which examined the impact of program characteristics on outcomes using only the service-learning sample of 1100 students, showed that the quality of service-learning classes impacts outcomes significantly. Program characteristics such as a placement quality, link between the academic subject matter and service, written and oral reflection, diversity, and community voice were predictive of many student outcomes. In the problem solving interviews, students had the chance to demonstrate their analysis of a social problem linked to their service. Over the course of a semester, students in service-learning classes in which service and academic study were continuously and closely linked showed significantly more change in the complexity of their problem analysis, their assessment of the locus of problem and solution and in their critical thinking ability than did students in programs with little linkage between the service option and the course of study or students with no service options. Students in the well integrated service-learning courses were also more likely to apply subject matter knowledge to their problem analysis and to have well developed practical strategies for community action. In both the survey and the single interviews, students reported greater learning when they had higher quality experiences. The pre/post-semester interview data also support this finding.

The new millennium has seen a continued focus on research related to how service learning experiences impact college and university students.
Vogelgesang and Astin (2000) compared and contrasted the effects of service learning and community service on student development and academic success. The data for this study were collected as part of the Cooperative Institutional Research Program (CIRP), which is sponsored by the Higher Education Research Institute (HERI). The CIRP collects data annually from freshman at institutions around the country using the Student Information Form (SIF). The College Student Survey (CSS) is generally administered four years after a student enters college and provides longitudinal follow-up data. This study uses 1998 CSS data, and data from the SIF administered in 1994 (and other years, when applicable). This study looked non-course based community service and course-based service and their effects on several variables. These included self values and beliefs (commitment to increasing racial understanding, activism, and sense of efficacy); academic skills (GPA, growth in writing skills, and critical thinking skills; leadership aptitude (growth in interpersonal skills; leadership activities and leadership ability); and future plans (career choice and plans to engage in community service). Control variables included pretest measures for most of the dependent variables, sex, high school volunteer work, tutoring, attending religious services, being a guest in a teacher’s home, commitment to participating in community action programs, desire to make money, and self-rated leadership ability. The researchers used a method of blocked, stepwise linear regression analysis to study changes in each of the dependent variables. Students with data missing for the pre- or posttest were dropped from analysis, yielding
different final sample sizes for each variable. Findings included the fact that all eleven dependent variables changed significantly when service learning or community service was performed. For some variables community service with no ties to coursework has a more positive impact than service learning. Self-efficacy and leadership did not show significant changes unless students were also participating in generic community service. There are also some variables for which service-learning is a superior predictor of outcomes, including some affective measures (commitment to activism, and promoting racial understanding) and all three learning measures. Choosing a service related career is also impacted more positively by participating in service learning than by performing generic community service.

Toews and Cerney (2005) conducted a study to gain a better understanding of the personal, professional, interpersonal, social, and academic development of students who complete a 15-hour service learning assignment as part of the requirements for a family diversity course. The sample consisted of 36 family and consumer sciences majors, all females, enrolled in a family diversity class. As part of the requirements for this upper-level family and child development course, each student was required to work directly with families and/or children for a minimum of 15 unpaid hours at a site pre-approved by their professor. It was suggested that the required hours be distributed over the course of the semester (i.e., 1-2 hours per week); however, flexibility in scheduling was granted with permission from both the professor and the on-site supervisor. In addition, the
students were required to write a paper (7-10 pages) at the end of the semester reflecting on what they learned about themselves and others and to what degree the service learning assignment related to course content. A manual content analysis was conducted by three independent coders. Inductively, reoccurring themes within and commonalities among the students’ responses were identified and sorted based on similar themes. Next, the data were examined deductively to identify more specific themes such as personal, professional, interpersonal, social, and academic development. Lastly, the primary coder examined the identified themes to determine if the findings were consistent among the coders. The students’ reflections demonstrated the benefits of integrating service-learning into a family science course, even when the experience was brief (15 hours). They learned numerous valuable lessons about themselves and their future careers. Moreover, they became more accepting of others and they realized the importance of service to one’s community. Students who engaged in service learning were able to process and synthesize the information they learned in the classroom by experiencing course content in a real-world setting.

Wang and Rodgers (2006) utilized the Measure of Epistemology Reflection (MER) to explore the impact of service-learning courses with and without a social justice emphasis in college students' cognitive development. This study involved instructors and students in six service-learning courses offered at a large Midwestern state university. These courses were selected based on the academic level of the students in these courses.
and whether social justice was an emphasis in the course design. Qualitative methods were used to classify the six courses into a Social Justice group or Nonsocial Justice group, based on whether or not they have a social justice emphasis in course design or not. Interviews were conducted with instructors about the foci of their courses and their detailed designs for achieving their intended outcomes. Document analyses were done with course syllabi, reading packages, textbooks, handouts, and other materials. Based on the interviews and document analyses, each course was evaluated in four components: course description and objectives, reading assignments, writing and other assignments, and instructor’s perception of student achievement. The degrees of social justice emphasis for each course were analyzed by one researcher through analysis of all the course documents and interview transcripts. A second researcher then read and analyzed all the interview transcripts and syllabi independently and confirmed the classifications of the first researcher. Member checks were then performed with six out of the seven instructors, and they also agreed with the classifications of their courses. This study used MER to measure students’ cognitive development (Baxter Magolda & Porterfield, 1985). MER is a written instrument designed to assess Perry’s five positions of cognitive-structural development. The MER instruments were administered to students in all the courses/sections in the first week and tenth week of the class in the spring quarter of 2003. This study used a quasi-experimental pretest-posttest design because students could not be assigned randomly to different classes.
This study provides evidence that students’ thinking and reasoning become more complex after taking service-learning courses. In particular, MER continuous scores indicated that the cognitive development level of all the students in the six service learning courses significantly increases from pretest to posttest. This study also reveals a significant difference in cognitive development between students who were enrolled in the Social Justice courses compared to those who enrolled in the Nonsocial Justice courses. The cognitive level changes for students from the Social Justice courses are significantly higher than those from the Nonsocial Justice courses when students’ age, gender, class rank, and their cognitive levels at the beginning of the courses were controlled.

Bernacki and Jaeger (2008), conducted a research study on service-learning’s impact on students’ moral development and moral orientation. In this study, 46 students in service learning and non-service learning sections of comparable courses offered at a northeastern Catholic university completed the Defining Issues Test, the Moral Justification Scale, and the Service Learning Outcome Scale at the beginning and end of a semester. Moral development and orientation did not change significantly. Service learning students subjectively reported becoming more compassionate and more sensitive, having a greater understanding of and ability to solve social problems, and possessing a greater efficacy to make the world better. While a single-semester exposure
to service learning may be too limited to affect moral development, participants' self-reported changes may be precursors to such developmental changes.

In summary, the literature concerning the academic and social outcomes as a result of students’ involvement in service-learning programs is rich and abundant. It appears that service-learning has a positive effect on student personal development such as sense of personal efficacy, personal identity, spiritual growth, cognitive complexity, and moral development. Service-learning has a positive effect on interpersonal development and the ability to work well with others, leadership and communication skills. Service-learning has a positive effect on reducing stereotypes and facilitating cultural & racial understanding. Service-learning has a positive effect on sense of social responsibility and citizenship skills. Service-learning has a positive effect on commitment to service. Volunteer service in college is associated with involvement in community service after graduation. Students or faculty report that service-learning has a positive impact on students' academic learning. Students and/or faculty report that service-learning improves students' ability to apply what they have learned in “the real world”. Service-learning participation has an impact on such academic outcomes as demonstrated complexity of understanding, problem analysis, critical thinking, and cognitive development. The impact of service-learning on student cognitive moral development is mixed. Service-learning appears to contribute to career development. Students engaged
in service-learning report stronger faculty relationships than those who are not involved in service-learning. Service-learning improves student satisfaction with college. Finally it can be ascertained that students engaged in service-learning are more likely to graduate.

These studies have implications for focused research dealing with community partnership development between community service agencies and institutions of higher education. As demonstrated, social growth may be positively impacted by participation in service-focused activities. Primarily, the studies involved processes where a community service agency actively engaged the students; however, as can be discerned by an examination of these studies, the partnering agencies were never viewed as the primary focus of any of the research. The role played by the agencies in the developmental process of the participants would seem to merit study as well.

Service-Learning and Campus-Community Partnerships

Early in the service-learning movement, many colleges and universities participating in service partnerships viewed the agencies and their clients as passive recipients of university expertise or as subjects for research. Hence, colleges and universities tended to see themselves as dominant in the partnerships. The colleges and universities often maintained self-serving needs. The agencies and their clients were not seen as equal partners. Little research has been conducted on the impact of service learning on partnering community agencies (Shaffett, 2002). Nevertheless, Kendall
(1990) and Torres (2000b) indicate that there has been some benefits, especially when the
service-learning directly fulfills the mission of the recipient organization. Little research
on the effect of service-learning on communities or involvement of the communities in
decision making with service learning projects has been conducted. This is despite the
presence of community partnerships as one of the central tenants of service-learning
principles of good practice. The following summarizes the literature related to these
pertinent issues.

Shumer (1993) offers an evaluation of a community-based learning program
whose primary goal was to retain students through youth service, career exploration and
academic development. The program described focused on dropout prevention in an
inner-city in the Los Angeles area. The program studies was a K-12 magnet school with
approximately 500 student located in a large metropolitan area. The focus of the
investigation was grades 9-12, with most participants in grades 11 and 12. It is important
to note that this school chose to partner with a university to address this retention issue.
The Community-Based Learning Program (CBLP) was composed of a multi-ethnic
population of 60 students. The students participated in two days of career exploration in
self-selected field sites. These same students also spent three days per week in individual
and small group study sessions. College tutors from local universities assisted these
individuals with class work and discussed personal topics. These college students
received academic credit for their work at the school. The emphasis of this program was to establish personal relations between adults and students and the communities themselves. Members of the CBLP were instrumental in the overall design and evaluation of the program by assisting in the development of the review process. The evaluation design utilized within this inquiry was a comparison group process. Students were observed and interviewed over a period of one year. These students completed surveys on their respective programs which required them to rank order the program components which influenced their learning and their interest in school. Data were collected on student absence rates from school records and student grades were also obtained. Researchers spent time in the schools two days per week, working as tutors and conducting participant observations. Additionally, student and teacher interviews were conducted. The intent of the study was to determine the impact of the CBLP on the clients being served, on student performance and retention. Data at the magnet school were collected on student attendance for the year prior to the CBLP and for the year the CBLP was studied. Comparison group attendance data were collected for the year prior to the study and for the year the CBLP was studied. A t-test was conducted comparing mean scores of attendance and grades for CBLP and comparison groups for both years. In the year prior to the CBLP there was a significant difference (0.05 level) between the CBLP and comparison students related to attendance and GPA. The CBLP group was absent more frequently than the comparison group. By the end of the program year, there
was no significant difference between CBLP students and the comparison group in terms of attendance. Hence the group with a history of absences gained equity with the group without a history of absenteeism. This indicated that the CBLP program did affect student attendance positively. Student and teacher interviews also supported this assertion. Additionally student grade averages were monitored before and after the program. In the academic year prior to the program, CBLP students had a significantly lower overall yearly grade point average than did the comparison group. By the end of the year of the program, CBLP students achieved a higher GPA than the comparison group. The students themselves cited several reasons for their academic improvement including more frequent attendance, a curriculum that connected them to their service and the community, extra help from tutors and more interaction with adults and peers. In an analysis of the surveys administered to the students participating in the CBLP, it was found that the one area ranked the highest for help with student learning was “help from college tutors”. Though this study focused on the outcome of the experience on K-12 students, a significant factor in the program was the inclusion and impact of college service-learning students’ involvement as mentors and tutors. Members of the community who came together to form the CBLP were very influential in designing this capacity of the program. Changes, if any, within the development of the college student participants were not noted within the study.
Driscoll, Holland, Gelmon, and Kerrigan (1996) presented a comprehensive case study model of service-learning assessment at Portland State University as a response to the need to measure impact of service-learning among four constituencies: students, faculty, community agencies and institutions. These case studies blended qualitative and quantitative measures in order to determine the most effective and practical tools for measuring the impact of service-learning. There were four service-learning courses that served as the sample for this pilot study. Researchers identified multiple variables, indicators and measures to examine the hypothesis that participation in service-learning would have a positive impact on all four constituencies. They employed three methods of data collection: in-person assessments, independent reflection measures, and reviews of existing documentation. Preliminary findings supported the legitimacy of the predicted impact variables for students, community agencies, and faculty. Service-learning affected students in their: awareness and involvement in the community; personal development; academic achievement; and sensitivity to diversity. The impact on community agencies was evident in that they perceived an increased ability to serve clients, received economic and social benefits, and were satisfied with student interactions. Finally, faculty members felt that community service experiences could be fertile ground for research and other scholarly work.

Holland (1997) developed a comprehensive assessment model that used qualitative and quantitative methods to collect data according to a set of impact variables
identified for recipient agencies associated with Portland State University (PSU). Data from community partners were collected through direct observations, structured interviews, and focus groups. These data were analyzed using a pattern-matching approach. Pattern matching involves an attempt to link two patterns where one is a theoretical pattern and the other is an observed or operational one. Organizational staff or other agency volunteers often increased their skills and capacities across agencies. The partnerships were seen as an agency learning experiences and opportunities for reflection about modes of operation and service delivery. Agency staff were uniformly impressed, and even surprised, by the quality and performance of PSU students placed in their organizations through service learning courses. In general, agencies expectations were exceeded and the agencies got more than they hoped for from working with students. Most partners reported drawing direct benefit from the life experiences and skills of students as well as their assigned task outcomes. Only partners with well-developed organizational infrastructures were prepared to estimate the economic impact of working with PSU service learning courses. More often, partners were able to discuss the sense of value received from services or products that would not otherwise have been affordable or available to them. They often focused on the intangible benefits of association with the university as a significant resource with which they seek a lasting relationship. The most significant finding of this impact study was the value the agencies placed on that strong and ongoing relationship with a particular faculty member. Also significant was the
degree to which partners see themselves as teachers. They saw themselves as helping to prepare future professionals and citizens. This was considered as much or more important to them as the value of the direct benefits of student services provided to them. These community representatives wanted to work with faculty members and students as partners in setting learning and service goals, and even in evaluating student learning outcomes.

Ward and Vernon (1999) conducted a two-phase study investigating community perceptions of students and faculty involved in service learning and campus outreach initiatives. Four areas of focus informed the study: 1) how communities and campuses come together to engage in service activities; 2) how communities perceive the service mission of institutions of higher education; 3) whether community service agencies see service-learning students as a help or a hindrance; and 4) how to enhance partnerships between campuses and their communities. Phase one of the study was a survey of 65 directors of community service agencies in four towns in a rural Northwestern state. Questions included general background information on students and activities, the overall perception of the campus in question and higher education in general, and questions related to student service providers. Both open-ended and Likert-type scale questions were included in the survey. In the second phase, semi-structured follow-up interviews were conducted with 30 agency personnel from one community. These data and the responses to open-ended survey questions were examined for themes. Findings included
the fact that the communities under study have positive perceptions of campuses in their area and of the students with whom they worked; the challenges of working with service learning students included student inconsistency, unpreparedness, and need for training; and that agency personnel wanted more coordination and communication with the professors. The authors provide the following concluding recommendations: 1) communication lines need to be opened between the service agencies and the professors; 2) campuses need to open their doors to community partners; 3) campuses and communities need to jointly approach issues associated with recruitment, training, and retention of service providers; and 4) guidelines need to be developed that clearly outline the purposes and expectations of different campus-based service initiatives.

Cruz and Giles (2000) wrote an opinion piece regarding the lack of research on the community perspective within service learning. They saw the lack of research focused on the service agencies and the community as a glaring omission in the literature. Analysis of the causes of this gap indicated that community-focused research is plausible and desirable. The article presented a four dimensional model for doing research with community partners on the process and outcomes of community service learning. The authors argue that the research should focus on the community-university partnership as the unit of analysis and that it should utilize a participatory action research approach. This study is an attempt to begin such research.
Clarke, (2000) conducted a study entitled “Evaluating the Community Impact of Service Initiatives: The 3-I Model”. The 3-I model included three related dimensions (Initiator, Initiative, and Impact) of service-learning programs in order to evaluate the process of community impact. The Initiator dimension took several elements into account, such as goal setting, partnership development, shared understandings, and the development of a knowledge base. The Initiative dimension was concerned with the process of implementing the service initiative, as well as community involvement and participation. The Impact dimension centered on results along with intended outcomes and goals, and the how knowledge of impact influenced the Initiator dimension. In order to investigate whether these dimensions accurately represented the process of community impact and to confirm that the community received benefits from the service-learning projects, the researcher used both quantitative and qualitative methods. The 3-I Model was tested in a community in which many projects of a university service-learning program were underway. Evidence was gathered from six sources: 1) an interview with the service initiator; 2) a community focus group interview; 3) observations of community members participating in the service initiative; 5) a community survey with questions pertaining to the impact of the service; and 6) a review of extant data, such as newsletters, community records, lists of community participants, and community calendars. These multiple sources of evidence provided ample evidence that the community was favorably impacted by the service project. Survey respondents and
community leaders felt that they had a clear idea of why the university was involved with the community. They knew project goals and the community helped set project goals. The university helped the community reach its own goals. The project worked well in the community and the community believed it was well-served. Community/university bonds were strengthened and the community gained access to new resources. The project helped community residents become active in and feel a sense of control over the community. In addition, the model and evidence showed that the impact process and their impact outcomes were not separate, but intertwined. For instance, the initiator noted how the program had to be redesigned to meet the communities’ perceived needs. The survey, focus group, observational and interview data show that the program did meet community needs, not just for service itself, but for involvement with the service-learning project in the planning and implementation phases.

Rubin (2000) examined the literature to determine the types of questions and approaches being developed and utilized in evaluating university-community partnerships. The first observation highlighted was that there had been an evolution in the literature between 1990-2000. Most of the early published accounts were reports of individual cases, including histories and reflections written by the academic participants in partnerships, usually faculty members or academic coordinators. During the later part of the 1990s, while such accounts continue to appear, there has been a growth in the number and size of more systematic, longitudinal, and comparative analyses. A second,
related factor is that this literature was largely produced by academics who were writing about their specific arena - higher education. Third, there was a very wide array of disciplinary and professional perspectives among the contributors to the literature, with backgrounds in psychology, education, urban planning, anthropology, political science, sociology, philosophy, and several other fields. The final factor in the review of literature was the newness of the field of study. Although published, broad based empirical findings were relatively rare as of spring 2000, many of the most extensive and ambitious studies were scheduled for completion within the next year.

Ferrari and Worrall (2000) asked 30 supervisors at community based organizations (CBOs) to fill out performance evaluations of 135 upper division students enrolled in courses at a Midwestern university with a 20-25 hour service learning component. Students were aware that their performance was to be evaluated and that they would not be graded on the performance review. An exploratory factor analysis was performed and produced two useful factors. The first of these was called “student service skills”. The items loading on this factor were: working relationship with client/s; appropriate respect for clients; sensitivity to client’s needs; presenting an appropriate image to clients; and constructive attitude about working with clients. The second factor could be labeled “work skills”, and the items loading on this factor were attendance, punctuality, dependability, and good quality work. A two by two ANOVA showed no interaction between or main effects for sex of supervisor or sex of student. A content
analysis was performed on the four percent of evaluations that included written comments. Seven themes emerged from this analysis: 1) students were helpful to agency; 2) students were sensitive to clients’ needs; 3) student was friendly to clients and staff; 4) the students showed empathy toward clients; 5) student relationships with clients were appropriate and positive; 6) students were interested in providing services to clients; and 7) students were dedicated to his or her work. CBO supervisors, on the whole, were impressed with students’ helpfulness, sensitivity, friendliness, compassion, and actions.

Vernon and Foster (2002) conducted a study to examine college student service learning and volunteer activities from the nonprofit service providers. Data were gathered from agency personnel who worked directly with college student service learners and volunteers. The study examined the perceived impacts that college students have at the nonprofit agencies and the needs being served. A collective case study model was utilized. In-person, semi-structured interviews were conducted with 17 personnel from 15 nonprofit community agencies that utilized college student volunteers to help meet the needs of youth in seven communities of a northwestern state. Pre-formulated, targeted questions designed to obtain baseline data from each respondent were utilized. Open-ended questions were included in order to provide respondents with the freedom to communicate their own versions and interpretations of the college students’ service. Data were analyzed using an inductive content analysis described by Strauss and Corbin as “open coding.” This constant comparative method involved a continuous cycle of
conceptualizing data, categorizing it, and defining the properties and dimensions of each concept. Four research categories emerged and relate to the research questions. The research categories include: (1) the partnership between the community agencies and higher education institutions, (2) college student volunteer impacts on the agencies, (3) student impacts on the youth being served, and (4) community perspectives of college student volunteerism.

Conclusions are summarized as follows. 1. The agencies overwhelmingly appreciate and support the service provided by college student volunteers. 2. Agencies believe that traditional-aged college students make easier and stronger connections with youth because they are viewed by youth as cool. 3. Agencies are not always supportive of service learning requirements. 4. Due to the vulnerability of the youth being served, agencies want a stronger commitment from college students and protocols for campuses to follow to increase retention and responsibility levels among volunteers. Based upon these findings, the authors then offered the following recommendations for campus-based service learning programs and nonprofit agencies in order to increase effectiveness and strengthen partnerships. 1. Campuses must designate a specific unit and/or faculty and staff who are responsible for operating and supporting the service learning and volunteer activities for students. 2. Professors who teach service learning courses need to hold students accountable for the service they are providing. 3. Campus service learning professionals need to work with community agencies to overcome the negative
connotation that required volunteerism sometimes holds. 4. Campuses need to do better outreach to community agencies to explain service learning. 5. Increased collaboration between agencies and campuses needs to occur in order to identify the most effective way of utilizing college student volunteers. 6. Colleges need to be more aware of college students’ motivations for volunteering or enrolling in service learning courses.

In regard to research being conducted on service learning projects, if the research is about community outcomes, community-based research wants community members involved in the research process and not just the university personnel. Community members should be involved in the design and implementation of the research projects. Couto (2001) explained how “community-based research takes us another step towards the scholarship of engagement by more surely integrating the pressing problems of urban and rural areas into the curriculum through a community-based, problem-centered pedagogy”. Such research, however, may or may not be deemed acceptable for publication in professional journals and hence usable by professors on tenure and promotion decisions.

Community-based research has “a diverse history that spans the globe and most of it does not involve higher education or academics at all” (Strand, et. al., 2003). Because of the community emphasis, this approach is the closest higher education comes to creating a community-centric research paradigm. The content and context of the research is centered on and in the community. The community perspective on research questions
becomes tacit knowledge and can also translate into organizing principles used to solve problems. The principles that guide researchers are: 1) satisfying the researcher’s and community’s interests and needs; 2) hopefully both the researcher’s and the community’s capacities are enhanced (much like the concept of reciprocity); and 3) adopt long-range social change perspectives (Strand, et. al., 2003, p. 29). The focus of the process is to improve social conditions within the community being studied. This is not research guided by theoretical questions, but rather research which is action oriented inquiry designed to promote the good of the community.

To sum up, increasingly over the years, institutions of higher education and external community agencies, including government, corporations, and not-for-profit community organizations have begun collaborating on specific projects or wide-ranging initiatives to address societal issues and crises (Harkavy and Benson, 2000; Office of University Partnerships, 2002). The leaders of community organizations are recognizing the effectiveness of collaborative partnerships with a college or university. Collaborations with colleges and universities appear to increase the effectiveness of basic mission for the agencies. Some higher education scholars also realized that linking scholarship and service adds value to the learning experience for students and can address vital community concerns (Cruz and Giles, 2000). Most service learning research however has focused on student outcomes (Howard, et. al., 2000). There has been less attention
given to the overall effects of campus-community partnerships on community agencies or to community based research.

This study will focus on multiple issues of campus-community agency partnering including the impact of service learning on community agencies in order to help close the gap in service learning literature. I will investigate the nature of the experience of community service agencies within service-learning partnerships. I shall examine, from the community service agency’s and the professors’ perspective, the rationale behind and outcomes expected in establishing a service-learning partnership, the process of forming, maintaining, renewing, changing, and evaluating a service-learning partnership, and then finally any perceived impact(s) a service-learning partnership has upon the participating community service agency. It is my hope that this study will add positively to the growing body of literature related to campus-community agency partnering.

**Partnerships, Alliances and Relationships**

*Corporate Partnerships.* As indicated and discussed in Chapter 1, Bergquist, Betwee, and Meuel, (1995), interviewed and reviewed hundreds of companies and organizations and then conceptualized six reasons why these entities establish partnerships. The reasons related to emerging trends in the work environment and consisted of the following: 1) In an age of limited and diminishing resources, partnerships offer expanded capabilities, allowing organizations to do more with less or
to do something entirely different than their existing resource base permits; 2) In an age of change and shifting boundaries, partnerships enable companies to be more flexible, to leverage competencies and share resources and to create new ventures that would have been inconceivable on their own; 3) In an age of growing complexity, partnerships offer access to specialized resources; 4) In an age of growing globalization, partnerships can offer a wider geographic reach into diverse global markets, allowing for approaches that are customized for local markets and individualized consumers; 5) As technology gives rise to independent and often impersonal work, partnerships form community and recognize interdependence as a way to get a job done, and; 6) In an age of growing egalitarianism, partnerships offer the chance for increased personal involvement, control, and professional fulfillment.

Kanter (1994) stated that successful partnerships “cannot be controlled by normal systems but require a dense web of interpersonal connections and internal infrastructures that enhance learning” (p. 97). Berquist, Betwee, and Meuel (1995) concurred with this description and added that they repeatedly found in their research of successful partnerships a need for clear communication, a respect for differences, and flexibility. The authors focus on the fact that partnerships “cross traditional institutional boundaries” (p. 36) and thus communication can become distorted and intentions can be easily misunderstood. They highlight the work of Senge (1990) which speaks of the value of
dialogue, as opposed to just discussion. “When we communicate through dialogue we seek out common understanding and shared value and visions rather than trying to win over the other party or make our point as we do in discussion” (p. 39). They share that partnerships in particular need more dialogue and less discussion. By maintaining a healthy respect for differences between the partnering groups, each becomes a learning organization. Each partner has the ability to take away best practice processing from the other. “In fact, learning and borrowing ideas from partners is part of realizing the full value of the relationship (Kanter, p. 107).

The notion of flexibility and the need for trust between the partnering entities is a key component to successful partnering. Berquist, Betwee, and Meuel (1995) state “successful partners can readily reconfigure their relationship and their mutual business because they trust one another and because that have established a covenant based on the sharing of information, continuing clarification of goals, and mutual problem solving.” (p. 196). In addition, they found that successful partnerships require moving beyond the formality of such items as legal contracts, into a shifting, dynamic relationship based on trust and communication. Also, the author’s research led them to view successful partnerships as those with the capability to define and redefine complex systems. In other words, partnership was viewed as an evolutionary process. A tangible example supplied by the authors is that of the Lesher-Norpac partnership. The two companies
established an initial set of contracts regarding the sole-source supply of newsprint, but they have since adjusted their relationship to expand their areas of cooperation and the scope of their partnership. Each organization learned from one another, formed strong bonds of trust, and adapted their partnership and ultimately the way they do business. In this sense, the researchers believe that the success of a partnership was not a result of the time spent together, but rather the ability to capitalize on opportunities to further develop the capabilities or scope of the partnership.

Hamel, Doz, and Prahalad (1989) concur with this notion when they “did not judge the success or failure of each partnership by its longevity – a common mistake when evaluating strategic alliances – but by the comparative strength on each side”. (p, 138). In another passage the researcher’s note “the point (of the partnership) is for a company to emerge from an alliance stronger and more competitive than when it entered.” If one were to apply this notion to service-learning partnership development, then the emphasis on sustainability is downplayed. Rather than attempting simply to develop a long-term relationship, equality and the value of that relationship for each partner should be reviewed. This would seem to illustrate the importance of reciprocity in that the value of the relationship of specific organization and integrated organization goal attainment for each entity within the partnership is the focus rather than the partnership length.
In this study, partnership will be examined by the following: 1) how the structures of the organizations in these partnerships interact; 2) the shared directions and unique needs of the organizations in these partnerships; 3) the systems, values, beliefs, decision making mechanisms, and communication patterns of these organizations; 4) How the two partners operate in terms of control, problem solving, use of physical facilities, marketing and finance; 5) the impact these partnerships have on personnel, policies, physical facilities and services of both parties; 6) the best practices and learning opportunities in these partnerships; 7) learning that is occurring between or within the partnering entities; 8) how and why these partnerships were/are established, maintained, renewed, molded, shaped, and changed and, 8) What, if any, impact(s) do service-learning partnerships have on the community agency’s and/or the university’s product(s) or service(s).

Corporate partnerships. There are a great variety of partnerships and strategic alliances that can be found within the corporate sector. Each specific case has its own merits, and the following examples illustrate the various partnership capacities described by Berquist, Betwee, and Meuel. According to Flagg, (1992), the international computing conglomerate, IBM, was once considered “the supreme example of vertical integration”, but now invests capital in no fewer than two hundred important partner-suppliers in order to protect and enhance the ability of these companies to add value to
IBM’s products and services. Thus, IBM has moved from a self-sustaining non-partnering entity to one which invests in a wide variety of partnerships that have proven to be extremely successful for the company.

Lei and Slocum, (1991), examined the pharmaceutical industry and found that Merck, Eli Lilly, Fujisawa, and Bayer aggressively cross-licensed (an agreement according to which two or more parties grant a license to each other for the exploitation of the subject-matter claimed in one or more of the patents each owns) to their newest drugs to one another, not only to support industry wide innovation, but also to apportion the high fixed cost of research and design and distribution. Additionally, Lei and Slocum, (1991) found that Corning Incorporated established “strategic alliances” which are defined as a formal pact between two or more organizations to achieve mutual goal or set of goals. Corning had two dozen joint ventures, with such foreign partners as Siemens of Germany, Samsung of Korea, Asahi Chemical of Japan and CIBA-GEIGY of Switzerland, designed to enter a growing number of related high-technology markets.

Weiner (1990) describes an interactive network, where information flows side to side between partners. He shares the story of the Boeing Aircraft Company and its development of partnership with such customers as United Airlines, in order to bring the opinions and expertise of United into the very beginning of the new aircraft creation process to optimize their product. Jick (1990), shared a similar example of General
Electric, which brought in its customers (and sometime competitors like Sears) to help it design new appliances.

Berquist, Betwee, and Meuel (1995), relate a story of a partnership designed to meet the needs of a changing marketplace in the collaboration between high-tech Bay Electronics and General Systech. The companies both served clientele in the highly volatile electronics arena. Rapid technology changes and switching markets became a frustration point for each company individually. Through a collaborative partnership, they were able to maintain flexibility and remain open to new possibilities. Each company brought a unique talent and market point to the partnership which helped the other respond to market demands and keep them open to new revenue streams.

In his text entitled Strategic Alliances: An Entrepreneurial Approach to Globalization, Yoshino (1995) shares that in the highly competitive global arena, companies that do not forge strategic international partnerships will be left behind. Today, the old joint venture has given way to a new, more entrepreneurial globalization process. Drawing from the examples of successful alliances like Ford/Mazda, Toshiba/Motorola, and Whirlpool/Philips, the author offer a road map for managing these entrepreneurial relationships and argues that the greatest challenge for top executives lies not in initiating such partnerships, but in continuously developing organizational process innovations to manage a global network of dynamic alliances.
Grayson (1998) describes his interview and internship with Len Rust, the vice-president of IDC South Pacific. Rust articulates that companies in the information technology (IT) sector are required to forge alliances with other companies and develop a program of strategic asset acquisition if they are to survive in the IT marketplace. Market success depends upon two key factors: the creation of effective brands and the provision of a comprehensive range of good or services. These comments were made during an address to those attending the 19th annual directions briefing conducted by IDC. Examples of successful business partnerships include that between Oracle Corporation and Netscape Communications Corporation.

Aldisert (2001) describes means to increase a corporation’s sphere of influence by developing strategic alliances with other professionals within that business field. She calls for a deeper level of networking along with a willingness to share information and resources. Aldisert is particularly imploring banking professionals to join in strategic alliances and partnership development in order to bring together the best resources available to execute the organization's marketing strategy. The author describes corporate strategic alliances as ongoing structured business relationships between two parties. For example, companies may join together for marketing, distribution or purchasing reasons. She emphasizes some successful strategic alliances outside of the banking industry. FedEx has partnered with Intel by providing Intel with logistics services. It provides a warehouse and distribution services for the chips that Intel
manufactures in Southeast Asia. FedEx provides its best service--using its systems to monitor inventory levels and optimal shipping times. Intel provides its best service: manufacturing top-of-the-line microchips. The Internet business-to-business (B2B) industry has spawned numerous strategic alliances among vendors, distributors and suppliers. They use the Internet to aggregate goods and lower costs. Primary industries such as chemicals, plastics and steel have joined together, providing excellent purchasing opportunities for manufacturing companies that source these materials. Finally, the computer industry companies have successfully partnered to amass sales. Dell, for example, offers a variety of computer software and accessories in addition to its traditional computer hardware line. Here it has collaborated with related companies that provide complementary products to provide one-stop shopping to its constituency.

Chathoth (2004) focused his work on the evolutionary aspect of alliances, while developing the proposition that alliances typically move from simple to complex resource-sharing arrangements with the primary objective of not only increasing revenues but also reducing costs, which is a direct outcome of the evolutionary trend. The importance of this concept is described within the hospitality industry, lodging and restaurant firms, and the airline industry which saw the emergence of new strategic concepts. The author reviews both historic and contemporary partnership and alliance formations. He ultimately proposes two propositions of alliance formations. P1 (a): The alliance structure that firms use in order to define their role/relationship and the manner
in which they combine resources to tap market opportunities will evolve as competitor firms imitate such successful combinations of resources and alliance structures. P1 (b): The trend of this evolution will be in the direction of more complex resource-sharing relationships that need to be created to tap new opportunities. This will create an evolutionary path of alliance structures ranging from simple to more.

P2: As organizational alliances evolve into more complex resource sharing entities, the nature of the relationship between incumbent firms within an alliance will evolve from revenue maximizing functions to one that involves revenue maximizing accompanied by cost minimizing functions.

The study of corporate partnerships suggests a framework to review service-learning based partnerships. Though obvious differences exist in corporate and educational culture and function, the general review of partnership development can provide insight into the perspective of partnership establishment, function and evaluation within the context of service-learning efforts. The merits of corporate partnership can be summarized in that they: 1) add to products and services; 2) apportion cost; 3) assist with goal achievement; 4) expand turf or services; 5) provide user input into what is needed, and 6) provide response to rapid change.

**Learning from a Partner.** Learning in a variety of forms is often an objective of partnerships. For example, Jones and Devonshire and the Mid City Sheriff’s Department
formed a learning partnership (Berquist, Betwee, and Meuel, 1995). The sheriff’s department desired the partnership in order for inmates to learn a responsible vocation to use when they were released. Jones and Devonshire employees learned of the issues facing inmates as they were released back into society, and their need to have a discerned craft and/or work competency. Employees of the sheriff’s department learned of environmental concerns, as well as strategies for assisting inmates in learning marketable skill sets. As a consequence inmates learned the science of growing quality fruits and vegetables and also the broader issue of respect for the environment and living things. Hence, both sides learned from the other.

Hamel, Doz, and Prahalad (1989) focused on dozens of strategic alliances between United States and Asian companies. In nearly every alliance, it seemed as if the Asian company fared better. It was repeatedly reported by the leadership of the Asian companies that there was a distinct difference in attitudes regarding learning from the alliances. The Asian businessmen viewed Americans as approaching their partnerships with the attitude of teachers often with the goal of impressing their Asian partners. They were not oriented toward learning from their Asian counterparts. Conversely, the Asian businessmen viewed themselves as students, readily absorbing any and all information relevant to improving their business processes. It was this capacity to learn from their partnerships that gave the Asian companies a distinct advantage.
Lei (1997) examined the roles of organizational learning and strategic alliances in facilitating competence building and technology fusion efforts within organizations. In his work entitled “Competence-Building, Technology Fusion and Competitive Advantage: The Key Roles of Organizational Learning and Strategic Alliances” Lei presents that the knowledge base that lays the foundation of the firm's core competence is composed of both explicit and tacit forms of knowledge. Tacit knowledge is embedded in the social fabric of the organization’s processes, dynamic routines and internal communication paths and provides a firm-specific resource to sustain competitive advantage. He makes a distinction between competitive advantage driving from strong product/market positions and the resource based perspective, which involves sustained and continuous learning aimed at developing and exploiting assets, skills and capabilities that influence a firm's evolution, competitive strategies and growth paths. Lei sees strategic alliances as key to building sustainable competitive advantage. Such alliances are likely to be in the form of close cooperation and interaction between partners along every aspect of the product's value chain, or underlying technology. He espouses that sustainable competitive advantage is more likely to result from building core competencies possessing a high component of tacit knowledge that is embedded in the organization. The author cites several examples of strategic alliances where partners have learned from one another. Such examples included Kawasaki Heavy Industries and
Unimation, Mitsubishi/Westinghouse, Fanuc/General Electric and Fanuc/General Motors, AT&T with Nippon Electric, Mitsubishi Electric, HP, Sundisk and IBM.

Tsang (1999) highlights the idea of gaining access to “sources of know-how” located outside of an organization through strategic alliances. This article examined the issue of learning in strategic alliances. Two different objects of learning are discussed and compared - "learning the other partner's skills" and "learning from strategic alliance experience." Depending on whether the partners concerns focused on the same or different objects of learning, four patterns of learning, namely asymmetrical, non-mutual, competitive and non-competitive, were identified. It is expected that firms behave differently when engaging in different patterns of learning.

Espinosa, Martín and Dobón (2003) studied to what extent strategic alliances, such as joint ventures, are used as a means of transmitting knowledge among service companies, focusing on the hotel industry. The authors analyzed the advantages and disadvantages that joint ventures imply and measured their degree of utilization in this industry. The authors utilized a case study research technique. They examined the limited number of joint ventures (strategic alliances) of hotel chains in Asia, Europe and America. The authors discovered that while learning is essential, the real challenge is acquiring knowledge that creates a competitive advantage. Successful companies viewed every alliance as a window opening onto the wider capacities of its partners. In spite of
the advantages that the formation of a joint venture offers for learning and transferring knowledge in the hotel industry, it was not the most commonly used form of alliance, and wide variations in use appear when comparing different world zones. Asian joint ventures between a local partner and a foreign company derive fundamentally from the search for new markets and attain closer ties between different cultures. The interchange of knowledge in this geographical area is important, because the foreign partner teaches its specific knowledge and experience and the local partner contributes its cultural knowledge. In Europe, companies are faced with mature markets within the hotel industry, and the cultural differences are similar. The joint venture is a little used formula for this sector and continent, and the disadvantages outweigh the advantages. It was therefore not seen as an advisable option. In America, joint ventures represented a rapid form of growth, especially for small companies, but this it is not the only reason for their use. The authors found that the location of the assets (hotels) and the transfer of knowledge are motives for choosing this form of alliance, although to a lesser degree. They also underscored the increasing trend towards the formation of joint ventures on an inter-sectorial basis. They concluded that: firstly, joint ventures interchange knowledge between very different cultures, as is the case with Asia and Eastern Europe. Secondly, joint ventures are not used in mature areas or sectors because of the absence of transferable tacit knowledge. Lastly, joint ventures are successful in the hotel industry when interacting with other industries related to the partner or to the tourist sector.
Simonin (2004) proposes and tests a basic model of organizational learning that captures the process of knowledge transfer in international strategic alliances. Based on a cross-sectional sample of 147 multinational companies and a structural equation methodology, this study empirically investigates the simultaneous effects of learning intent, learning capacity (LC), knowledge ambiguity, and its two key antecedents - tacitness and partner protectiveness - on technological knowledge transfer. In the interest of expanding an understanding of the organizational mechanisms that both hinder and facilitate learning, the concept of LC is refined into three distinct components: resource, incentive, and cognitive-based LC. Further, the strength of the relationships between these theoretical constructs and knowledge transfer was examined in light of the possible moderating effects of organizational culture, firm size, and the form and competitive regime of the alliance. Consistently, learning intent (as a driver) and knowledge ambiguity (as an impediment) emerge as the most significant determinants of knowledge transfer. Moreover, the effects of partner protectiveness and LC on the learning outcome were moderated by the firm's own culture towards learning, the size of the firm, the structural form of the alliance, and the fact that partners may or may not be competitors.

Das and Kumar (2007) propose a framework for examining the dynamics of learning in the stages of alliance development (formation, operation, outcome). Three kinds of learning in alliances are described as content, partner-specific, and alliance management and the saliencies and implications of particular types of learning in
different alliance stages are discussed. The framework makes clear that alliance learning varies according to the stages of the alliance developmental process (formation, operation, outcome), and that different types of learning have different strategic implications. Within practical implications content learning augments the collective strengths of the alliance, partner-specific learning (i.e. learning about a partner as opposed to learning from a partner) is crucial in determining whether or not an alliance gets formed, and alliance management learning helps build the confidence of the alliance partners in managing alliances.

As has previously been discussed, the concept of reciprocity is central to the notion of service-learning. An element of reciprocity can be mutual growth and learning between partners of the service-learning experience. As has been demonstrated in this review of corporate partnerships, learning can and does occur sometimes both ways and sometimes only one way. This element is a focus from examination of service-learning partnership in this study. Hopefully learning will be a mutual focus and access in both sides of the partnership.

The Study of Partnership within Service-Learning

It is only recently that research has focused on partnership development within the service-learning process. Ramalay (2000) described the complexities of partnership
formation when she stated “often partnerships are fragmented by competing interests within the community, or on campus or both”. (p.3). Ramaley espouses the need to revise and expand the traditional concepts of scholarly works within academia and embrace the notions of *discovery, learning, and engagement*. In her conceptual framework, “discovery” involves research created in partnership with community members. Learning would involve students as co-creators of knowledge and provide points of interaction in and with the community. Finally, the concept of “engagement” involves a shared agenda that is beneficial to both the institution and the community. This work is action research oriented with reciprocity as an emphasis.

An important occurrence guiding the campus/community partnership development process occurred in 1998 when the national Campus Compact Wingspread Conference convened to “examine the anatomy of campus/community collaborations” (Torres, 2000, p.2). An outcome of the conference was the creation of loosely grouped stages of partnership development. The stages include the following:

Stage I: Designing the Partnership – Democratic partnerships are designed based upon a shared vision and clearly articulated values on both sides. Democratic partnerships are deliberately designed to benefit both partnering institutions.

Stage II: Building Collaborative Relationships – Strong collaborative relationships are composed of interpersonal relationships based on trust and mutual respect. In addition,
they are multidimensional in that they involve the participation of multiple sectors that act in service of a complex problem. Trust and mutual respect must be manifest in the behaviors and attitudes of personnel in both institutions. They involve personnel at various levels of involvement in the project.

Stage III: Sustaining Partnerships Over Time – If Democratic service learning partnerships are to be sustained over time, they are integrated into the mission and support systems of the partnering institutions. Sustained partnerships also make communication, decision making, and requests for change open to both parties respectively with each having basically equal time and influence. Finally, sustained partnerships evaluate outcomes and processes regularly.

Given these stages, research on the elements that contribute to the establishment of successful relationships and sustainable partnerships between higher education and community entities is beginning to appear. The studies reflect the contextualized nature of the research. (Blythe, 2004; Bullough, 2004; Cox, 2000; Darlington-Hope, 1999; Fullbright-Anderson, et. al., 2001; Leiderman, et. al., 2003; Risley, 1992; Shaffett, 2002; Vernon and Foster., 2002). While the contexts of the partnerships and methodological approaches to the research differ in these studies, there are common themes that focus on relationships, processes and sustainability.
Numerous colleges and universities have begun to create electronic structures that help foster sustainable partnerships with their neighboring communities. One study on the use of technology in campus-community partnerships found that “trust” was a necessary factor in the established and valued relationships (Blythe, 2004). By analyzing data obtained on the users of technology that were invested in a partnership, the study illuminated their perceptions of the process. The participants commented on the value of a trustworthy relationship in a successful partnership. The value of “trust” is a common element in human relationships. Hence, the research reported that the campus-community partnership mirrored trust in those human relationships. Other studies suggested that assumptions about the respective roles by the participants in a partnership influence the strength of the relationship (Bullough, 2004). These studies elucidated core factors or themes that contributed to the success or presumed failure of civic partnerships. In addition to “trust,” a common theme emerged indicating that a difference in status between participating faculty undermined the goal of collaboration and that “partnerships need(ed) to be understood less as an administrative and motivational problem than a question of identity formation and of relationship building” (Bullough, 2004, p. 520).

Creighton, (2006) conducted a qualitative research study designed to develop common indicators of engagement for civic initiatives between institutions of higher education and their community organization partners. The unique aspect of this study was that the indicators were generated by the community organizations participating as
stakeholders in campus-community partnerships. Using an action research methodology that involved 11 community organization participants from the health and wellness sector, the study advocated for research that provided a deeper understanding of the perspectives of community organizations. Findings suggested that significant divides existed in core civic areas dealing with service-learning, relevance of academic research, and equitable treatment of community partners. The study produced a formal set of community partner indicators of engagement that were developed by the participants in the study and disseminated to higher education leaders. The indicators illustrated the expectations of community partners that engaged in civic partnerships with higher education. Additionally, the study provided an analysis of the literature on civic engagement, identifying a lack of empirical research concerned with the perspectives of community organization partners.

Assessing the needs of community organizations provided an illustration of the core ingredients, or indicators, for forming an effective relationship and partnership with a college or university and the considerations for effective civic engagement. The development of the indicators required self-reflection on behalf of the community organizations, a process that focused on an understanding of effectiveness, partnerships, purpose, and mission. The process also focused on an understanding of effectiveness by requiring community agency participants to undergo an examination of what they look
for in a civic engagement partnership. Additionally, the process allowed participants to identify tangible and intangible manifestations of effectiveness.

Eleven community organizations situated in the Dayton, Ohio community participated in the study. Each organization partnered with one of four primary Dayton-area colleges and universities. The scope of the study included community organizations from the public purpose sector that worked on issues of health and wellness. The selected community organizations participated in a three-part process that led to the development of a common set of indicators of engagement. The three parts included interviews and two conference-style group sessions. The findings resulted in a final set of community partner indicators of engagement that represented their views about expectations in campus-community partnership. Research findings emerged from intense conversations among community-partner participants during the interviews and the conferences. Participants shared their personal experiences with higher education institutions, expressed their views about the way they were treated, and also provided rational observations about logistical challenges and successes in their past partnerships. The data collected revealed thoughtful and exhaustive examples that addressed what the participating community organizations looked for and expected in civic partnerships with higher education. The following categories resulted from the research and comprised the community partner indicators of engagement: 1) Mission Compatibility; 2) Mutual Commitment; 3) Equitable Treatment; 4) Clarity of Expectations and Roles; 5)
Effectiveness of Communication; 6) Usefulness of Service Learning; 7) Sustainability, and 8) Synergy. The service learning community partners indicators of engagement were defined and characterized as the following:

**Mission Compatibility**
- Flourishes because of compatibility of missions, creating a meaningful and complementary intersect
- Lacks relevance to either party’s mission
- Instills competition instead of collaboration

**Equitable Treatment**
- Demonstrates respect, fairness, quality, cooperation, integrity, and trust between partners
- Adds value to the credibility of the community partner and/or faculty member
- Provides opportunity for development of relationships with affiliate organizations
- Recognizes both partners make decisions based on ethical considerations and financial implications
- Emphasizes the importance of civic responsibility
- Disrespects and undervalues community service agency or faculty partner
- Ignores importance of community partner’s role as a provider of practical knowledge, field experience, and training
- Devalues faculty members role as only theoretical and disconnected from pragmatic
understanding

• Perpetuates the “ivory tower” syndrome, which keeps higher education from utilizing existing services, programs, and expertise of community partners

**Mutual Commitment**

• Promotes service of faculty or administrator within the larger community context
• Commits to educating current leaders and creating future leaders
• Raises awareness of the vitality of non-profits and their effects on the community
• Commits to the intentionality of learning from partnership
• Exhibits motives driven by a shared goal of relevant communal improvement
• Provides faculty incentives to increase the value of service
• Exhibits insensitivity to the needs and challenges of community partner
• Exhibits insensitivity to the needs and challenges of faculty partner

**Clarity of Expectations and Roles**

• Outlines expectations and outcomes in writing, including specific check-in points to assess progress
• Identifies and commits to equal sharing of resources
• Provides explicit documentation necessary to sustain the process
• Fails to recognize that community and/or faculty has expectations

**Effectiveness of Communication**

• Values honesty, transparency, openness, and sustained communication
• Identifies decision makers for achieving goals that are central to partnership
• Develops personal relationships between participating individuals
• Creates a forum for conversations between both parties to engage in a dialogue that helps establish mutualism
• Communicates and adheres to best practices, resulting in improved collaboration and a better understanding of each other’s needs, perspectives, and effect on the community
• Ignores community and/or faculty partner’s opinions, creating a fundamental communication gap
• Makes it difficult for community and/or faculty partner to determine with whom or what department to discuss and plan for partnerships
• Operates in bureaucratic systems that prevent collaboration and/or makes working together difficult, creating unwarranted interference, challenges, and barriers

Usefulness of Service-Learning
• Organizes a system for instructing students about service and for coordinating effective placement in cooperation with community partner
• Provides helpful and typically low-cost labor by undergraduate students
• Views students as role models for the constituencies being served by community partner
• Permits sense of student empowerment
• Fails to recognize that under-prepared undergraduate students tax community partner
personnel, placing an increased strain on the infrastructure

- Shifts service-learning purpose from community-centered to student-centered
- Treats community partners as merely a laboratory
- Treats faculty partners as merely researchers disinterested in community development
- Depends on community partner excessively, resulting in too many students calling for interviews, information, and placement
- Reflects the priorities of the community partner’s service needs
- Produces applicable service outcomes, increasing a community partner’s ability to provide service to constituents
- Provides service as a partnership, waiving associated fees or monetary investment
- Integrates existing models of practice and academic knowledge, enriching relevancy of both theoretical scholarship and direct service
- Produces service that places stress on community partner infrastructure
- Strains the already limited resources of the community partner through an exhaustive service production process

**Sustainability**

- Exhibits quality commitment to strengthen the intellectual capacity of community partner personnel, building agency and empowering constituency
- Recognizes the community partner as a legitimate teaching center
- Recognizes the faculty partner as a legitimately committed to the needs of the greater
community

• Values placed on protocols that create and sustain a long-term relationship
• Strengthens personal relationship between faculty member and community partner
• Develops new projects and collaborations overtime and assistance in finding funding sources
• Recognizes and adheres to each described service learning partner indicator of engagement
• Places community and/or faculty partner in a position in which it feels it is unable to walk away from partnership because of the fear that it will negatively affect its reputation
• Permits short-term placement of students for the purpose of checking off their service requirement for a major or course
• Fails to recognize the long-term value of the community and/or faculty partner and its constituency

Synergy

• Acknowledges that both partners are better off working together than separately, creating a mutuality that results in higher productivity and progress toward desired outcomes
• Recognizes the community partner adds value to student education by providing
practical experience and that students receive real-world lessons in servant leadership

• Demonstrates that faculty gain more experience in the areas of practice and direct service

• Creates feeling of pleasure from collaboration

• Produces happiness with results of the partnership

• Believes parties’ constituencies mutually benefit from the relationship

• Permits patronizing attitude toward community partner on the part of faculty and administrators

• Permits patronizing attitude toward faculty partner on the part of service agency administrators

• Exhibits academic arrogance on the part of tenured faculty who are disconnected from direct service

Sandy and Holland (2006) used qualitative methodology to learn the perception of service learning partnerships from the point of view of the community participants. The research involved 99 community partners in eight California communities. These community partners participated in 15 focus groups that examined their service learning partnerships. A semi-structured interview format was used to collect perspectives and perceptions. They addressed questions concerning their motivations, benefits, challenges and recommendations to improve the relationships. The research team worked with
community partners to check for understanding and completeness using methods derived from community-based practices. The researchers developed emergent themes from the responses of the participants. Highly valued characteristics described by these community partners, ranked in order of frequency, include the following: 1)

*Communication among partners:* a) roles and responsibilities, b) communications must be ongoing, c) persons involved need to be accessible to both sides, d) flexibility about how communication takes place, and e), and the ability to say 'no'; 2) *Understanding partner perspective:* Community partners described the need for understanding each partner's work cultures, responsiveness to partner needs, and caring about mutual goals. Some partners stressed that higher education partners need to focus more intently on community needs and not just their own needs; 3) *Personal connections:* Overall, community partners did not often stress the need for formal structure such as written agreements or resources, although this may be partially explained by the fact that these experienced higher education partners already have this infrastructure in place; 4) *Coplanning, training, and orientation:* Community partners described collaborative planning with faculty and university staff, and agreed-upon systems for training and orientations for service-learners as one of the most critical areas to improve campus-community partnerships; 5) *Accountability and leadership:* These partners emphasized the need for adequate follow-through and accountability on the part of all partners, and shared, equitable leadership. Continuity of personnel was seen as important.
One of the most compelling findings of this study was the community partner's dedication to educating college students. This was the case even though educating students might not be an expectation of their job description, or if the service learning experience provides few or no short-and long-term benefits for their organization. Community partners also perceived that higher education institutions collaborate with them in order to improve the image of the campus and to obtain access to research sites and individual contacts. Community partners indicated that their greatest challenge in partnering with campuses was to find ways to interact directly with faculty. They desired ongoing, reciprocal relationships with faculty, collaboration in designing the service-learning curriculum, and faculty to be involved more deeply in the work of the agencies. Finally, all of the community partners at the participating campuses stressed that they would welcome more opportunities to network with faculty and other community agencies. Experienced partners often desire more university involvement in larger-scale community development initiatives, and some recommended that the faculty take on a leadership role in bringing community members to orchestrate social change. These desires may or may not fit with the roles and time commitment desired by the university’s faculty and the promotion criteria of their institutions.

Summary
There are numerous service-learning research and evaluation studies, particularly focused on the impact these programs have on the students with whom they engage. There is, however, a significant lack of research related to the impact these programs have on the communities for which they are designed to serve and the involvement these communities have and in the construction of overall service-learning program designs. With the emphasis placed on the presence of community partnerships as one of the central tenants of good practice principles of service-learning, these impacts and inclusions of the community will hopefully be developed for a better understanding of the comprehensive service-learning process.
CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Introduction

The purpose of this study is to examine, from the community service agency’s and the higher education faculty perspective, the rationale behind and outcomes expected in establishing a service-learning partnership, the process of forming, maintaining, renewing, changing, and evaluating a service-learning partnership, and then finally any impact(s) a service-learning partnership has upon the participating community service agency. The basic tenet of the study is a phenomenological examination of three service-learning based partnerships and the meaning that this partnership holds for the various participants. Studying three community service agencies and their particular service-learning partnerships with three higher education faculty members of The Ohio State University-Newark shall comprise this examination. The purpose of this study is not to determine which partnership was/is “better”. It is not an evaluative study. Instead, the purpose of this study was/is descriptive – to discover and share the experiences of community service agency and higher education faculty member partners.

Service-learning partnership exploration has the capacity: 1) To develop an understanding of the nature of service-learning partnerships with a regional (branch) campus located in a small rural town as understood by three participating community
services organizations and three higher education faculty members, 2) To develop an understanding of how service-learning partnerships are established/formulated, 3) To develop an understanding of how service-learning partnerships are maintained, 4) To develop an understanding of how service-learning partnerships are renewed, 5) To develop an understanding of how service-learning partnerships are changed, 6) To develop and understanding of the impact(s) service-learning partnerships have on the participating community service agencies staff/employees, physical facilities and services provided, and 7) To understand potential differences made on each of the six previous questions by the type and variation of service provided within the service-learning partnership. It is an understanding of the full spectrum of “partnership” through the community agency’s and higher education faculty member’s involvement in the service-learning partnership that will be the focus of this study.

This chapter lays out the methodological foundation that guides the process of inquiry in this study. A rationale for this study will be presented by a description of the design of the study, the setting in which the research was conducted, the criteria utilized in selecting the sample agencies and faculty members and the type of service performed by students within the service-learning experience. The process of gaining entry into each organization will be discussed as well as data collection methods and data analysis. This
chapter will conclude by discussing the steps taken to establish trustworthiness, as well as the potential ethical issues raised within the inquiry.

There is a need to create a comprehensive plan to guide the inquiry process. The development of an epistemology that can truly delve into the complexities presented by the research questions is essential to explore the subjective variables presented. This study therefore will take an in-depth, extensive exploration of three community service agencies and three higher education faculty members that have chosen to collaborate in partnership to deliver service-learning program opportunities for college students. An attempt will be made to develop an understanding of organizational leaders and higher education faculty member’s motivations, aspirations, expectations regarding the service-learning experience. In addition, logistical processes of the service-learning program such as individual and unit tasks and functions will be reviewed to garner an understanding of the potential impact of service-learning programs on participating community service agency’s personnel, physical facilities, and organizational product.

Throughout this study, an extensive use will be made of the first person (I) when referring to myself rather than the use of terms such as the “researcher” or the “author” due to the participatory nature of the study. Due to the nature of this research, it is crucial that a personal relationship, emphasizing trust and collaboration, be established with the agency directors and the higher education faculty members with which the study will be
coordinated. The use of “I” more accurately reflects the actual interactions between myself and the individuals associated with the service-learning experiences.

Given that little research exists related to an understanding of the nature of service-learning partnerships especially representing the community service agency’s voice within the service-learning partnership process, there is a very real need to gain substantive insights into the nature of these collaborations. By gaining insight into the experiences of three community service organizations and three higher education faculty members, an overall interpretation of the process of partnership in these contexts may be rendered.

The epistemological position of constructivist inquiry was utilized to guide this study. Constructivist inquiry is a paradigm for making meaning and knowledge creation. Lincoln and Guba (1985) provide insight and descriptions of the axioms which guide this form of inquiry.

**Axiom 1:** The nature of reality.

The basic tenet of this axiom is that there exist multiple constructions of realities of truth, all of which are legitimate for the perceivers and must be treated holistically in the context of what is being perceived. “There is no reality except that created by people as they attempt to ‘make sense’ of their surroundings” (Guba and Lincoln, 1989). These
multiple realities lead the inquiry in various unanticipated directions, thus making a priori assumptions limited and sometimes unnecessary or irrelevant.

Given purpose of this study, data will be gathered from a number of different sources. These include the identified leadership of the service agencies, additional staff members within these agencies, other volunteers from the agencies, constituents served by these agencies, as well as a variety of publications, historical documents, etc., affiliated with these groups.

**Axiom 2:** The relationship between inquirer and respondent.

It must be understood that the inquirer and respondent both interact with one another, and on some level, influence one another. As the inquirer, I must accept this as inevitable in human science research and utilize it to enrich and enhance the study. Specifically, for this study, it must be understood that I am directly involved as both researcher and participant. I have served in some capacity to facilitate the formation of the service-learning experience and the resultant partnerships. It is my responsibility to develop and maintain a trust-worthy rapport with the individuals associated with this study and to maintain an ethical foundation from which to discover the intricacies of the partnership experience. I must be conscious of my personal influence on the study and take every precaution to minimize my effect on the process. I will elaborate on these precautions in a later section of this chapter.
Axiom 3: The aim of inquiry.

The goal of inquiry must be to develop a body of knowledge about the specific context being examined in an attempt to understand the particular situation at hand. It is also an aim of inquiry in this process to develop working hypotheses about the research questions, recognizing the inherently dynamic nature of the research context.

There are a number of reasons that would make the goal of generalizability irrelevant for this study. First, this study was conducted in the context of three community service agencies and three higher education faculty members of a regional campus of a public, urban research university and situated within a small town setting. The nature of the university involved is a branch campus of a large research university in the Midwest. As a branch campus in a small town, it has both research and service missions, with the service component perhaps being more important than it is on the main campus. Hence, findings in this study derive from their specific context. Secondly, the partnering service agencies are also located in the same small town area. This makes the research context fundamentally different from institutions and/or service organizations that may differ along these lines. Additionally, the types of service provided by this agency may vary from those offered by other organizations partnering with institutions of higher education in a service-learning program. The nature of the service-learning course
and the content within may be quite different from institution to institution so general comparisons may ultimately prove unreasonable.

**Axiom 4: The nature of explanation**

Constructivist inquiry rejects the notion of single causality. It argues for simultaneous mutual shaping which allows for all entities constantly to interact with and influence each other in ways that preclude predetermination of process outcomes, and of the forms that this process constantly assume. Cause and effect relationships may be thus indistinguishable.

Within the context of university-community service-learning partnerships, the community partner may influence and in turn, be influenced by a number of circumstances and individuals. The goals, objectives, aspirations developed by the community agency and higher education faculty partner and may be shaped in part by the service agency personnel, the particular faulty member or designated university personnel, agency and community leaders, political issues, and university engagement in community issues. Additionally, the actions of the community partner can have immense impact on political issues and the type and amount of interaction with the university. The same can be said regarding the actions of the higher education faculty members or university representative as it relates to interaction with the community. What exists, therefore is a set of relationships that are interactive. It is difficult to show when and how
entities impact on the subject of inquiry to account for the realities that emerge from the research context. It is the case that a number of variables, some known and others unknown, constantly interact and influence each other in determining what is known about service-learning partnership establishment and maintenance.

**Axiom 5: The role of values in inquiry.**

Inquiry in inherently value-bound given the diverse entities that collectively make inquiry possible. “There is no such thing as a value-neutral approach to the world” (Eisner 1988). The choice of the problem itself, coupled with its framing, bounding, and preferred substantive theory all implicate values which to some extent, have an impact upon inquiry.

Being unaware of the values I bring to the research process would not mean that those values would not impact the research process. Quite the contrary, it could very well be that the values which have the greatest influence in framing my approach to and involvement in the research process may be the ones for which I am simply unaware. This makes it all the more important to be as honest and forthcoming in representing to the best of my ability, the values and biases that may influence my work.

In many areas, it must be established, that this study has the potential to be influenced by my particular values. I have a strong interest and belief in the community
service process. I am actively engaged in service-learning initiatives and hope to incorporate these programs in my future career opportunities. I believe that service-learning fosters positive outcomes for both students and the communities which they serve. It is important to recognize my belief that qualitative measurement would only provide a very limited portrait of the impacts of the service-learning which may represent multiple-realities. There is little doubt in my mind that these values have potential to impact my approach to this study in the perceptions I may derive from the research process. Steps taken to minimize any distortions in the construction of the data in this study are discussed under trustworthiness, confirmability and member checking that follow.

The previously discussed axioms present substantial implications for both the process of inquiry and that knowledge that is created. These guiding principles of inquiry are augmented by fourteen characteristics outlined by Guba and Lincoln (1985) which emerges from the previously mentioned axioms.

**Characteristic 1: Natural Setting.** The natural setting is the only appropriate context in which to pursue qualitative inquiry. Constructivist inquiry requires that research is conducted in the setting in which a given phenomenon occurs normally and naturally. The natural setting or research for this study is the service agencies where the service-learning volunteer experiences and interaction with the community occurs.
**Characteristic 2: Human Instrument.** The human instrument has the unique ability to be sufficiently flexible and adaptable to the multiple realities encountered in the research situation. Only the human instrument, the researcher, can probe, redirect questions, observe, build upon discussion, and the like to maximize learning from the inquiry process.

**Characteristic 3: Utilization of Tacit Knowledge.** A fundamental assumption is that not all that is known can be expressed. The researcher and/or respondents may feel very strongly about a particular issue but be unable to prove or provide evidence to support such a belief. Intuitive or feeling knowledge is legitimized in constructivist inquiry in order to make allowances for the nuances of multiple realities in a way expressed knowledge is limited. The values of the researcher and the respondents, from which tacit knowledge would inevitable be influenced, are acknowledged and accepted in this paradigm.

**Characteristic 4: Qualitative Methods.** Qualitative methods are certainly the preferred mode of study given the benefits it affords the researcher in the process of inquiry as explained in the previously outline axioms. Qualitative methods are more appropriate for revealing the richness of the research context and the researcher/respondent interaction, as well as dealing with the multiple realities that arise from the process.
The aim of inquiry is understanding that people (including the inquirer) initially hold constructions (Denzin and Lincoln, 1994, pg 113). The process is aimed at building consensus but is still open to new interpretations as information is acquired. Respondents and group affiliates are the ones who will determine what elements are important relative to the research questions that are presented. It is also possible, that different questions will emerge as the research progresses.

**Characteristic 5: Purposive Sampling.** Through purposive sampling the researcher is allowed to select a sample that is as diverse as possible in order to detail the many specifics within a given context. This ostensibly leads to an increase in the scope of data generated, an uncovering of a greater range of multiple realities, and the maximum development of grounded theory.

**Characteristic 6: Inductive Data Analysis:** In this study, the inductive mode of analysis is preferred over deductive data analysis because a-priori theory or variables are not used in constructivist inquiry. Units of information are created from raw data and are made more understandable through the creation of categories. Categories can result in patterns of relationships. This mode of analysis recognizes the multiple realities arising from the data, allows for values of the researcher to play in the analysis, and it lends itself to in-depth information and insight the questions asked about in the context in which the inquiry was carried out.
Characteristic 7: Grounded Theory: Propositions grounded in data form a context which is the start of creating theory. Propositions and theory follows from data rather than preceding them. (Guba and Lincoln 1985). Constructivist inquiry recognizes that only theory which is developed from the context can reflect the multiple realities of the context in which it was generated. Grounded theory is open-ended and can be continuously expanded and refined.

Inquiry is conducted in natural settings, collecting more situational information, and discovery is an essential element within the process. The values of those being observed and their particular viewpoints are utilized to determine the meanings and purposes that those individuals ascribe to their actions.

Characteristic 8: Emergent Design: An emergent design where the directions of the inquiry unfolds as inquiry moves along is preferred over strict a-priori construction specifically because there is invariably insufficient information prior to the implementation of the research to formulate an adequate and complete set of questions or design for the study. The multiple realities, mutual shapings, and the value systems usually emerge in at least some unpredictable ways as I interact with the respondents.

Since little empirical information exists related to the formulation and maintenance of sustainable community partnerships, a description of internal interactions,
interactions with constituents, and the nature of the interaction between the university and the community agency need to be identified as well.

**Characteristic 9: Negotiated Outcomes:** Meanings are most accurately constructed and/or validated by those from whom those meanings originate. Not only are respondents crucial to this process for the credibility of the study, but also they are stakeholders whose lives could be affected by the published findings. The respondents are therefore viewed as part of the process for constructing and/or reconstructing meaning from the data collected, since they are the experts and the researcher the learner. Negotiations permit the final product to reflect the meanings, values and mutual shapings of researcher and respondents.

**Characteristic 10: Case Study Report Mode:** The case study construction lends itself to an insightful exposition of multiple realities, to thorough description of activities and decisions of the research, and to “thick” description which facilitates transferability to other sites. This mode also allows for full analysis and description of the values of the investigator as well as those that exist in the local context, subjective theory, and methodological paradigm. Finally, this mode is well suited to offering as precise a rendition as possible or the variety of mutually shaping influences presented in the research context.
This study is not a descriptive case study as such. However, since it presents a complex description of a phenomenon within its context, the study does view the material as an isolated individual case summation. This approach produces a study that could become part of a cumulative body of knowledge rather than just isolated empirical data. The case study construct allows the researcher to unveil what can specifically be learned from these unique cases. The nature of these 3 cases is examined including such items as the historical background of the service-learning partners/participants as well as the partnership establishment process. The physical setting is described. Other dynamic contexts are introduced and examined. Additional relevant or related cases may be introduced. Finally, particular attention is devoted to the perceptions and realities of the process participants themselves. The case study approach allows for a focus on features important for understanding the particulars of the case itself. This process “can usefully be seen as a small step toward grand generalization” (Campbell, 1975).

**Characteristic 11: Idiographic Interpretation.** Since the meanings constructed and the conclusion drawn are contextually rooted, constructivist inquiry interprets data in terms of the particulars of the individual study. The two sets of criteria proposed to measure quality within the constructivist paradigm are those of trustworthiness and authenticity. Within the concept of trustworthiness there are four specific components: credibility, transferability, dependability and confirm ability. These are the constructivist
equivalents of internal and external validity, reliability, and objectivity (Lincoln and Guba, 1985, Pg. 300). Cognizant of the fact that no other research exists which is exactly the same as the one in which this study shall be conducted, I am concerned about uncovering the particulars of the previously identified service-learning partnerships in this sample rather than generalizing finding to other contexts. It is my resolve to subject the materials acquired to a constant comparative method of analysis, that is, comparing incidents within categories, integrating categories, member checking and external audits.

**Characteristic 12: Tentative Applications.** Naturalistic inquiry acknowledges that not only are there multiple and differing realities, but that the characteristics of each context are different. The researcher therefore makes only tentative applications of findings across settings, since the mix of factors which gives rise to a particular set of findings may not exist elsewhere.

**Characteristic 13: Focus-determined Boundaries.** It is very important in constructive inquiry that criteria are set to determine what is and is not relevant to the study. Termed “bounding the inquiry” (Guba and Lincoln 1985), it is implemented on the basis of the emerging foci. The basis of the foci in the study’s questions in essence establishes a set of boundaries. The exact boundaries can only be finalized with knowledge of the multiple realities, the contextual factors, and local value systems.
The previously identified research questions guided my inquiry process, realizing the need for allowances from the emerging mature of the design.

**Characteristic 14: Special Criteria for Trustworthiness.** Constructivist inquiry has developed its own set of procedures consistent with its axioms to demonstrate the trustworthiness of research conducted on the basis of this paradigm. These criteria include credibility, dependability, and confirmability.

The establishment of credibility includes two crucial components that work together. They include prolonged engagement, and persistent observation. The criterion for prolonged engagement requires that the researcher spend sufficient time in the research context in order thoroughly to understand it, to build trust with the respondents, and to overcome distortion either from the researcher’s or respondents’ limitations.

**Qualitative Methodology Employed in the Study**

I spent approximately three months reviewing the partnership established by the three community organizations and the three faculty members in this sample, 2) attended coordination and negotiation meetings, 3) conducted site visits, 4) interviewed multiple participants in the partnership process, and 5) collected documents and materials, all in an effort to gain deeper insights into their functioning.
I kept field-notes and deciphered these as promptly after engaging with the service sites and service partners as possible. I used interviews, observations and document analysis in my study. These efforts should assist in the prolonged exposure to the groups and maintaining a base for persistent observation. As grounded theory demands, stressing the naturalistic observation is imperative and it was used in the study. I conducted open-ended interviews, focused upon “the sensitizing use of concepts, and a grounded (inductive) approach to theorizing” (Strauss and Corbin, 1990). Within this construct, I provided information on the sample (community service agencies), designated core categories, described key elements and incidents, created hypotheses, and described negative cases that emerged during the research process. The structure of the interviews as outlined by the work of Berquist, Betwee, and Meuel’s (1995) six lenses for examining partnerships provided ready-made categories. Within these categories, I conducted a line-by-line analysis as instructed by Lincoln and Guba (1985).

Basically, the findings of this study cannot be viewed as the definitive statement of community based impacts from service-learning engagements. The findings can be used in understanding other service-learning partnerships and effects depending on the similarity between the research context of this study and the other context for which comparisons are to be made.
As a factor related to the trustworthiness of a study, dependability is primarily concerned with the process and the product of inquiry. Member-checking is an important function in establishing dependability. Member-checking allows for the participants of a study to review the material gathered and interpreted by the researcher to ensure accuracy. I utilized member checking for interviews. Another important technique for establishing dependability is the paper trail audit. I kept a paper trail audit of the multiple layers of organizational documentation including but not limited to such items as partnership contracts, reports, evaluations, historical accounts …etc. I reviewed these materials individually and again with organizational members. This assisted with the process of providing accurate accounting and interpretation of events and developments.

Confirmability is concerned with ensuring that the findings are in fact grounded in the data derived from respondents. The researcher has the obligation to present the findings that represent only the results of the research activity and that are not a product of his/her own agenda or biases. Confirmability, in effect, determines that the findings of the study emerged as an understanding of complex situations and/or experiences from the point of view of the participants themselves. “What is real is a construction in the minds of individuals” (Lincoln & Guba 1985). To ensure this process within this study, all transcripts were read by a second party and all constructions were then read by this same person to check for accuracy and conformability.
For the purpose of this study, the analysis included all interview data, observational data, and relevant document analysis. In the context of the service-learning partnership process, the following questions guided the inquiry:

1. When participating in a service-learning experience, how do community service agency staff and higher education faculty members construct the concept of partnership?

2. What are the rationales for community service agencies and higher education faculty members to partner in a service-learning experience?

3. What are the expectations that community service agencies leaders and higher education faculty members have of a service-learning partnership?

4. How are service-learning partnerships formulated with community service agencies and higher education faculty members?

5. How are service-learning partnerships renewed by or with community service agencies and higher education faculty members?

6. How are service-learning partnerships changed by or with community service agencies and higher education faculty members?
7. How are service-learning partnerships molded, guided or shaped by the participating community service agency and higher education faculty member partner?

8. What, if any, impact(s) do service-learning partnerships have on the participating community service agency’s personnel?

9. What, if any, impact(s) do service-learning partnerships have on the participating community service agency’s physical facilities?

10. What, if any, impact(s) do service-learning partnerships have on the participating community service agency’s product or service?

11. Does the type of service (direct, indirect, mixed) performed within a service-learning partnership play a role in shaping the community service agency’s and higher education faculty member’s experience?

12. Are the concepts of effective partnerships as described by Berquist, Betwee, and Meuel (1) shared direction, 2) structure, 3) systems, 4) culture, 5) operations, 6) competency, and 7) leadership and management) represented within the service-learning partnerships studied, and if so, how?
The Debate Over Reliability and Validity

For the purposes of this study, reliability will be defined as “the ability to replicate the original study using the same research instrument and to get the same results” (Feagin, Orum, and Sjoberg 1991, p. 17). As the analyst of the study, I engaged in the labeling of actions and creating coding systems for materials. I tried to guard against “idiosyncratic biases” I may harbor toward the subject matter. One of the reasons I chose to focus on three service-oriented organizations was to conduct studies of the same phenomenon over roughly the same time period. This enabled me to create a basis for observations and thereby help ensure that observations were roughly identical from one case to the next.

Validity can be defined as “the degree to which correct inferences can be made based on results from an instrument; depends not only on the instrument itself, but also on the instrumentation process and the characteristics of the group studied” (Frankel & Wallen 1996, p. 591). I utilized interviews, documents, literature, etc… to cross check and thereby to validate observations as well as claims based upon these observations. This system of triangulation was the key in the efforts to provide considerable measure of validity to this study. It was my responsibility to ask several individuals the same in-
depth questions and to cross check these answers with alternative and independent sources of information.

It is essential that this study carry a measure of credibility to both the Newark Campus and the Licking County community. According to Lincoln and Guba (1985), the credibility issue for qualitative inquiry depends on three distinct but related elements: 1) rigorous techniques and methods for gathering high quality data that is carefully analyzed, with attention to validity, reliability and triangulation; 2) the credibility of the researcher, which is dependent on training, experience, track record, status, and presentation of self; and 3) philosophical belief in the phenomenological paradigm, that is, a fundamental appreciation of naturalistic inquiry, qualitative methods, inductive analysis and holistic thinking.

I implemented a series of techniques for enhancing the quality of analysis for this particular study. I was as objective as possible in the data analysis and interpretation. I tested rival explanations when describing and analyzing patterns, linkages, and possible explanations. Additionally, I thought about other logical possibilities and examined if those could be supported by the data integral to the research design.

Another technique that must be implemented in the data analysis was that of member checking. It is essential that the data collected by the researcher be reviewed by the members of the study to check for accuracy and interpretation. It is the individuals of
he group who have the best understanding and knowledge of the organization and their experience within those groups. The researcher must guard against misinterpretations and/or misunderstandings by sharing the data and analysis therein by sharing their findings with the organizational constituents. I conducted member checking with all the participants.

A third critical factor in this research design is how the credibility of the researcher affects the way findings are received. Because the researcher is the instrument in qualitative inquiry, the study must include information about the researcher that speaks to his or her qualifications such as, what experience, training, and perspective does the researcher bring to the field, what personal connections does the researcher have to the people, program or topic studied, or who may have funded the study and under what arrangements were made with the researcher? According to Michael Patton (1990), “there can be no definitive list of questions that must be addressed to establish investigator credibility. The principle is to report any personal and professional information that may have affected data collected, analysis, and interpretation either negatively or positively in the minds of the users findings.” I was very concerned with reactions of program participants and staff to my presence. I must be aware of my own biases and predispositions. Finally, I must be sure to be sufficiently prepared to engage in the study.
Patton (1990) outlines a series of guidelines for fieldwork that I implemented:

1) Be descriptive in taking field notes. I took a large variety of detailed notes from interviews, observations and interactions. I observed and audiotaped all of the interviews and activities including partner meetings.

2) Gather a variety of information from different perspectives. I talked to multiple individuals associated with The United Way of Licking County, the American Red Cross Licking County Ohio Chapter, and Sharon Glyn Senior Apartments, as well as those affiliated with the higher education faculty and any Ohio State University-Newark staff involved in the delivery of the service-learning course experiences.

3) Cross-validate and triangulate by using different multiple methods of research within the study to gain a more wholistic view of the issues/processes/and setting. In this study, I gathered different kinds of interviews, program documentation, and data-observations.

4) Use quotations: represent program participants in their own terms. Capture participants’ views of their own experiences in their own words. It is in this realm that member checking is so important. Quotes also are used in the results chapter to illustrate constructions.
Strategies for Analyzing Interviews

The interview protocol for this study consisted of the following items and areas. The interview questions have been outlined previously and are also presented in the Appendix. The questions were designed to elicit responses from the participants that are comprehensive in nature and allow for the further creation of exploratory questioning.

The individuals identified as essential in the interview process include the formal leaders of the three partnering community service agencies and the staff members of each of those organizations who actually facilitate the service-learning experience. The senior administrators constitute the origination of the partnership. Their individual interpretations and perspectives will be essential in the creation of an understanding of the service-learning partnership process. The second organizational layer shall consist of the actual hands-on supervision of the service-learning partnership. In this particular case, the direct facilitators of the service-learning partnership will be targeted.

I conducted the interviews in three specific areas. The conference rooms of The United Way of Licking County, the American Red Cross Licking County Ohio Chapter, and Sharon Glyn Senior Apartments were utilized for formal interviewing purposes when directing questioning to the members of that organization. The Bromfield Room on the Newark Campus was utilized for formal interviewing purposes when directing questioning to the members of that organization. The offices of the Executive Directors
of The United Way of Licking County, the American Red Cross Licking County Ohio Chapter, and Sharon Glyn Senior Apartments were utilized when interviewing the Directors of the respective organizations.

Interview times were flexible for individuals based upon their availability. For the purposes of on-going evaluation and interpretation of the partnership, a regular monthly meeting was established between The United Way of Licking County, the American Red Cross Licking County Ohio Chapter, and Sharon Glyn Senior Apartments and the faculty and/or community service representative of the Newark Campus. I attended these meetings to garner additional information related to the progress of the partnership. The service agency Directors and staff, as well as the Newark Campus faculty and/or the community service representative were interviewed. The actual process of interviewing was both hand and audiotape recorded.

For the purpose of this study, a cross-case analysis was implemented. According to Michael Quinn Patton in his book entitled *Qualitative Evaluation and Research Methods*, cross case analysis means, “grouping together answers from a different people to common questions or analyzing different perspectives on central issues.” Thus, it would seem appropriate to first conduct an in depth examination of The United Way of Licking County, the American Red Cross Licking County Ohio Chapter, and Sharon Glyn Senior Apartments individually. Because each of these organizations has a distinct
history, culture, capacity, and purpose, resource potential, and community impact, it is essential to completely explore these separately in the initial phase of the study. However, once social history has been established, a cross-case analysis allows for full collaboration of these contextual variations.

The full cooperation and integration of individuals charged with the leadership and management of The United Way of Licking County, the American Red Cross Licking County Ohio Chapter, and Sharon Glyn Senior Apartments was essential for this study to prove fruitful. The foundation for a successful collaboration had been laid with the service-learning projects and verbal approval and support for this research project had been shared.

**Transcription and Content Analysis**

It has previously been stated that the crux of this study lies within the interview process of the individuals who comprise the service-learning process. It is thus imperative that the qualitative interviewing process be as robust and reliable as possible. Within the context of my interviews, I intended to “record as fully and fairly as possible that particular interviewee’s perspective” (Patton, 1990). I coordinated data interpretation and analysis predominantly from what the study participants actually said. I utilized verbatim transcriptions from all taped interviews. From these transcriptions I searched for patterns, connected and pieced what was said in one area with that which
was shared in another, ultimately integrating concepts from individual views and perspectives.

Once all interviews were conducted, I reviewed the verbatim transcriptions and began deciphering this voluminous information into topics and files. I labeled various types of data in order to create a data index. The content of the data was then incorporated into a classification system. It was from this classification process that I discerned patterns and linkages of the data collected. I edited the information, sorted out any redundancies, fit together pieces, and organized data according to both chronology and/or topics. I collected a great deal of unedited raw data from interviews, observations, and documents that were transcribed, analyzed and organized before the final analysis was written. Basically, the data coding and analysis process was utilized to make the mass of data accumulated, a manageable working system.

Presentation and Proof

It was my intention to first be as honest and candid as humanly possible about the materials I planned to research and to provide a “clear buttressed” presentation of my findings. I see the case study approach also as an opportunity to utilize a literary or narrative style of communication. The literary narrative approach can combine elements of both the “scientific” and “literary” which are not mutually exclusive concepts. This approach can be “precise and disciplined” with the added advantage of being graphic,
readable and imaginative. I hope to tell a story of how various groups or organizations work together for the common good of the larger whole and how these efforts are conjoined to create a lasting partnership based upon the premise of providing service-learning engagement opportunities. As Orum, Feagin and Sjoberg (1991, p. 42) wrote, “the researcher who uses the case study typically seeks to grasp the nature of social action as it has been experienced by people themselves. He or she has chosen the case study to get at the human understandings that underlie the action he or she portrays.” It is my contention that the narrative form of representation is precisely adapted to communicating these meanings and understandings.

**Actual Plan of Action**

I concentrated my efforts on examining the nature of the service-learning partnership experiences of participating community service agencies, namely The United Way of Licking County, the American Red Cross Licking County Ohio Chapter, and Sharon Glyn Senior Apartments as related to their service-learning partnerships with three faculty members of The Ohio State University at Newark campus. I researched all of the components that have come together to create these distinct partnerships. Initially, I interviewed the formal leadership and the staff designated as implementing the service-learning experience of each service agency, as well as the faculty of the Newark campus to
comprehend the formal and informal structures, parameters, purposes, and function of the service-learning partnership.

First hand observation was also essential in order to decipher an understanding of the service-learning partnership. I observed partnership meetings as well as certain elements of the actual service delivery of students in the designated service organizations. I needed a first-hand account and subsequent analysis of the groups in action. I analyzed the organizations functions, services, and group dynamics amongst others.

A review of relevant documents was important to develop. I collected written agreements, publications, promotional items, news article, printed material, historical documents, and/or informational items related to the service-learning partnership. It was important to cross-reference these items to both the interviews and observations I collected.

Conclusion

I was most excited about the phenomenological examination of the nature of service-learning partnerships as manifested within the relationships of individuals and groups within this study. It is the most appropriate form of research for this particular study. This manner of research appealed to me and I feel it channeled my personal strengths of observation, interaction and analysis. I feel I have established a strong
foundation with the leadership of The United Way of Licking County, the American Red Cross, Licking County Ohio Chapter, and Sharon Glyn Senior Apartments as well as the Newark Campus higher education faculty that allowed for a complete examination of the service-learning partnership. The information garnered proved useful to both these organizations as well as to the national affiliates of each of the community service agencies, The Ohio State University and hopefully the larger education community.
CHAPTER IV
RESULTS

The purposes of this research study were to seek understanding of the following: 1) The nature of service-learning partnerships as understood by participating community services agencies and higher education faculty members, 2) How service-learning partnerships are established by participating community service agencies and higher education faculty members, 3) How service-learning partnerships are maintained, 4) How service-learning partnerships are renewed, 5) How service-learning partnerships are changed, 6) The impact(s) service-learning partnerships have on the participating community service agencies staff, employees, physical facilities and services provided, and 7) The potential differences made on each of the six previous questions by the type and variation of service provided within the service-learning partnership. The study focused on three community service agencies who partner with three higher education faculty members of The Ohio State University-Newark in offering service-learning experiences. The study used Berquist, Betwee, and Meuel’s (1995) six lenses for examining partnerships to guide the exploration of the research questions. The six lenses are as follows: 1) shared direction, 2) structure, 3) systems, 4) operations, 5) competency, and 6) leadership and management.

The list of questions for which understanding was sought are as follows:
1. When participating in a service-learning experience, how do community service agency staff and higher education faculty members construct the concept of partnership?

2. What are the rationale or reasons given for entering into a service-learning partnership used by community service agencies and higher education faculty members?

3. What expectations do community service agencies leaders and higher education faculty members have of a service-learning partnership?

4. How are service-learning partnerships formulated with community service agencies and higher education faculty members?

5. How are service-learning partnerships renewed by community service agencies and higher education faculty members?

6. How are service-learning partnerships changed by community service agencies and higher education faculty members?

7. How are service-learning partnerships molded, guided or shaped by the participating community service agency and/or higher education faculty partner?
8. What, if any, impact(s) do service-learning partnerships have on the participating community service agency’s personnel?

9. What, if any, impact(s) do service-learning partnerships have on the participating community service agency’s physical facilities?

10. What, if any, impact(s) do service-learning partnerships have on the participating community service agency’s product or service?

11. How does the type of service (direct, indirect, mixed) performed within a service-learning partnership play a role in shaping the community service agency’s experience?

12. How do community service agencies and higher education faculty members construct the partnership’s shared direction?

13. How do community service agencies and higher education faculty members construct the partnership’s structure?

14. How do community service agencies and higher education faculty members construct the partnership’s systems?

15. How do community service agencies and higher education faculty members construct the partnership’s culture?
16. How do community service agencies and higher education faculty members construct the partnership’s operations?

17. How do community service agencies and higher education faculty members construct the partnership’s competencies?

18. How do community service agencies and higher education faculty members construct the partnership’s leadership and management?

Chapter One introduced the purpose of the study and provided background on the service-learning movement as well as work on organizational partnership development. Chapter Two presented a rhetorical argument for the need for this study, reflected on the literature and empirical research on service-learning, including: historical development of the service-learning movement in higher education; reviewed the major initiatives within higher education to advance the practice of service-learning partnerships, alliances and relationships beyond higher education and research on campus-community service-learning partnerships. Chapter Three conveyed my positioning statement, sharing my professional background in higher education and potential biases. Chapter Three also presented the rationale for the selected method of inquiry—constructivists inquiry—and included the design of the study, including the delimitations and the selection of the community organizations and faculty members. Chapter Four outlines the detailed findings of the study. Hence this chapter includes the findings on the research questions,
followed by the key categories. Incorporating quotes from participant interviews will provide detailed description for the reader to assess the ability to transfer the results of this study to other contexts. This chapter mainly emphasizes the detailed review of participant interviews. However, it is important to note that I found no instances of discrepancy between these interviews and the written documents that were developed within these partnerships, nor with any of the observations of participant interactions that I conducted. The observation field notes of meetings and my review of students performing service within these partnerships were consistent with what was found in the interviews. This process is consistent with the naturalistic inquiry principles outlined in Chapter 3. I provide a detailed account of what transpired during the data-collection process and identify the various responses of the participants in the study as they relate to the established partnership themes identified by Berquist, Betwee, and Meuel (1995). I also present the limitations of the study.

Community Agency Partners Descriptor –

**Sharon Glyn Senior Apartments** is a collaborative housing project of 60 individual housing units. The facility was constructed in 1997 in cooperation with the *Licking Metropolitan Housing Authority* with the purpose of improving the quality of life of independent senior citizens in Licking County by providing safe, decent, sanitary and affordable housing to low-to-moderate income families. Sharon Glyn is staffed by a
fulltime onsite apartment administrator and is supported by the efforts of a part-time social worker. The social worker designs programs, services and activities in an effort to increase the quality and caliber of life for all residents of the facility.

The Licking County Ohio Chapter of the American Red Cross is a local chapter of the larger American Red Cross organization. The mission of the local organization is reflective of the national entity. The American Red Cross is a humanitarian organization led by volunteers and guided its Congressional Charter. The mission of the Red Cross is to provide relief to victims of disaster, and help people prevent, prepare for, and respond to emergencies. The Licking County Chapter of the American Red Cross provides services in the areas of blood drives, health and safety, coping with fire, disaster services and child safety. The Licking County Red Cross chapter is staffed by five professionals including a: 1) Executive Director, 2) Blood Services Coordinator, 3) Director of Preparedness, 4) Disaster/Armed Forces Emergency, and 5) Secretary.

The Licking County United Way is a registered chapter of the United Way of Ohio. Ohio United Way is the voluntary state association of United Ways across Ohio. With 85 United Way members, the association works to represent the public policy interest of its members, provides them with educational opportunities and leads statewide initiatives designed to improve Ohio communities. The United Way is the leading
fundraising organization throughout the country. With 1,400 United Ways nationally, the movement raises over $3.7 billion annually. In Ohio, Ohio United Way members raise over $250 million annually. The Licking County Chapter of the United Way was established in 1973. Since that time, the organization has completed multiple community assessments in an effort to continue identifying community needs. Today, the organization supports and funds 55 programs at 23 agencies. The organization is staffed by an Executive Director, Operations Manager, Community Impact Director, Fundraising and Event Coordinator, Marketing Director, Accountant, and two Administrative Assistants.

Faculty Partners Descriptor –

For the purposes of this study, all three faculty member participants taught undergraduate courses offered at the Newark Ohio regional campus of The Ohio State University. Located in east central Ohio, OSU-Newark offers regional based access to area residents. Classes on the Newark campus are most often taught by PhDs in their field. Each of the three faculty members in this study holds a Ph.D. in their respective discipline. The average class size taught on the Newark Campus is 21 students and no course represented in this study surpassed that number. The average age of students who attend the Newark Campus is 23 and the students who participated in the service learning experiences outlined in this study were almost all of traditional age (17-23).
Approximately 2500 Ohio State students attend the Newark campus. The total enrollment of the three courses highlighted within this study was 56 with course enrollments of 15, 18 and 23. The three faculty members who taught the courses reflected in the student represented the fields of Sociology, English/Rhetoric, and Education/Geography. The Sociology faculty member was non-tenured and this was not his first service learning course experience. The Education/Geography faculty member was tenured and this was not his first service learning experience. The English/Rhetoric faculty member was non-tenured and this was her first experience with a service learning course.

Service Type Groupings –

As was indicated and defined in Chapter 3, direct, indirect and mixed service opportunities were used in the three specific partnerships. Case One involved a sociology course where students performed direct service at the Sharon Glyn Senior Apartments. Students directly coordinated activities, conducted oral histories, instructed computer workshops and served as conversation partners with the residents of the facility. All of these activities required direct, first-person, on-site interaction between the students and the clients in the housing units.

Case Two involved an education course where students performed a mixed assortment of services for the American Red Cross of Licking County. Students
participated directly by teaching a CPR course and by assisting in the coordination of Blood Mobile drives. Students also provided indirect service to the Red Cross organization by creating publicity and promotion materials and by assisting with the coordination, set-up and delivery of volunteer recognition events. These activities required either direct, first-person interaction between the students and the constituents served or indirect support or assistance by assisting with the functions of the social service agency.

Case Three involved an English/Rhetoric course where students performed only indirect service at the United Way of Licking County. Students within the course assisted with the creation of a variety of documents (annual reports, survey result forms), promotion and marketing materials, and presentation materials. All of these activities are classified as indirect service in that the students were not involved in any direct contact with the client population served by the United Way of Licking County, but did involve use of the English language to create materials for the agency.

**Case One**

Background

Dr. Peter Henen is a non-tenured Sociology professor at OSU-Newark who is in his third year with the university. This is the second university/college where Dr. Henen has been employed and his first as a tenure track faculty member. Dr. Hennen elected to
incorporate service learning into an introductory Sociology course at OSU-Newark. This is the second course Dr. Hennen has taught where service learning was a required element of the class. This was however, the first such course he has taught at OSU-Newark.

For the purpose of designing the service learning experience, Dr. Hennen partnered with the Sharon Glyn Senior Apartment. As was previously mentioned, Sharon Glyn Senior Apartments is a collaborative housing project of 60 individual housing units. The community service partnering agency representative for Sharon Glyn was Ms. Jean Busch. Ms. Busch serves Sharon Glyn as a part-time social worker. Ms. Busch designs programs, services and activities in an effort to increase the quality and caliber of life for all residents of the facility. Ms. Busch has worked with Sharon Glyn for four years. She is located on-site two days a week. She also provides social work support for two other senior centers in Licking County.

Analysis

Both of these individuals, constituting the service learning partnership case one, were presented with a series of questions (See Appendix) regarding the nature of their partnership and experience. The following are patterns of meaning and understanding from these interviews organized by the seven core partnership components identified by the Berquist, Betwee, and Meuel (1995) model as adopted for this study.
Structure

The first of the six components of partnership that was examined was structure. Structure refers to each organization’s mission and purpose and goals and objectives as well as their shared mission, goals and objectives. From both the faculty member’s (Dr. Hennen) and the service agency service learning experience supervisor’s (Ms. Bush) perspectives, there were similarities and differences in their understanding of these concepts.

The mission of the organizations as described by both partner representatives was fairly distinct. Dr. Hennen spent a great deal of time elaborating on the difference between the mission of The Ohio State University and the mission of The Ohio State University at Newark as a regional campus. “I would make a sharp distinction between the mission of the Ohio State University in general and OSU-Newark. Actually I take exception to the whole idea of OSU as one campus many locations. I actually think we ought to concentrate on creating separate identities for each of the OSU regional campuses. We are in some respects considered subordinate to the Columbus campus. I actually think that a much smarter way to go about this is to view us as the open admissions institutional branch of Ohio State. One the main reasons I’m here is because I’m really good at teaching and because our students need help in a variety of ways, more so than the typical OSU Columbus student. My personal philosophy is that this
campus setup allows an opportunity for potentially underprepared students and for students who have learning our language issues (ESL) to access a college education which otherwise might not available to them.”

Jean Busch describes the mission of her specific service agency in context of Sharon Glyn Senior Apartments as “well, my organization, the Area Agency on Aging, the primary goal is to keep seniors in their homes for as long as it is safe to do so. Now, we have a variety of programs to meet that goal and one of them is service coordination.” It is important to note, that she provides services to the residents of Sharon Glyn Senior Apartments but that she is employed by the Area Agency on Aging. When presented with the follow-up question asking them to describe how their organizations mission was similar to or different from that of their partners, an interesting convergence of opinion was shared. Dr. Hennen stated “Sharon Glyn for example, the idea is to help people over a difficult passage primarily working with seniors, people who again have a variety of problems or challenges which they are facing and they’re trying to you know help them over the hurdles those types of situations pose. I quickly found out it is through a much more difficult process because some of the kids are dealing with but it’s the same general philosophy obviously it’s an older population, so it’s a different developmental stage but it’s the same kind of thing by trying to bring people into the system that might otherwise might you know be marginalized.”
This was an interesting parallel with the statement presented by Jean Bush. Jean stated “Well, I think one of the areas we are kind of on the same track is quality of life. The service-learning students have brought a different quality of life to this program that there is no way I could have duplicated without them. There are certainly some major differences. You know higher education is much different than housing as far as Sharon Glyn goes. However, education in general is something we share because not only are the students learning, but the seniors here have learned a great deal from the students and developed a wonderful relationship. As for differences I think the seniors had some difficulty understanding that it would be a give-give instead of a give-take. They didn’t know at first that it was going to be tutoring or what exactly they we going to do. Of course when they found out, they did respond well. So that is not really a difference but it did turn out to be sort of an issue to work through that.” From the point of view of both Dr. Hennen and Ms. Bush, their respective organizations share a mission of being catalysts for both education and change. They both discussed the importance of challenging stereotypes of older citizens and expanding people’s understanding of an elderly population. Additionally, they spoke of personal development for both students and seniors as critical components of their organizations missions. Hence, both organizations have education missions and the learning goes both ways, not one way. Seniors learn from students and students learn from seniors.

The next set of questions within the component of structure dealt with organizational
goals. When the issue of organizational goals was posed to the partners, there seemed to be less cohesion of thought between the faculty member and the service administrator.

Dr Hennen shared his perspective on the potential of shared organizational goals between the university and the service site. “As a faculty member... just that I would like to help people through their problems and I’d like to help people. First of all I’d like to help people to gain a better understanding of the kind of adversity people are facing but that’s just a means to an end by trying to help them through it. And I think that if you can do that, then it’s tremendously gratifying. I have had those moments occasionally her., I actually found those moments pretty much nonexistent at Sharon Glyn. Now I obviously respect the staff there tremendously because the work they do is incredible and the rewards are few and far between”. It seemed that Dr. Hennen viewed his organization’s goals through a personal lens as a faculty member. He basically presented his personal goals as a faculty member such as the expectation that students would learn and understand the kinds of adversities that seniors face and a hope that students would become more socially aware of the experience of senior citizens. Jean Bush took a very different perspective on this question. She operationalized the goals of Sharon Glyn from her work as a service provider. Our goals, our specific goals, in service learning include expanding our program which is a major goal. To create new and interesting programs within our program at each of our sites and to make each program unique to that site are things that we are constantly trying to evaluate. And I think that’s another thing that the
relationship to the service learning experience helped to do because we created some interesting experiences here which we could not necessarily duplicate. We might be able to do something similar but it was very helpful to the seniors to be able to experience this as well as the students to learn about seniors and that they are not all grumpy people.”

Dr. Hennen’s goals seemed very personal and focused on making sure that the service learning experience instilled a sort of awakening to the plight of underserved peoples by the participants of the service learning experience. Jean Bush seemed to have much more of an operational approach to goals. Her focused seemed to be programmatic and the creation of interesting and unique opportunities for her constituents to experience. Each uses the other as a means to accomplish their main goal.

To sum up, the partners describe a situation where two educational goals exist that forms the partnership for mutual benefit. One partner needs program implementation, the other wants to create social awareness among college students. Each gets their goals met by using the other as a means to their end.

**Shared Direction**

The second component explores motivation for partnering and each person’s expectations for the partnership. Once again, similarities and differences were found and explored.

The first set of questions within this category asked the respondents to share their
concept and definition of the term partnership. Dr. Hennen initially had a negative response to the term “partnership” and shared his views as “just that word alone, out of context, it has a corporate feel to me. I would actually tend to take a little suspicious or possibly negative view towards it just because it has a very specific association. I worked in the corporate world a few years, and obviously didn’t stay for some pretty good reasons, and so it has a definite corporate feel to me. Although if you just changed it a little and said partnering with an agency, that doesn’t have quite the corporate association to me.” Ultimately, Dr. Hennen did not provide a clear perspective of what partnership actually meant to him. Jean Bush on the other hand, had a very positive association to the term partnership. She described her reaction to the term partnership as “well, to me its, its like teamwork, except that you may have a smaller group, you have two people kind of directing it. And I think it’s a give and take. There has to be give and take on both sides. And there has to be common goals and there has to be some positives that sometimes are not maybe shared but they need a goal somehow that that goal may not be shared but the means to get there must be agreed upon.” Hence, Dr. Hennen associated the term with his previous experience in the corporate world which was negative. He sought a softer, non-corporate term. He never actually defined what this softer term meant to him. Ms. Bush had a teamwork oriented view of partnership. She spoke of shared goals and negotiation.

Next, Dr. Hennen and Ms. Bush were asked why they had agreed to participate in a
partnering relationship with one another. Dr. Hennen stated a very personal experience based response. “When I was in graduate school, I had the faculty member who became part of my Doctoral Committee who was a very strong advocate of service learning. He sort of turned me on to it. I eventually ended up doing it for my teaching course that all graduate students are required to conduct before they can teach. I did a report with another grad. student on service learning. I remember having a fair amount of research about service learning and how that worked. So that piqued my interest and I really began to wonder how this would actually work. So when it came time to actually teach, I think it was a social problems class, it was a very small class but I was horrified by how things turn out. Because what I found was that my students were actually now that I look at it I remember one student in a particular. I think the students had a choice whether they’d like to participate in the service experience, they could do that, or write a 20 page research paper. I actually think a fair amount of them surprise, surprise, chose to do the service learning instead of the research paper but my concern became probably best characterized by one particular guy who really used his experience, at I believe it was a soup kitchen or a homeless shelter, to reinforce a lot of negative ideas that he already had about people of color, about poor people etc. etc. I mean he really used it to reinforce his wavering faith in American achievement ideology and the idea that absolutely anyone could pull themselves up by his bootstraps, all they needed to do was to keep their nose to the grindstone and work hard yadda yadda yadda. And really not
acknowledging any kind of class divisions, any kinds of marginalisms by race, physical ability, any of those types of things, substance abuse problems. And so actually it had the exact opposite effect of what I was hoping it would have, and I suddenly realized that I had come in with a very romantic idea of how students were going to perceive things in the field and also realized that I needed to address this with this guy but I just didn’t have the time. And so I actually felt like I had done more harm than good. So that was a very negative experience. So by the time I came here though I was ready to try it again. So I did so formally in an introductory sociology class and I spent the entire summer prepping in terms of making the connections with social service agencies. I basically did that myself. I wasn’t really even aware of all the resources that are available on campus here and I was probably reinventing the wheel to some extent, but to me it was important to, one of the things I realized from the first service learning experience was that I really needed to get to know the community agencies and figure out what made them tick and to me I just had to do that personally. And so I spent a great deal of time over the summer doing that and certainly learned from that. It was a more successful application but I still had some of the same problems to a lesser degree. In terms of not having the time to sit down and analyze students reactions. It also brought in terms of the reflective components questions of well, well diplomacy, perhaps classroom diplomacy in terms of a lot of students were coming into the class with very individual kinds of issues that I felt really needed to be dealt with. But the classroom situation wasn’t necessarily because
they were personalized observations that they were sharing with me in their assigned journal, I use journals as reflection tools. I did not feel it was necessarily appropriate to bring those kinds of thing out into the classroom situation and at the same time I didn’t have the time at my disposal to have a one-on-one reflective session with students. So there again it was frustrating but more successful than the first attempt.” Dr. Hennen had a personal history with the notion of service learning. He participated in this partnering experience because of personal commitment for his students to become aware of and sensitive to other people’s pain and struggles, understanding that these pains were often due to social prejudice based upon class, age, and physical characteristics. However, he learned in previous service learning experiences that direct experience with others in need sometimes developed an opposite result and hardens prejudice. Some students do not see pain or the social prejudices; they do see confirmation of their stereotypes. He chose to enter this partnership to try not to have these negative results. He chose this particular partnering agency because their service needs were less extreme than his previous partnership. Additionally, he designed reflective components on the students experiences more carefully. His desire to try and make a successful venture and a positive developmental experience for his students seemed to be the driving factors behind his desire to enter into this service learning partnership experience.

Jean Bush seemed to have a difference point of reference when asked why she and her organization agreed to participate within the service learning experience “Again, I
think the uniqueness of the program, giving seniors access to programs that improves their quality of life, is probably the major goal and reason that the organization agreed to do the program.” Ms. Bush seems to once again connect her desire to participate in the experience back to the organizations goals. The advantage of higher quality and greater variety of programs for her constituents were her driving forces to participate in the service learning partnership.

When next asked to share what expectations they had of the service learning partnership, again there seemed to be both a convergence of thought and a divergence of pragmatic expectation between the two parties. Dr. Hennen reinforced his earlier statements and he elaborated on his thoughts as well. He reiterated his belief and expectation that the service learning experience would be something that would certainly dissuade participants from their stereotype beliefs rather than reinforce those beliefs. Additionally he stated “I think the general idea of just sensitivity to other people’s pain, to other people’s struggle, to adversity in general and in particular in being able to see very specific kinds of struggles that people are going through. That was the hope and I actually do think in some cases it was successful but in others it’s just had the opposite effect.”

Jean Bush did seem to share some of Dr. Hennen’s hopes and expectations that this partnership and subsequent experience would be a learning process for both students and seniors. Overcoming and debunking stereotypes were an important expectation for Ms.
Bush. However, again it can be seen that there were also pragmatic expectations of specific and unique programs and services that would be generated for her senior clientele. “Initially I think the creation of a unique program that would improve their outlook, the seniors’ but also the students’ outlook to each other. You know that students aren’t having a party everyday and aren’t kids. And seniors aren’t just elderly grumpy people that are too old and have nothing to contribute to society. Breaking those stereotypes was a big issue for me. Certainly to have some young blood in the building was great. And smaller goals obviously we did some computer training with the seniors and they loved that but that was just a way of getting them to interact. It was just an excuse to basically get the two groups together.”

The next line of questioning focused on what the Ohio State University at Newark and Sharon Glyn Senior Apartments gained by their participation in the service learning partnership. Dr. Hennen stated “I think certainly the idea of instead of simply driving by someplace such as Sharon Glyn, to actually go in there and see what they do and get to know the staff and the clients on a day to day basis. I think that was certainly useful and valuable.” This response seems to imply that Dr. Hennen believes that because he as Ohio State Newark’s representative engaged directly with the service agency, he got to know what they do and who they serve. Ohio State University at Newark gained from this approach. People at Sharon Glyn view Ohio State more positively. Jean Bush described meeting the needs of clients in her organization and also the mutual learning
and understanding that took place because of the interactions between her residents and the students. She also felt that participation was a program model for other units.

“Creative programming is probably the big one. Improving the quality of life for my seniors and giving them an opportunity to feel that can contribute something to society, or give back to society. And the give and take with the students, breaking stereotypes.

I think one thing I thought was repeated back by many of the students was getting to know someone on a very different basis and having a very different relationship with someone that they did not have with people like their friends. Something like that where they are used to having friendship relationships with same age friends and this was quite a new experience for them. So I think that was a unique learning outcome. Being able to offer a program that other residences could not do for the most part in other agency buildings where there is service coordination, possibly replicating it. (So creating a sort of model program?) Right, right. And initially it was certainly a good PR issue for Sharon Glynn but in the long term I wanted to see it repeated in other building and facilities we run” Thus, Ms. Bush also believes that the partnership will meet pragmatic needs of her constituents as well as the students’ developmental needs also. Additionally Ms. Bush would like to see this partnership become a model for other facilities in which she is involved. The professor believes his approach to getting to know the organization prior to the partnership resulted in a positive image of Ohio State Newark by the agency. He seems to believe that the agency felt that they had been respected and known before
joining the partnership.

**Systems**

The third component is called systems. Systems focuses on issues of organizational operations, values, beliefs, behaviors, and communication flow. Potential congruence and/or divergence of thought on these issues by the two organizations were reviewed.

The initial question under the heading of systems asked the participants to describe how their respective organization operates. Doctor Hennen described the particular operation of service-learning initiatives of the Ohio State University at Newark and his personal role within that process as “Oh, right right I understand and perhaps this is why I just decided to go out and meet people individually, on my own because I’m very much aware that there is limited resources on this campus sort of first layer of resources there’s not much resources but I don’t think I was fully aware of at the time. But part of me didn’t want to deal with all that, I just wanted to basically sit down sit down face to face with people and try to envision my students there and ask them personally what kinds of things my students would be doing for them. I do seem to remember a time bouncing off of them what you would do with students who come and how you would deal with issues of racism or a student who looks at the alcoholic as someone who has brought on their own trouble, and those kinds of little things and get some kind of perspective.. I think the resource issue on this campus as a regional, I mean certainly from the
Columbus campus there’s a whole other set of resources and that’s nested within Central Ohio and Ohio and national resource so I mean, obviously a lot of people do research in this area. I sometimes think it’s a little bit more like any bureaucratic system and set of relationships that people can be working at cross purposes. But when I really started doing my own research it got to be kind of overwhelming in terms of everything that it out there but you know with proper guidance it doesn’t necessarily have to be seen as a bad thing.” Dr. Hennen describes himself as an organizer, teacher, and researcher. He also seems to see his role as something of an ambassador from Ohio State University at Newark to the community agency. He seems to recognize that as a regional campus, Newark has more of an opportunity as more of a responsibility to connect with the larger community in which it resides.

Jean Bush described a very complex arrangement. In her situation she is basically an independent agent who works for and represents a larger collective agency. “It is very complex because we have so many different programs it is difficult to describe. First, we have a Board and this is an organization that although we serve many counties it is located in Franklin County. We have a director and each part then has their head. Each sub area has a supervisor depending on how large their program is under those directors. Now I have an interesting situation in that I work for two different departments and have two different supervisors. One of my supervisors is a Franklin County senior options case manager and she is my supervisor of this site and this
program. And then my other program I do is the Passport program and I have a different supervisor for that. So it is very confusing. There isn’t a lot of supervision out here. 

This is a position that requires the individual to be a very self-motivated, creative, think outside of the box type.” Ms. Bush describes herself more in terms of an organizer, a creative force, and a programmer. There seems to be a sense of autonomy for her but also a need to keep the core agency (The Area Agency on Aging) goals and objectives in the forefront of her work.

Next, the Dr. Hennen and Ms Bush were asked how the partnership makes decisions or how decisions were made within the partnership. Dr. Hennen discussed his belief that a great deal of preplanning on his part minimized the need for much decision making within the partnership. “Well I came in with certain concerns that I had. I think I came in pretty much with a lot of work done in terms of how tracking would occur and how things would be recorded in terms of how hours would be logged and monitored and about how many hours I thought was appropriate. My recollection is that I came in with some fairly developed ideas about that and that all I got was agreement basically. I’ve found that people across the board were happy that I was interested in this and were very welcoming to the idea of having my students and to help them in whatever capacity.”

When pressed if there were any decisions that needed to be addressed once the service experience had commenced, Dr. Hennen shared a very unique and to him very disturbing experience. “Well in this particular class it just so happened that I had allot of problems
with my students and I think at this point it’s clear to me that this was my most challenging class in a lot of ways. And at one point I think there were three guys who were doing work at Sharon Glyn and it really took me by surprise because they’re using their time at Sharon Glyn to sort of, I almost suspected that they were turning that time into more like a bitch session to get together and compare notes about what I was doing wrong in class or something like this. Now I was volunteering there at the same time and so that perception mixed with those times when and I would actually be there when some of those other guys were there, made for a rather uncomfortable type of situation and that was very unexpected. This incident seemed to be reflective of several students’ manipulative personalities. These individuals seemed to take advantage of the Sharon Glyn staff and even conned them to a certain extent. It can be determined that the direct service at Sharon Glyn did not deter these students’ pre-formed notions or stereotypes of the residents of the facility. I then asked about the personal interactions that the professor had on-site due to the fact that in most service learning experiences the faculty member does not actively participate in service alongside the student. Dr. Hennen responded that “again perhaps I was being a little overly optimistic but I thought it would be this great way not only to show the clients at Sharon Glyn that they had a lot of young adults who were interested in them but it was also a way to bond with the students. As I said, it didn’t quite turn out that way. In many ways much the opposite situation occurred but that was what I was sort of thinking. Had I known that much of this could’ve happened, I
may not have volunteered for the duration of the quarter.” This seemed to demonstrate a unique approach to decision making potential with Dr. Hennen personally actively serving on-site at times within the partnership. However it did not seem that any direct decision making between he and Jean Bush occurred during those times. It did however sound as if there was an issue of lack of trust on Dr. Hennen’s part. The personnel of Sharon Glyn may have not been enforcing the service responsibilities of all students within the course.

Ms. Bush did not share any specific comments related to either Dr. Hennen’s direct participation as a volunteer or of any problematic issue with a particular student or student group. She had a more definitive response when posed this question. “Well because it is a partnership, I think it has to be you know a shared thing and that was a part of the whole reason we made the decision to resolve issues together and that has worked out well. Any issues that need to be resolved, we have been able to do in conversations. A few things that happened with students and seniors needed to be resolved but they were not big issues and we were able to work through them together. Our planning really made a difference in making sure that we did not run into any problems or things popping up that we didn’t expect as program issues.” Both parties seemed to agree that preplanning was a key factor in limiting any drastic issues that would need to be addressed within the service-learning experience. They also agreed that open dialogue and communication were essential to decision making if and when any
issues needed to be addressed. Ms. Bush addressed and affirmed this directly with her comments. “Even something as simple as the student should not go to the apartment unless they were with someone or had specific permission to do so. Things like that made the whole thing go so much smoother. We made sure we undertook each other’s expectations and it made a huge difference. We were able to communicate well which at times can be difficult but it seemed to work out well for this.”

The next set of questions asked the two respondents to consider what each believed the partnership valued within the service learning relationship. The question asked them to reflect on any potential partnership values. Dr. Hennen responded by sharing the following: “I think one of the things that service learning really can accomplish and I think this is part of the intention, is to get students out of what I see, what I observed with increasing alarm, as an almost entirely instrumental attitude toward education. In other words I’m in this class so I can fulfill this requirement so I can get my signed degree as quickly as I can and get the hell out here so I can get to that great job that I know is out there waiting for me, if you people would just get out of my way. This idea that we are just a means to an end and there is no sense stopping to think too hard and feel anything along the way. I think that service learning can interrupt that attitude in a real important way. It has the potential to at least.” Dr. Hennen basically supports the notion of service learning as experiential opportunity that can move
students’ concepts of education beyond simply utilitarian. He sees a partnership value of bringing education to life for students.

Jean Bush valued preplanning to head off difficulties and achieve high quality interaction. “Well I think one of them would have to be that we both wanted each of our populations to get a good experience through the program. We spent time planning to ensure that that happened and that was obviously essential because we would not be able to repeat it or know if anyone got anything out of it. And I think that worked well the way we presented the program to the students and the seniors it worked out perfectly because people saw the value in participating and you know everyone enjoyed it so much and seemed like they would do it again at least the senior would. And I think that was an important value for the program.” The most pronounced difference between the two parties was that Dr. Hennen discussed the value of the experiential process as it impacted students only. Ms. Bush discussed preplanning as the key to a good program.

The next topic was institutional belief about service learning. Dr. Hennen struggled with this question. “I don’t know what the university beliefs are, at least I can’t really put in place because it’s difficult for me to think about an institution as huge as OSU having a belief system or at least anthropomorphizing it that way. I’m sure you’ll find elements advocating service learning and that there’s a way you can reference the questions. I don’t mean to be flippant; I just don’t know how to get how to get at the question.” When prodded a bit about this question, he added: “I am sure that there is
even some sort of counter discourse that also says “holy cow” there are pockets of people and constituencies within the university that think service learning is a bunch of boloney and a waste of time. But I don’t come into contact with those people so it is really difficult for me to give an answer to that question. I always assumed that no matter what I am doing someone sees value in it and someone doesn’t. If I’m convinced that what I am doing is right then I proceed and work with those people supporting me. I think in terms of large a bureaucratic organization that’s as good as you can get”. Dr. Hennen is a member of a complex, large organization that includes members that both support and others that oppose service learning. He does not see large organizations having a posture of the issue per se. He implies that people have beliefs but organization do not. On the other hand, organizations do take on value posture and structure in what they reward and punish. The Ohio State University takes the posture of a major research institution. This makes research their top priority. Faculty are not to use their time on other labor intensive educational efforts such as service learning. Nevertheless, Dr. Hennen sees Ohio State Newark as neutral on this issues so it’s his personal belief that matter. He thinks service learning is valuable so he does it and seeks support from those who agree. He also shared there was another camp who did not support or believe in the virtues of service learning. Dr. Hennen identified himself and those connected with the service learning program at Ohio State Newark as supporters and believers in the positive contributions of service learning as a discipline.
Jean Bush had a much narrower and specific interpretation of this question. “I think we both went in with a positive attitude that this was going to be a good experience for both and put all of our efforts into making it as positive as possible. Our belief was that this was going to be a great program.” She seemed to assume that service learning is a valuable effort that would benefit both organizations. She never examined whether her organization holds a belief about service learning.

The next set of questions posed to both respondents asked them to share what they believed were the behaviors that were demonstrated within the partnership. Dr. Hennen focused his response to this question on the issue of communication flow. “I remember calling in occasionally and I think I kind of cleared that in advance so they didn’t think I was checking up on them. I mean I would never call when a student’s was supposed to be there to check up on the student. I would call I think a couple of times a quarter just to check in and say hello and how are things going. I think I checked in sort of once during the middle of the quarter and once at the end.” He elaborated on this concept as well. He shared that he felt his partnering organization was somewhat familiar with service-learning and had a measure of trust that they could manage the process. “They all seemed to be familiar with service learning from other institutions as well as our service learning programs. I was very confident that this was something that they had experience in Newark. They knew if something was a problem.” It is important to note that Dr. Hennen did espouse that he himself designed and directed the service experience.
process that would be orchestrated during the partnership. He believed his preplanning was the key to effective processing and minimal need for communicating any service process reengineering.

Jean Bush also focused her response to this question on the area of communication. “Well I think good communication, making sure we were on the same page. I think that made all the difference in the world of course in minimizing any problems. I think those were the main behaviors.” Both parties agreed that communication was a key to a positive working relationship with one another. Ms. Bush added “The key communication flow went well and of course we made use of technology between telephones and email and voice mail. Even the student’s communication back to us was fairly remarkable and that worked too.”

Finally, we examined how the partnership was guided or shaped by their needs, either be their personal needs or their respective organization’s needs. The two respondents provided dichotomous answers. There was an interesting example provided by Dr. Hennen in reference to a time when he tried to coordinate the donation of some dated computers from both the Newark campus and the Ohio Department of Jobs and Family Services. This was a self-professed eye-opening experience for him. “I think that there were two fulltime staff members at the Sharon Glyn at the time and it was quite apparent that they were busy from the moment I walked into the door and they had their hands full and I could tell there was quite a lot going on. I do remember a couple times
when I tried to coordinate, oh they had a computer room with terribly out of date computers and I was trying to see if there was some way we could get old O. S.U. computers donated to them and they didn’t actively “poo poo” that but it was sort of like oh they had tried that. I sort of figured out after the process had run its course that they knew there were a lot of snags in that process and it seems like the most simple thing to do by someone like me walking into it and saying OHH here we have these computers and you have a need and we will just you know ... And I remember talking to ODFS and they had some computers sitting in the hallway and I asked what is going to happen to theses? And they said oh we are going to recycle them. And I said is there any way you could donate them to another nonprofit agency and they said oh sure we could do that. But then there was some sort of bureaucratic snafu that the other side could only take them if this and under these circumstances so I would come up with all these you know brilliant ideas and they would kind of say ohh OK we will try to do that and then I would ultimately realize that would probably not be able to happen which again only increased my respect for them because there had to constantly deal with these kind of crazy bureaucratic restraints all the time. But I would say that that was the only thing I could really think of just not being overtly enthusiastic about my suggestions but never discouraging them in any way.” This seemed to be a kind of epiphany for Dr. Hennen in terms of a realization that the service agency management providers of Sharon Glyn were very knowledgeable about their needs and resources. His belief that he could come in as
a sort of chivalrous provider of resources was dispelled by the staff but in a very
congenial and polite manner. His belief that his focus was on the needs of the other
partnering organization and his ability to personally meet those needs seemed to be
somewhat dispelled.

Jean Bush returned to the same theme: the partnership could help deliver
beneficial service to her clientele. “Well I guess I look at the program more of what the
client’s needs were than my own. And I guess in a sense those are professionally my own
too. But wanting to present the residents with a unique and positive situation, through
relationship building. And of course I had different reasons for that. Some of them
needed something to do, some of them were depressed and interaction is good for them,
some of them have some wonderful ideas to share, history to share, stories to share and
things like that. It gave them a mode of doing those kinds of things and they may not
have even realized that in some cases they were developing relationships with the
students. And some of these individuals had great difficulty maintaining relationships in
their past and suddenly this is very easy for them. Issues like their loneliness and their
isolation issues and things like that inadvertently became resolved.”

To sum up, Dr. Hennen brought up his personal need to be helpful to Sharon Glyn
by trying to get Ohio State Newark computer donated to them. He emphasized his naïve
belief that it would be easy though Sharon Glyn personnel knew it would not be easy but
were still open to the process if he could achieve the goal. Dr. Hennen learned that he
was naïve and found roadblocks (institutional policies) that were prohibitive. He learned about large organizations and tactical rules and boundaries. Ms. Bush stayed on the same theme. Both she and her organization wanted more programs for their clients.

**Operations**

The fourth of the six components of partnership was operations. The features examined were control, problem solving, communication, physical facilities, marketing and financing. There were similar and differing perspectives on these issues.

The first set of questions posed under the operations category focused on locus of control. The question asked the following: Who do you believe to be in control in this partnership and why? The response to this question seemed to produce a variation on a theme. Dr. Hennen reported his belief that students were in control. Jean Bush stated that participating agents, both students and seniors were in control of the partnership.

Dr. Hennen stated “Well in a way I’d say students. I certainly go in with what I hope they will get out of it and that you know the service agency certainly has certain things that they want and certain things that they won’t tolerate. But you know I guess that perhaps that’s disingenuous way of putting it. I’d like to think that the student is in charge and that he or she really guides the process. I never felt, put it this way, I never felt any tension between the people at the sites that would sort of cause me to abandon
that illusion if it is one. So I think that we were both kind of working on the same page that way. I think it really was a true partnership in that respect.”

Jean Bush took a much broader perspective. She did not see a person being in control. She thought control was inherent in the interactive design of the program, with the needs of the seniors guiding the process. The seniors had need, the program was designed to respond to those needs, the students chose the need as a focus for the project in which they wanted to participate, and the seniors decided whether to participate or not. Thus, control was built into the overall design per se. “I don’t see a person in control, I see the participant because they know their needs. So I don’t think it’s the people really it is more the needs. Its sort of the subjects, the students and the subjects and it sort of the program because there is some structure presented on each side although it is kind of loose intentionally but there was some control by both sides of the partnership.” The faculty member’s exclusive focus on students as the controlling entity and the service administrator’s expansion of this perspective to both students and agency clients and program design is an interesting convergence. These statements are consistent with previous emphasis shared by both parties. 1) There was a focus on the need for prior establishment of trust; 2) There was an emphasis placed on cooperative program design; and 3) The focus on needs seems to be the central concept related to the notion of control.

The next question posed to both Dr. Hennen and Ms. Bush was how problem solving occurred within the partnership. If problem arose, how did resolution occur? Dr.
Hennen repeatedly referred to the amount of “up-front” time he spent crafting the service learning experience and meeting with agency representatives to discuss and review the process. He felt that this greatly minimized any problems that might develop. Here, he elaborated on the process he had crafted in order for students to choose (or not choose) to participate in the service learning experience. “I remember wanting students to choose that option (of service learning and not an option to complete a 20-page research paper). I wanted to frame it as something appealing and part of it was to use the stick and to say if you don’t do this you are going to have to write a 20 page research paper which for most undergraduates is enough to scare the living daylights out of them. But I also wanted them to actually care and oh I remember that I invited representatives from each of the groups to come and speak because I wanted them to see face to face who these people were. My perception from speaking to them over the summer is that they all had some sort of personal investment that this wasn’t just a job for them and I wanted my students to see that. So there was that aspect of it, whether or not that played itself I am not sure.

Professor Hennen interpreted problem solving in term of how to design his course such that students would voluntarily choose to participate in service learning rather than a purely academic alternative. Hence, problems from his point of view occurred only if students did not choose service learning.

When the same question was posed to Jean Bush, she had a more direct and personal response. “Depending on how serious it was, it was generally something that
we (herself and the faculty member) *had a communication about to resolve. Once and a while the student would present a situation that I had resolved or that was my job to resolve. I think it was pretty clear when I met with the students and I would tell them that these are the areas that they would discuss with me or with our other staff and these are the situations that would need to be discussed with the instructor. And I think that they did a good job of figuring out which or who they should speak to about issue. Now if there was a problem or a problematic issue with the program, then a discussion between me and the instructor would occur.” Thus, Ms. Bush described that she handled problem solving herself if the issue involved students, her staff or seniors. She did reinforce the need for good open communication processes with both students and the faculty member. There is an indication that there may have been more problems about which Professor Hennen never was aware. Ms. Bush simply dealt with them.

One question that was posed only to the service agency director was to describe their organizations physical facility. Jean Bush shared the following description.

“Sharon Glynn is a two-story newly built building. It has 60 apartments. It is very beautifully decorated. We have a large common area; we have a large dining area, a library and what we call the coffee shop. And we have our craft and computer room upstairs where we do both crafts and computers. We have some small office space, but the students tended to use the more common areas.”
The next question that was posed to both participants was to describe how the partnership was marketed. Dr. Hennen shared that one measure to market this experience was bringing in the agency directors and/or representative to his class. This occurred during the second class session. When asked if students knew of the service-learning option/component of the course, Dr. Hennen shared; “I don’t think that they did. I don’t think that because I just decided to do it late spring quarter or just prior to the spring quarter and I don’t think that they received any forewarning. And that’s why I feel like I could just require them to perform service learning because it requires time outside of class. So no I don’t think they did.” Jean Bush discussed the marketing aspect of the partnership in reference to her clients. “Well within the organization, we did not have to do much marketing because we were with the students a lot. It fit into our regular schedule. Initially when it started, I had an OSU-Newark Master’s student from the social work program helping which made it much easier to get the program started. As far as with the residents, we would talk up the program. We would discuss it within the Residents Council. It was to give the residents a foundation of the program and to spur their interest. And then we got together to discuss basically the kinds of things we were interested in doing and discussed this with the professor and offered it to him and then listened to what kind of ideas he had, what kinds of things did he have interest in participating in as an individual or as a group. That’s how we developed that part of it.” Marketing to Professor Hennen was to students. He emphasized his hope that students
would choose the service learning experience over the alternative of an academic paper which seems “harder” than the service learning experience. For Ms. Bush, marketing was to the residents and motivating them to participate. She utilized a Master student who helped in this process.

The marketing question was followed by a question asking Dr. Hennen and Jean Bush how the partnership was financed. Dr. Hennen had a vague notion of financing related to the partnership. “That was one of those things that I was blissfully ignorant of was that there was any kind of financial support for this kind of stuff. I don’t believe I had any kind of grants or any extra cash. Other than gas, you know to travel to and from, I don’t think there was any out-of-pocket expense.” Jean Bush too shared that there was modest financial support that came from Sharon Glynn. “Well other than a few supplies that were primarily for communication purposes, because a lot of students would come at times I was not here, that was pretty much it. We did open up a space, basically a closet upstairs and turned it into a communications room with pens, paper, board, basic supplies that was pretty easy for us to provide. So other than a few supplies, there was no other monetary support. We also provided the physical facility and the structure for them to meet. With the students their contribution was there time which obviously was a requirement of their course.” It seemed that both partners perceived financing as a minimal investment from themselves and each other. Hence, efforts in
marketing, problem solving and actually implementing the program were not perceived as involving costs.

**Competency**

The fifth of the six components of partnership that was examined was competency. What were organizational best practices, learning outcomes, and overall impacts of partnering?

The first question under the competency category asked the respondents to describe what their organization do best and identify their organization best practices in this partnership. Dr. Hennen relayed his belief that the institution of The Ohio State University at Newark provides support to furthering these types of service-learning partnerships. “I would say the best thing that we do particularly from you is that you communicate your support. You John Berry communicate your support. That was important to me to realize that what I was doing is not just some sort of crazy experiment that was a hold-over from my graduate school days but that there was an established interest in it. And that when I found out this is what you were doing your dissertation on, this was a great relief to me because I felt like I did not have to umm explain myself to you. You were very supportive so all that felt great.” It should be noted that as the Senior Student Affairs Officer for the Ohio State University at Newark, both our office and I personally provide support to faculty interested in engaging in service learning
experiences. Jean Bush provided a different perspective of best practice perspective of Sharon Glyn. She described the collaborative nature of the organization as its key strength. "I think working together with other organizations is probably one of the best things that we do. And that is unusual in many respects. I know many other service organizations that do not work well with other service organizations. And often times this means they really can't function well. In these times, with very little money we have to be very creative to umm have a clue as to how to access the resources other organizations have." This spirit of collaboration and a willingness to work cooperatively with the university to create a successful service learning experience was the specific best practice example cited by Ms. Bush. Thus, there were opposite assumptions about there organizations. Dr. Hennen did not expect support but found it and thus was pleasantly surprised that Ohio State Newark actually supported service learning. Ms Bush expected it and viewed it as their organizational best practice.

The next follow-up question asked the two respondents to identify the best practice(s) their partnering organization brought to the service learning experience. In essence the question asked both participants to describe what they believed the other organization brought to the table as their best practice. Dr. Hennen described his perspective that the staff of Sharon Glyn, especially Jean Bush provided quality service to her clients with very little acknowledgment of that support from the clientele. "I think that they were very generous with and right now when I'm taking of that I am thinking of
the two fulltime staff at Sharon Glyn. I asked a lot of questions and was fascinated by these two women. I was fascinated by the organization umm and what they were doing. I remember asking at one point, does anyone come back to say thank you? Because a lot of, part of what I found draining about the experience is that these seniors were like kids and they needed and needed and needed and sometimes they didn’t just ask—they demanded. And it was give me, give me, give me and these two women they knew where to draw the line and how to correct certain kinds of behaviors. But basically it was a one way kind of nurturing experience and it just occurred to me one day and I asked does anyone every say thank you? And they both kind of got quiet and this one particular incident that they told me about and it was obvious that they were sort of having to savor this even when they were telling me about it they were sort of savoring it as it was one of those few and far between moments where they actually got a sense of what kind of difference they were making for these seniors. Umm they were very generous with all of my questions are all that stuff and I think that they liked that I recognized that aspect of their challenge.”

Jean Bush focused her response more on the collaborative spirit of the university and Dr. Hennen in particular. He also discussed the importance of communication as well. “Well again I think my perception is that the collaborative effort was outstanding. Until this time I had not been able to get much involvement with our residents from the university. So I think that has been a big plus with the university to be able to have the
time, the energy and the fore-sight to see how this program could be beneficial; to both parties. I think communication was well done. I don’t think a program like this can work without good communication. The willingness to try it out and if it doesn’t work then there was a willingness to figure out what will. There was never any finger pointing. There was no territorial issues or anything like that.” Dr. Hennen seemed to focus his response on the belief that the quality of the staff of Sharon Glyn was their organizational best practice. Jean Bush focused her perspective of best practices from Ohio State Newark as a willingness to collaborate with a community service agency and providing open dialogue and communication with her and her organization.

The next question asked both parties to describe what, if anything, they hoped to learn from the other partnering organization. Dr. Hennen stated “I hoped to learn..., you know that is an interesting question because it makes me realize something that I had forgotten. Part of this impetus to want to do this was feeling like I didn’t know Newark at all – I live in Gahanna. I just get into the car and I drive back and you know I felt like I heard students talk about places in Newark like the mall and this or that and it suddenly occurred to me that I did know anything about the city or how this community works. And so I think that was probably the overriding objective of this was to get a better sense of the community of Newark, how it works and what the social service network was like.” For Dr. Hennen, this partnering experience had the potential to help him become more grounded in the community and form a sense of place. He hoped to learn more of the
local community and his place in that environment. Jean Bush seemed to take a much more pragmatic view of this question. She shared “I guess new resources. Ideas of new programs basically.” She returned to her program for resident main theme.

The next question posed to the two respondents asked them to identify what, if anything, they hoped to learn from the students who serve in the service-learning experience. This was a different twist to the previous question. The focus on learning was from the perspective of the students who participated in the service learning experience and not the partnering organizations. Dr. Hennen focused his response more on his hope that the students themselves would have a positive learning outcome. He hoped to learn what he could do to ensure that students had indeed developed a positive learning outcome from this type of experience. “A broader sensitivity and broader scope view of life and definitely since it was a sociology class, a connection between people’s personal troubles and you know public issues like housing policies, like minimum wage legislation, like you know racism, those kind of larger social structural issues that trickle down and shape people’s lives.” Dr. Hennen actually turned this question to what students learned rather than what he learned from them.

As requested, Jean Bush focused her response more on potential learning that she herself experienced from the student participants in the program. “Well, I think as a social worker we are always interested in people, so contact with people in general is always something I have an interest in doing. And through this type of population it was
interesting to listen and observe and whatever. It is important to be able to work with a group you don’t usually have contact with and in this case it was college students.”

College students were a population that Ms. Bush had seldom had the opportunity to work with and their perspective on the work done a Sharon Glyn was seen as valuable to Ms Bush and other members of the Sharon Glyn staff. However, it is not evident that she or her staff actually learned anything from the students as her response did not indicate any tangible learning outcome.

The next question in the competency category asked each or the respondents to share what if anything they anticipated their partnering organization would learn from them as partners in this experience. Dr. Hennen was somewhat hesitant with this question. His perspective was that Sharon Glyn may have learned more about his organization, The Ohio State Univerity at Newark. “No I don’t think I did. I’m not sure, I mean I’m sure that they learned something about OSU- Newark but I can’t say that I really know. I mean it is interesting because I keep thinking back at Denison (University). Denison was like so present at Sharon Glyn and sending service learning students over as well as our own and so it seemed that they were very present at all the sites I worked with and perhaps OSU- Newark less so. So maybe it was just a simple acquaintance with OSU-Newark and what we do. But I don’t know what that is or how best to characterize that or truly what they did learn.” Dr. Hennen interpreted this question as what Sharon Glyn would learn about Ohio State Newark and contrasted Ohio
State Newark with Denison University which also had students doing service learning work at Sharon Glyn. He hoped they had learned about Ohio State Newark but he did not know if this was the case. He did not interpret the question as to what Sharon Glyn and its residents would learn from the students.

Contrastingly, Jean Bush perceived the learning experience for Ohio State Newark as definitive and concrete. “Oh I think so! A general sensitivity to issues again was created for the students. Learning about and seeing the different programs our organization provides. A lot of people do not know about our area agencies and just having that knowledge. You never know when that will come in handy. Another thing about working with seniors is they don’t always want to hear about the services available when they don’t need them and when they do it is too late. So having that information out is obviously helpful to us but it also helpful to students and helpful to staff because they may need it sometime or they may know someone who does.” Ms. Bush concretely believed that members of the Ohio State Newark staff and student members of the college learned about Sharon Glyn, both their program and the issues faced by their clientele.

Next, we explored what the student learned from their experiences. Dr. Hennen had already elaborated on his learning outcomes hope for students in this experience. Again, he had reiterated his hope that students would become more enlightened regarding sociological constructs and that various issues faced by seniors. Jean Bush echoed this sentiment. She too hoped that students would become more versed about Sharon Glyn
and their services but more importantly became aware of the needs of senior and the various social issues associated with an ageing population.

The final question asked Dr. Hennen to identify the partnership’s impacts on the service Ohio State Newark offers. This was difficult question for him to answer due to the breadth of service offered by the college. “I think that’s hard for me to say just because I’m not sure how the experience that I had in my classroom fits necessarily with the broader aims of service learning things that were happening on this campus.” He was new to the campus and also did not know the scope of service learning at Ohio State Newark nor the other services offered by the campus. Hence, he did not have perceptions of the impact of the partnership with Sharon Glyn on Ohio State Newark’s services. His partnership had been personally motivated and not institutionally driven. He was learning about Ohio State Newark because of the research project just as he was learning about Sharon Glyn and the town of Newark because of the partnership. He hoped this experience would enable Ohio State Newark and he as a representative of that organization to become more connected to the wider Newark community. Additionally there was a desire to have the community feel more of a connection to the Ohio State Univeristy at Newark campus.

The final question posed to Jean Bush was more specific in regards to impact on Sharon Glyn’s personnel, agency operation, policies, physical facilities and services. The first part of the question focused on any impacts regarding Sharon Glynn personnel.
“Well it obviously increased our workload, but on the other hand it has definitely been worth it because the residents just loved the program, they really enjoyed the interaction with the students. So although it has been more work per se, it’s also helped me in developing relationships with some of the residents because they know that I am here to help them and to help find their interests. So it actually saved me time in those areas.”

Were there impacts on your agencies operations and/or policies? Ms. Bush indicated that operation were affected in that Sharon Glyn has to create new form which were designed to protect senior and students on issues of confidentiality, appropriate interactions with senior and resident’s room restriction.

Were there any impacts on the organizations physical facility? Group activity rooms were reserved for the program and a closet was converted to student use. New computer were donated by Ohio State Newark and the students taught the seniors how to use them. Hence, the new computers expanded the equipment at Sharon Glyn, however there were only scheduling change and a loss of a closet as impacts on the physical space.

How has the partnership impacted the services that your organization offers?

“Well I guess the one thing that comes to mind immediately would be when a client or resident comes to me and says there is something I would like to do, like I love to write but I have arthritis or I can’t organize my thoughts, then I have another resource that I can use and help to find something for the client. So there has been some specific client-based situation where this has provided a whole new resource and there is no way I
could have ever thought of that previously. All of these responses seemed to indicate that the partnership for the purpose of service learning was an investment in time and energy and that it increased workload, but it was an investment that was well spent. Seniors were served better because of the program. Operation or policies were adapted in order to be responsive to the program.

Leadership and Management

The final component was leadership and management. We explored leadership roles, understanding of service learning, apprehensions or concerns, and change processing within the partnership.

When asked what role they specifically play within their organization, Dr Hennen described the role he plays as a faculty member and how others on the campus perceive him. “Well if you had to assign a role to me, I suppose I am like the exotic, radical, (laughs) umm eccentric guy who does that weird research that nobody quite understands. But seems to be well liked by his students, at least that’s how I perceive people see me.” Thus, Dr. Hennen perceived himself not as a typical faculty member but as a faculty member interested in research question that are different than most of his colleagues. He believes he is popular with students and basically self motivated and driven. Jean Bush had articulated her role within the Sharon Glyn organization earlier within this interview protocol. She serves as a third-party service provider to Sharon Glyn Senior Apartments.
“I work for the area Agency on Aging and I have an office here at Sharon Glynn Senior Apartments and I am the Service Coordinator here. I come once a week and provide service such as advocacy, referrals to services, protective support, and to help seniors stay in their own homes as long as it is possible to do. I obviously work for more than just one site, but this is my site in Newark.”

When asked to define the concept of service learning, Dr. Hennen described service learning as an experiential component that applies course material to the real world. Hopefully, this changes the students’ awareness of social issues and the plight of others. “Just sensitivity to other people’s pain, to other people’s struggle to adversity in general and in particular in being able to see very specific kinds of struggles that people are going through.” Dr. Hennen knew service learning as an educational construct. Jean Bush was relatively new to the concept of service learning. “To me it’s like two separate components. The learning part, they are obviously in college for a reason. They are there to learn whatever the subject is and service learning is the community service part, where they are going out and actually performing a service to learn whatever the discipline or class is.” Ms. Bush does encapsulate the gist of service learning but does not have the same perspective of changing deep-rooted social constructs that Dr. Hennen strives to achieve.

The next set of questions concerned any apprehensions or concerns they had related to the service-learning experience with one another. Dr. Hennen shared his
concern that the service learning experience could have the exact opposite and negative outcome he was striving so hard to educate against. His concern was that some use their experience with others who have struggles to reinforce stereotypes and harden their prejudices. Service learning experience can have negative results for some students. Jean Bush had not had any such negative service learning based experience(s) previous to this program. Her concerns focused much more on any potentially negatives impacts upon the senior themselves. “I think the only apprehension I had was a concern about the long-term effects of the relationship on this community of seniors. I had some apprehension about that. You just don’t know when it comes down to human behavior of either the students or the seniors how that would go in terms of forming relationships. But I think in terms of how the program was setup that it really made it work. I just didn’t want anyone to get hurt, either their feelings or whatever.” It is important to note that each participants concerns stemmed from the potential negative outcomes from the interaction between the students and the seniors. Both also seemed to agree that careful design of the interactions was the key to increasing positive outcomes and decreasing negative ones.

When asked to clarify their specific role in terms of the service learning process, Dr. Hennen responded that he played the role of guide, nurturer, designer and processor. “I think that I need to help students think about what kind of placement is best for them at this particular time. I remember I had one student who went to work at New Beginnings
(Battered Women’s Shelter) and I was very concerned when she told me that she herself had been involved with domestic violence. I wanted to make sure this wasn’t going to be – I was very concerned that she wasn’t quite sure what she was getting into and that this may possibly dredge up some very unpleasant memories and it may turn into be a very emotionally taxing experience. But she was an older student and I talked with her at some length and was finally satisfied that she knew what she was getting into. The incident was sometime in her past so it was not a recent event and she just demonstrated a maturity and an insight that I felt comfortable with letting her go with it. He also deigned the means by which the students processed their service experiences. In this class he used a journal to encourage reflection. In the future he would use a weekly conference with students for more subtle reflection on their experience. In a conference he could both challenge and support the students. “Conference are tremendously time consuming and tricky because you are trying to challenge the student without disrespecting them.” In essence the role that Dr. Hennen plays require applied skills of a developmental educator. He was to understand his students backgrounds and guide them through a developmental experience. Jean Bush was more vague in her interpretation of her specific role within the service learning process. However she did seem to somewhat reinforce the perception of her role also as a logistics manager and educator. “I think initially education about my role here. But ideally it was to put them in situations where
they would meet their education goals and long-term to be able to take what they learned here and apply it to their lives through some fashion.”

The follow-up question posed to Dr. Hennen and to Jean Bush asked them how they work with each other to facilitate this service-learning partnership. Dr. Hennen shared that he specifically tried to minimize the work responsibility for his partners at Sharon Glyn. “I tried not to lay too many expectations on them and part of that was as I said before my extended contact with the two women at Sharon Glyn were so stressed to begin with that I didn’t feel I could say by the way make sure that John is seeing this and Jane is seeing that because that is what they really need to learn. So I really didn’t have other than just the keeping connection with the students, my expectations of them were fairly minimal.” So basically Sharon Glyn staff provided the onsite element for the students to experience and Dr. Hennen’s expectation was that they kept that a viable and productive process and that they kept record of what the students actually performed. He trusted the staff at Sharon Glyn and he doubt if he would relate to an agency where he couldn’t trust the staff. He did not have the time to micromanage.

This expectation and understanding seemed to be in stark contrast to the perception of Ms. Bush. She described her responsibility as bringing forward developmental opportunities to the faculty member. “When I identify needs, desires, or content that I think could be a possibility and want to invest in it we talk. There is always a new idea and a lot of that comes from the residents.” This is an area where there seemed to be a
difference of perspective. Dr. Hennen wanted to minimize any additional “organizational stress” on Jean Bush and the Sharon Glyn staff by adding anymore work load. Jean Bush conversely wanted to be involved more in helping students make connections between in-class topics and their application of those ideas within her service site. She wanted to be the assessment and market person for the class.

As the service director of Sharon Glyn, Jean Bush was specifically asked who was responsible for broad basic strategy on how her agency related to the service-learning program on the Newark Campus. She clarified several point of organizational dynamics during this discussion. There is a Director of the Sharon Glyn facility who directs the operations of the building. “Well I mean I don’t want to not include the rest of the staff for the building or from my agency. Because they did play a role here. So I think it was confusing to the students because our structure didn’t necessarily fit inside a box as far as the two organizations working together. There was some overlap in some areas but some of it didn’t.” Ms Bush did make it clear however that she was the leader of the service programs and related projects. She clearly identified herself as the person who handles and is responsible for broad-based strategy on how Sharon Glyn relates to the service learning experience. Thus, responsibility and operationalization resided in the same person.
The next set of questions related to day-to-day operations with the students. Dr. Hennen shared that he authorized the Sharon Glyn staff to perform these functions. “The thing with Sharon Glyn, they never know how many seniors and/or their family members are going to show up. So it was very much a kind of improvisational management style on their end of things. And I figured that out right away so I wasn’t going to give them any suggestions along those lines as they seemed to be very skilled adapting to those changing situations.” Jean Bush described more of a collaborative approach but did agree that the application of the service element on-site at Sharon Glyn was her responsibility. “I would say that was more of a shared responsibility. The overall goals were obviously set up by the instructor at OSU, but meeting those goals was my responsibility.”

The subsequent question posed to both respondents was to identify who handles and is responsible for negotiating changes within the service learning partnership. Dr. Hennen felt that this was a non-issue. “That never came up. There was never any fundamental changes needed within our process.” When pressed to address this from a hypothetical perspective, Dr. Hennen provided the following response. “In that case I would use as much information from the students as I could as to what was going on in that situation and why they thought it was happening. Then I would have approached the service organization and in as nonthreatening away as I possibly could just to say hey you know I think this might be what was going on. I would then solicit their perspective
on the issue and then make a decision. I would never assume that the student was 100% true or that the service agency perception was 100% true either. It would be one of those judgment calls but I would try to do it after getting as much information as possible.”

Jean Bush did see changes negotiated within the partnership; however, it was mostly change as expansion of the program. “Well that would be us, me and the instructor, although there would be or potentially could be initiated from the participants. Sometimes we saw that in the process.” She added that rather than significant changes that needed to be negotiated within the partnership, it was more the need for expansion of the program. “I think I have already said any change would be more regularized interaction, more expansion of opportunities for residents and students.” Dr. Hennen seemed to indicate that any problematic issue that might arise would likely be between the student and the service provider. Jean Bush identified the likelihood that the issue would be between her as the service provider and the faculty member. When pressed to identify how the change process occurred within the partnership, Ms. Bush identified the method of consistent and open dialogue between herself and the instructor. “I do that with any program. Its constant evaluation of what could go better, what didn’t go well, what we would not do. That’s the kind of constant review I do anyway and particularly when it’s new like this one. And that has worked well with this program.”

Summary
To sum up, in Case One a service learning opportunity was created by an individual faculty member who decided on his own, based on his own educational values and prior experience with service learning to initiate contact with Sharon Glyn as a potential service agency. He was not at the time exercising an orchestrated effort on behalf of Ohio State Newark. His values and previous experience with service learning motivated the creation of the program. His goals centered around social awareness and the breakdown of stereotypes. The social worker at Sharon Glyn and other staff were receptive. They saw an opportunity to expand the size and quality of the programs and services offered to their client. The design of the program was done deliberately and carefully by the two participants. The faculty member took time to visit the agency. He got to know the staff, residents and their program. This both created a relationship with them and allowed him to assess whether the agency would meet the need of his class. The faculty member and the social worker then carefully and in detail deigned the experience and the processing of the experiences that would occur at Sharon Glyn. The social worker made small logistical and tactical changes in procedure and forms used at Sharon Glyn. Their detailed and careful design work resulted in almost no change in the program being made during the term. The program only expanded. The seniors at Sharon Glyn loved their experience with the students and visa versa. No formal research on change in the students or the seniors was conducted. The direct involvement and communications between the professor and the social worker was not mediated by others.
They decided to create the program, they designed it, and they implemented it. They were intimately involved in all phase of the program.

**Case Two**

**Background**

Dr. Bob Klingensmith is a tenured Geography professor at OSU-Newark who is in his 32nd year with the university. Dr. Klingensmith has spent his entire academic career on the OSU-Newark campus. Dr. Klingensmith teaches an elective Arts and Sciences 101 which he self-describes as a “catch-all” course as it is open to any student in any major. The course construct is entirely based around the concept of service learning and leadership development. Dr. Klingensmith describes the course as follows:

“**Basically I (the instructor) and students meet and we have a two quarter process. In the fall quarter we take students out in the community and they meet with Directors of volunteer programs. We go to certain agencies like The Works for example, the Yes House, Red Cross, places where they may have an opportunity to do some community service or learn about volunteerism. Students meet once a week on Wednesday afternoon, from 3:00-5:00. And then in the Winter and Spring quarters the students do 40 hours of volunteer work in the community at an approved location. I keep a log of the hours they work and I turn the log in at the end of the quarter, have it signed and verified by a staff member where they worked and that’s pretty much it”.”
Dr. Klingensmith partnered with several different community organizations. The largest, in terms of number of student participants, was the Licking County Ohio Chapter of the American Red Cross. As was previously mentioned, the Licking County Ohio Chapter of the American Red Cross is a local chapter of the larger American Red Cross organization. The mission of the local organization is reflective of the national entity. The Licking County Chapter of the American Red Cross provides services in the areas of blood drives, health and safety, coping with fire, disaster services and child safety. The Licking County Red Cross chapter is staffed by five professionals including a: 1) Executive Director, 2) Blood Services Coordinator, 3) Director of Preparedness, 4) Disaster/Armed Forces Emergency, and 5) Secretary. The Red Cross was represented by the Executive Director, Rod Cook and the Director of Disaster Response, David Walker. Cook was instrumental in establishing the service partnership while Mr. Walker supervised the service experience of the student participants. Mr. Cook has been the Executive Director of the Licking County Red Cross Chapter for five years. Mr. Walker has been with the Red Cross chapter for 17 years but has been in this particular role for only two years.
Structure

The first of the seven components of partnership that was examined was structure, that is, organizational mission and purpose and goals and objectives were explored.

The mission of the organizations as described by both partner representatives was fairly distinct. Dr. Klingensmith elaborated on his perspective of the changing OSU-Newark mission. “I would say that it is primarily a service institution. Its focus is on providing two and four year programs to people in the local community. Although that has changed somewhat into a kind of broader reach in recent years. Historically we have brought higher education to Licking County – Licking and the adjacent county areas. Umm we are a land grant school and so the mission of the faculty in not only teaching and service but also research which is an important component for tenure and promotion. Land grant universities primarily have vocational and professional preparation missions and Professor Klingensmith articulated their mission very clearly. The emphasis on research may related to the main campus university’s charge of mission to research instead of a land grant focus.

When the same question was posed to Rod Cook and David Walker of the American Red Cross, their responses were very similar. Rod Cook stated “The mission is basically three pieces. To help the community prevent, prepare for and respond to emergencies now that’s kind of broad but that is the premise to this sort of organization”. Walker
echoed this sentiment but provided a deeper more personalized perspective based upon his own responsibilities within the organization. He described the group’s mission as “My purpose in my department is to meet the emergency needs of disaster maintenance. This could be natural disasters such as fire and tornadoes but it can be manmade disasters too such as building collapses gasoline leaks and stuff like that”.

At this point the three individuals were then asked how their organizations mission was similar to or different from that of their partner’s mission. There was an interesting connection on service to the local community made by both the faculty and the community agency members. Dr. Klingensmith indicated, “I think we are both engaged in providing a service for the community that in the end allows people to deliberately move up to prepare people for work, to meet the needs that they have to become a viable part of their community. What I have seen and you are asking me about Newark, I think the mission of the Newark Campus is to provide educational opportunities for students who are graduating currently and particular those people who are place bound in the community because of job, family, other responsibilities and really can’t take the time to get their education outside of Newark. So I see a lot of parallels in the fact that they are both service agencies, are both trying to help people meet the challenges that they have – one through education, one through a variety of services. Rod Cook draws some parallels to this view of the similarities in organizational mission but more on the premise that both organizations are grounded in the role of community educators. He
states “actually I’d say that if you compared our mission statements they are somewhat alike umm we do a lot of education and of course that is what the Newark campus is based upon, founded on, is the education, umm our education fall more on the line of preventing and preparing for emergencies and that is done through all of our courses that we offer. In fact we partner with the Newark campus in several different ways.”

There seems to be a belief by both parties that their respective organizational missions do share similarities. However, from the faculty member’s purview this is based in the service component each organization shares. From the service agency directors perspective it is the educational role of both entities.

The issue of organizational goals was then posed to the partners. Klingensmith explains “ I suspect it depends on how broad of how broad a mission we assign to us. If we take it philosophically and see it as raising the human experience than you could probably find a lot of parallels. Pretty clearly our mission is education. We are to help people through education. We are to help people and to help the community by providing umm trained leaders in a variety of fields – to provide them with areas where employees need it. Most of the service agencies, like the United Way type agencies that I dealt with have a more maybe problem specific program. That there is a need in the community that they are supposed to address and umm I suspect that their focus is more need based and ours is more educational.” Dr. Klingensmith then distinguished between service agencies that connect with a student’s major and those with less specific but societal
benefits. He put the Red Cross in the later category.

As was previously observed, the Executive Director of the Red Cross chapter believed that their primary purpose was education. This can be more fully seen in Rod Cook’s view of goal similarity between the two organizations. Cook shares “Well of course we have to follow our mission statement umm we are constantly driven to make sure that we are prepared to respond to any major disaster in the county. That would be a continuous long term goal of ours to be sure our capacity and readiness are at the highest level possible. Umm at the same time we are constantly trying to increase our reach into the community as far as our educational component, trying to teach as many people as possible trying to certify them in CPR, first aid, how to swim, etc. And just recently last year our Board revised our five year strategic plan and included a vision statement which states that we want to be the most recognizable and respected non-profit in Licking County. When we look at shared goals with Ohio State Newark, definitely I know that the service learning component is trying to get the students into the community umm not only to learn about the community but to learn how they can have an impact on the community and as a non-profit umm I already mentioned how we try to make an impact, a direct impact on the community through education, prevention programs, etc. the partnership that we have gives of the perfect fit in my mind”. It seems that citizen education is a goal that each member of the partnership sees as important but there is certainly a disparity between the two entities as to the degree that the service agency
actually is responsible for community education as opposed to strict service delivery.

Shared Direction

The second component explored motivation for partnering, and their expectations of partnering. The first set of questions within this category asked the respondents to share their concept and definition of the term “partnership”. Klingensmith shared his views of partnership as “well I think that it means the university and someone within the community working together toward a common goal, or working together on a common project that leads to the accomplishment of a common goal”. This was closely connected with the definition provided by Cook from the Red Cross. He defined partnership as “The way I look at it you have at least two entities that are working toward a shared goal or vision and they are doing it in a manner that is beneficial to both”. David Walker also defined partnership in the same context as the others. He shares his concept of partnership as, “working with another group or entity toward a common goal”. Thus, there was a definitive agreement on the concept of partnership.

The three individuals were next asked to share their personal motivation and expectation for participating in the service learning partnership. Klingensmith shared
some deep, personal commitments to the local community and its development.

“Primarily because of the last 20 years I’ve been doing programs for the Chamber of Commerce called Community Leadership which I know you are familiar with, and umm what that has done is to have brought me in contact with all of the community agencies in town. At one time or another I have heard from them, worked with them, at their ability to participate in the program. So that umm I was pretty well versed as to who was doing what within the community. And secondly, I have worked with community leadership locally and with the formation of Leadership Ohio, the state organization and from the state organization through a couple of organizations that have actually worked with teenagers and high school students so I have seen a pretty broad depth of participation in the community leadership model and when I was asked to come up with an idea for a community involvement it was natural for me to pick the model that I was most familiar with and that’s what I used to shape the experience for the campus.

Basically what I did was incorporate the model that was virtually used by all of the community leadership groups and organizations around the county and put that into a student model. It is a little bit different, a little more flexible and it’s probably more project oriented. We have the constraints of the quarters system that we have to mark that with an end to a project by the end of a class. Basically it the community leadership model for college students”. This personal commitment and experience with community development programming seemed to be in contrast with the motivations of
the Red Cross staff.

Cook identified his motivations as “Well going back to what I just said about partnership, I just see this benefiting our agency in that one of our struggles is having enough man power to accomplish our goals so through this partnership we are able to umm obtain extra labor so to speak to help us toward that end. And the key to it is the free labor (chuckles)”.

Walker was very candid in his interview, indicating little motivation or expectation as he was unfamiliar with the basic concepts of service learning. He shared his perspective as “I really did not know anything about it. I wasn’t sure what it was about. So I didn’t have much an expectation. Actually this morning was the first time I really thought about it because I asked director if he knew exactly what John Berry would be asking me today. So, the director is seeking free labor and that is his motivation and expectation. Walker has no expectations per se. He knew nothing about service learning.

The expectations of the partnership as defined by the three partnering individuals were very congruent with one another. Dr. Klingensmith indicated that his expectations of the service learning partnership “I thought my expectation was that the organization would provide our students with a volunteer experience, that the student would gain something from that experience which would in a long term would lead them to volunteering again sometime in the future. And I think what I expected to give the agency was help and the help was for a period of time. And provide them with free labor, it’s not
free actually because they have to have staff to train them but they felt the net value was there and they provided a service for them”. This expectation seemed to mirror the motivations for Rod Cook to enter into the service learning partnership. Cook wanted free labor and later he said, “As we have evolved, there were some long term benefits that I wasn’t envisioning and that is some of the students that were placed here are now long term volunteers with us even though they have left the Newark campus”. Hence, Klingensmith and Cook hoped that the students would volunteer on a long-term (even beyond the service learning experience) basis with the agency. There was no agenda for awareness of social issues or social justice.

When asked to relay his perception of the needs of The Ohio State University Newark that would be met within this partnership, Klingensmith shared, “I think primarily we accomplish the outreach mission of the university. When we are out providing a service for which we pay which is certainly good and our faculty provide some service to the community but we are primarily focused on the teaching mission and its [teaching] almost an internal thing. It’s the old stereotype of living in the ivory tower. I think most universities feel they owe something to their community or should to the taxpayers and we should go above and beyond simply our research interests, our teaching interests and find some way to really give back and this is one way to do it”. This indicates his perspective that the service learning partnership makes teaching external rather than internal with the university. It gives service to the community. It
implements the service orientation of the university’s mission. He indicates that service to the community is in his mind essential to the mission of Ohio State –Newark. To him external teaching is service. Rod Cook’s answer to the question of identifying specific needs of the Red Cross chapter that would be met via the service learning partnership included just about everything the Red Cross does. Service learning students do small administrative projects and full-scale marketing plans. David Walker agreed describing one of the student service learning participants. “One of the other side of the directors responsibilities has to do with military services. One of your workers that came to us, Molly, we trained her to go out and do our video emails to the military service personnel overseas and she set up booths and equipment and she did an excellent job. We got to where I was just able to give that to her and I didn’t have to do much more than supply the materials.”. The Red Cross uses service learning and intern students in all aspects of their operations. Sometimes the students help; sometimes they do the entire task.

**Systems**

The third of the six components of partnership included organizational operations, values, beliefs, behaviors, and communication flow.

Under organizational operations, Doctor Klingensmith described the service-learning initiatives of the Ohio State University at Newark as “basically I was asked to present a
proposal which I did. The proposal was approved and the administration funded it. So the administration provides a minimal amount of grant and certain financial support, they give me an income basically to facilitate the project. So really from conception to delivery the administration’s role is simply yes this is a good idea this is something we want to support. We think we’ve got the idea that we want we have a product that we are willing to buy. So really the process really the whole burden falls upon the faculty except for the process of approving and funding the project. To sum up, the Ohio State Newark administration asks for service learning proposals and funds some of them. If the proposal is funded, all aspects of implementation fall to the faculty member. This faculty member perceives his work as contribution to an external teaching effort of the university and this teaching results in community service.

When asked the same question in the context of the operation of the Red Cross Chapter, Rod Cook responded that the Board oversees broad goals and operations including cost and customer effectiveness. Daily operations are performed by the 4 paid staff. “We have a roster of over 470 volunteers. So a lot of this organization is operated, a lot of the paid staff time is volunteer management including students from the Newark Campus”.

The next line of questioning focused on the decision making. When asked how the university makes decisions, particularly related to the service learning experience, Klingensmith’s response is very focused on how students’ select the various service sites
in which they choose to participate during his class experience. He focuses upon his role in creating this opportunity. He did not focus on Ohio State Newark’s decision making. He describes the decision making process as: “Its probably not as formal umm in many cases in most cases if the agency comes in and talks to the students in the Fall, then they say this is what we’d like to have done. For instance the Humane Society comes in the Fall and brings in a couple of puppies and says in essence how would you like to work with these guys at the shelter - well you can and here are the things you would be doing. So the student then decides and initiates the contact really to the agency. The student goes out really and says I would like to walk dogs or whatever – they make the contact with the agency and they make the offer as to what they will do with them and when they will do it. He also emphasized that students usually do not know about some services such as the battered women’s shelter and he makes sure they learn about these organizations and the good work that they do.

When posed the same question in regards to the decision making process of the Red Cross chapter, Rod Cook takes a more organization-wide perspective. He describes the general decision making process within the organization. “It is more of a I don’t want to say dictatorship. That’s not really the right term but we are actually just a chapter of the national organization and we have to follow guidelines and some of these guidelines are actually placed upon us by congress through a congressional charter and mandate. Now, the way that boils down locally is the daily operational positions all have the final
say on it when it comes to something that effects the organization pretty much locally beyond the daily operations, that’s where the Board comes in. It is interesting because we are caught in a place we were in just two and a half years ago when we restructured the whole national system and now they are beginning to talk about another restructure. So nothing stays the same”. David Walker adds his perception of decision making as in this chapter we make the decisions based on policy from the national but that doesn’t mean that you can’t step outside of the bounds of national’s. In disaster services we don’t really follow specific guidelines especially for those who are homeless”. From the two responses, one can see a very different orientation in regards to decision making. From the faculty member’s point of view, he is very autonomous in his decision making. He decides what is needed and creates a process accordingly. This is in contrast to the response given by the community agency director. He describes being more bound by national agency directive. He does find some autonomy at the local agency chapter level. Though even here, he is responsible to his Board of Directors. This sentiment seems to be reinforced by David Walker in his role as a frontline administrator within the Red Cross chapter organization. He echoes the need to follow the edicts handed down by the national organization.

The next question in the systems category asked each of the three participants to address what they believed to be their respective organization’s values. Klingensmith provided his interpretation of the university’s values. “We generate some hours so we
generate certainly a presence. It increases our profile. Certainly the agencies that we support have Boards that know OSUN students are out there. I suspect that by increasing our visibility within the community that we are becoming an important player, partner if you will, in the community. That enhances our position and standing within the community. I am not sure that at some point we need to say that we believe this is the right thing to do and that’s what we are doing and it may not have an immediate financial benefit but we are in part teaching students to be citizens, and we may be teaching geography or something else but we are still teaching citizenship and this is probably one of the two or three most important about being a good citizen.”

Thus Klingensmith identifies two institutional values, one having to do with economic self interest and one having to do with teaching citizenship. The university values his service learning efforts because it generates enrollment and therefore, dollars. Because of the economic benefits, service learning is noticed. Secondly, service learning delivers on teaching citizenship which is also valued by the university. Rod Cook identified the core values of the Red Cross. “Actually if you recall we have a set of seven fundamental principles that every Red Cross Chapter follows. I will just give you a copy of them this is the basis for our core values. They are humanity, impartiality, neutrality, dependence, voluntary service, unity and universality and right now the major focus of the American Red Cross is universality.” These core values emanate from the national organization and are espoused and enforced locally. David Walker’s approach to
responding to this question comes from the perspective of his specific role within the Red Cross. “

"Mainly it’s a humanitarian response. We try not to discriminate against any person or people. Of course with the nature of disaster inside a house fire we often deal with lower income they tend to have more house fires." “These values are congruent in that by helping educate for citizenship the Red Cross gains free help and even long-term volunteers.

Next, the respondents were asked to identify the beliefs which are manifest in the partnerships. The three individuals had relatively similar concepts of the belief systems that were manifest within this service learning partnership. Professor Klingensmith shared his perception of university beliefs in the context of faculty roles. “I would say that is possibly true and it’s interesting from the faculty standpoint we seldom get into the beliefs of the university. We get into the beliefs of the discipline but as what the university believes, we could go back to the language of the mission. Yes the tradition of the land grant I think it lives within the university but I think the faculty is focused so tightly on discipline that we sometimes need someone to someone else to make that connection. That’s probably from the top down rather than the bottom up.” Dr. Klingensmith described the university as a loose system where beliefs of faculty come primarily from their disciplines. The university is just the locale. Instructional values come from the University President and other leaders but these may or may not affect faculty.
Cook shared his views on Red Cross belief systems as once again stemming from the philosophy of the national Red Cross office. “Well again this is based on our core values but I know that one belief this organizations holds strongly is that no matter how dire the situation, there will always be help and a lot of the times that symbol of that little red cross is the symbol of that help. And I would say some other belief capacities is that we believe that the community can be improved and that the Red Cross can be a critical component of that. But then also the Red Cross is beginning as a changeover at least is that the Red Cross is all powerful and knowing. They, we, are starting to truly believe that we need to do better at partnering with other organizations such as the Newark campus in order to achieve our goals. And that is a major paradigm shift. Cook extols the virtue of the Red Cross as a symbol of hope during a time of crisis, but he also shares an organizational belief that the Red Cross also stands for community improvement. Further, the Red Cross is now valuing partnering with other organizations to achieve its goals rather than being self contained and going on their own.

Next, we explored how their organizations behave. Each of the three respondents found this to be a difficult question to answer and each had a different perspective on this question. Professor Klingensmith shared his perception of his and students’ behaviors within the service learning course experiences. “In the course where they are actually in it there is some structure in that we have objectives and we come together once a week for reflection. So there is structure and there is an expectation that they behave in
certain ways. Rod Cook had a very different interpretation of the question. His focus was on the organization behaviors exhibited within the various subgroups of the Licking County Red Cross chapter. “In some respect we utilize a very team oriented approach especially in respect to Disaster and Armed Forces and Health and Safety but then there is some I will say an organizational oxymoron that in the top down there area actually two organization to the Red Cross. There are chapters which they are responsible for the Disaster, Armed Forces and Health and Safety. And then there is the blood division which is of course all the blood services and sometimes I have seen umm almost a competitiveness between the two divisions. And from being on the outside looking in on the blood division I have actually seen a lot of competitiveness within that division.”

David Walker once again answered the question from the specific perspective of his disaster response division within the Red Cross. “We will get a call from someone usually the 911 operator or merge in response. The first thing we do is organize our volunteers and send someone out to the scene and decide what our response should be. If it’s a large enough issue and the national would need to be contacted and coordinated with. The last time we did that it was with a large scale flood. Our response without the nationals happens 99% of the time. We make plans for immediate emergency need-basic human needs. And then we will help them on a long-range plan. We now use a lot more referrals then we had previously and that’s simply a financial issue. Donations were down, now I think are on the rise again.” To sum up, the professor described
service learning behaviors only and the Red Cross staff discussed organizational responses to their main missions, without any reference to their service learning activities.

The next question within the systems category asked the three respondents to describe how the service-learning partnership operates. Klingensmith simply reiterated the process utilized within his course described above and repeated here. Rod Cook explained how the Red Cross chapter engages with Dr. Klingensmith and the service learning experience. His perspective came more from a focus on the needs of his organization. “Well in a nutshell I basically let our need be known to the Newark campus and basically the Newark campus has provided us with students who are interested in working here. The one thing that I think both of us understand and was made very clear from the beginning is that we wouldn’t force students to work either here or other places that they did not want to. Now the thing I see evolving is that we have become a little bit more sophisticated in our requests and this current year is a perfect example where I specifically requested someone from the area of marketing and she has been a very dedicated person. The student in this case needed hands-on experience and in doing real marketing and we needed that area of expertise. It has been a real win-win for both of us. And probably the most interesting case we have had so far is that we have one young lady who had multiple disabilities that that has actually found a kind of a home here and she has been wonderful for us.” It is interesting to note that the two
partners only vaguely acknowledge each other’s role within the service learning partnership. Their prime focus was simply on their respective responsibility within the service learning experience. As indicated previously, Walker had little understanding as to how the service learning program operated. He defined worthwhile work opportunities for “interns” who happened to be students participating in the service learning experience.

The next question posed to the three men asked them to describe how the partnership makes decisions. Klingensmith chose to answer the question from a potential problem resolution frame of reference. He had indicated earlier that both partnering organizations bring something to the table when they agree to participate in the service learning experience. He shared that each group had needs and opportunities for which the partnering group could benefit and/or assist. However, when elaborating on decision making within the partnership, Dr. Klingensmith focused on problem resolution. “Yes, especially the only place we’ve had any significant problems has been at the Works and it’s been an issue not so much for me but rather with students not performing up to what is a reasonable standard in the organizations administrators eyes. And we’ve always just talked about it and agreed to as what we were going to do. It’s always been a kind of mutual thing thus far. There have been times when I’ve been asked to contact a student and I’ve always honored their request. If something is not going right then I simply go ahead and take care of it. We’ve never had anything more serious of an issue than a
student not living up to the partner’s expectations. Part of those expectations are I need to have you here at a certain time, if you tell me you are going to be here we need you then for the work then be here. If they don’t them I talk to them. I don’t think we’ve ever let one go though we’ve come pretty close.” Even in this frame of reference Klingensmith talks about the need for open dialogue and communication with the service partner. He also discusses joint decision making. Rod Cook however does not focus on problem resolution when discussing how the partnership makes decisions. He states that the Red Cross has not experienced any real negative issues with their service learning students. This seems to be consistent with Dr. Klingensmith citing a problematic example at the Works museum and not at the Red Cross chapter. Mr. Cook references decision making in terms of defining the type of service projects they will be implementing. “Actually we had some things related to defining the type of service we can provide – not in terms of problems because we really haven’t run into any. As far as on this end in terms of making decisions on what needs we want to prioritize that has been done among the staff. Within the partnership there really hasn’t been for me it’s been a really smooth transition into the program.” David Walker seemed to have little actual knowledge of the decision making process with the service learning partnership. In many respects Mr. Walker was very hesitant to have the students involved in his areas of responsibility. “It was me who provided the opportunities for different projects - yes I did that type of work. That had been very tough for me at first because I was so used to doing myself. If you
want something done right you do it herself was my philosophy and giving it away was an adjustment for me.”

Previously the respondent had answered a question pertaining to their individual organization’s values. The question that was now posed to them asked them to identify what they believed to be the partnership values. They were asked if they viewed any values that are created or developed within the partnership itself. Klingensmith was the first to respond. “I suspect that we both, the Red Cross Director and myself, value the process of community service. I think we both have some traditional expectations that if we are going to give this student a reward, then we have a reasonable expectation that they perform for that. I don’t think we are overly rigid about it but there is a point in which students need some structure, some reminders stating this is what is expected to be done and if you are not meeting it then this is the consequence. I also think there are some shared values or shared expectations of the students. Shared value of the importance of the work. And those are things both agree upon I think the values and beliefs are pretty intertwined. I understand the differences within the words but the meaning is pretty close.” What Dr. Klingensmith described was the shared values of the importance of the work being completed properly, while also being attentive to creating and sharing the students learning and service experience. These could also be interpreted as both beliefs and even behaviors.

Rod Cook presented his perspective that the value of education was a core shared
value manifest within the partnership. “I think that goes back to what we originally talked about. Both of our missions are educational based. So I see it as being multifaceted. Number one as far as both organizations that value the education this is a great opportunity for the students. As far as the students themselves, from what I have seen so far is a lot of them have come in not knowing if they really want to volunteer but they go away with really stronger values and beliefs in community service.” He recognized the importance of educating each other about what they do, how they do it and how to make this service learning experience a significantly positive experience for all involved. Also he purported that there is an opportunity for the student to learn specific elements of the student becoming more committed to civic duty and responsibility. David Walker seemed to make a connection with the statement of both Dr. Klingensmith and that of Rod Cook. “Well I think to the development of the students would be a shared value. I hope they learn something from being here. We’ve gained their work and their knowledge and their ability. And I hope that are taking something back with them. At least they know the Red Cross may be some ways they don’t or do want to work.” In his own manner Mr. Walker identified the value of education and developmental service. He also presented the value of learning about the Red Cross organization as well.

Following the discussion of partnership values, partnership beliefs and behaviors were explored. Dr. Klingensmith continued with a common theme he had presented
when asked about partnership values. “Yeah well you know you are a volunteer that somebody is depending on you to do a task whether it is paid or not. And one of the things that this program should offer the student is an understanding of what work is all about. Work is and sometimes involves some things you just don’t want to do because its Monday morning and its 7:30 and I’m expected to be there by 8:00 then I get up. You know and for students in particular they often lack the discipline and here they can look at the discipline that will be expected of them. Now most of our students have had jobs of one sort or another though they haven’t had it in this type of setting. I mean in teaching it’s all about expectations. We expect you to grasp the material and work on the material and it gives them an opportunity to exercise their initiative. And for some of today’s students what I see is a real lack of initiative. OK, I am here now educate me, give me a degree in 4 years and I need to make $100,000 dollars or more.” An interpretation of what Dr. Klingensmith was saying is the importance of instilling personal perspectives of discipline and how its manifest within your work relationships. He seemed passionate about the student understanding the need to live up to obligations, to do a good job and be responsible for their actions. He believed these were beliefs and behaviors presented by both parties within the service learning partnership.

Rod Cook too expanded upon his response to partnership values by developing his concepts more fully in beliefs and behaviors. I think that gets to some of the beliefs that are manifested in the partnership too. He consistently discussed the belief that students
could and should engage in service to the community. “It is not that they are just learning about the Red Cross but its learning about the community and the impact that they can potentially have on a much larger scale than they ever imagined. I fortunately have always been a very strong believer in service learning and in fact have overseen programs based on service learning. So I had some preconceived notions of the value that is going on where as it may be a little different if you were partnering with other agencies that weren’t quite as familiar with the concept.” Because of Cook’s familiarity with the concepts of service learning, his view of belief and behavior were very congruent with Dr. Klingensmith. David Walker indicated his perspective on partnership beliefs and behaviors were also consistent with that of Klingensmith and Cook. He indicated that there was a belief that students can and will learn about their community needs and act upon those. He also indicated that the partnership contribute provided support to the Red Cross by allowing for them as an organization to work on issues they could not address previously because of time and staff limitations.

The next question presented to the three participants moved away from values, beliefs and behaviors. This question asked the respondents to hare their perception of how communication flowed within the partnership. Klingensmith described the partnership as a system with a great deal of initial, up-front communication. “There is a lot of communication certainly in the first, in the fall quarter. And there is e-mail on a daily basis, they are told that they will be visiting and they will get a chance to come into class
and talk about each of their agencies. I spend some time doing some different things to even motivate them to see the importance of being there. After the first quarter they become really self starters because once they sign up for the course I ask them to fill out a form which states this is what I am going to do. And I respond to that form either by no, I don’t think that you can do this or by what I typically do and say it’s good and this is a reasonable project. Their response to that is to go out and make the contact so they have to initiate this. During the course of the quarter if there is a problem I will talk with the agency umm normally my contact with them is usually at the end of the quarter when they hand in the log of the student’s service.” Hence, Klingensmith describes the communication that sets of the program to get students into a compatible service agency and project. Cook wants to know the outcome of service learning for students at the Red Cross. Currently he gets no such information and doesn’t know if it exists.

Rod Cook took a different approach to the discussion of communication flow within the partnership. He praised the overall communication process with Dr. Klingensmith. However, he had a strong desire to know the educational outcomes of students. He wanted to know if the students who served with the Red Cross were “getting it” and making meaning of their service learning experience. “For the most part it has been very good. If there is one piece that might be missing at least for me personally, I would like to find out from the student if there is a paper they might have had to write about what they got out of it. So maybe in the future we can improve the program. Although I think
that with one exception every student we’ve had through the program is still with us and have continued as a volunteer beyond the service learning. I’m sure that is something that you are never going to be able to quantify or put into to quantitative terms but at least umm to have some kind of a narrative or something or some kind of conclusion that this student feels that they’ve gained this such and such from this experience. Perhaps using a post-service survey or something like.” Mr. Cook seems to comment that it is wonderful that the partners talk about how to setup the service experience, define their desired outcomes and agree upon each other needs. He also sees the value of communicating that the student did their job and made their hours, but he seems concerned that the service partner is not privy to the evaluative process - the “so what” or meaning making of the experience for the student. David Walker said, “We had to give them some basic training on some things as far as basic policy and procedure. Our issues and items of confidentiality and dealing with confidential documents we had to make sure that they would sign codes of conduct to talk about what they can and can’t do.” Thus, Walker focused on making sure that he covered with the students, basic policies and procedures, and issues of confidentiality. This is communication about boundaries and policies and specific job. To sum up, Professor Klingensmith described communication needed to set up the service learning program and to get students into compatible service agencies and projects. Cook wants to know the outcomes of service learning for students who volunteer at the Red Cross. Currently, he gets no such information and he
doesn’t know if it exists.

The final question posed in was about how their needs guided or shaped the partnership. Dr. Klingensmith focused his response on the fact that there were preexisting relationships that he had formed with service agency providers prior to this service learning experience. “I think in most cases the partnerships existed before the course. They were there in other contexts. From time to time I will get a new person that will come on board from the United Way or some other agency and they may need some training or information I can provide but generally speaking these are people that I have known for a long time. The partnership is there because they’ve participated in community leadership; spoke at the leadership classes or some subset of that. They actually participate in the program in some way. So I think for the most part the relationship was there before the program even started.” It seems that Klingensmith is arguing that the needs of service learning were the same as the needs of the relationship between himself and the agencies. Hence, service learning had nothing unique to add to already existing relationships between himself and these agencies. In addition, he had already discussed the need for compatible placement of students. Thus, both students and agency need needs must be compatible.

Rod Cook seemed to believe that the partnership was really driven by his organizational needs. “I think that’s 99% of it. As we alluded to earlier, the way we access our needs has become much more sophisticated.” Cook seemed to indicate that
the partnership was a more strategic means to address need within his organization. David Walker seemed to echo Rod Cooks sentiment. “It is by the type of work that the students actually committed, that is based upon the needs of the organization that you identified.”

**Operations**

The next agenda item was operations. The issues of operations included control, problem solving, communication, physical facilities, marketing and financing.

The initial question is who is “in control” of this partnership and why is that? This proved to be a question that each of the three pondered differently. Dr. Klingensmith decried the partnership as a loose association. “I don’t think either of us is actually in control. The partnership is just that, the partnership exists to satisfy two sets, two people’s needs, two groups and so the issue of control is not relevant. It’s literally that, it’s working together to satisfy both of our needs. Neither party is in control it is by mutual consent.” Interestingly, Dr. Klingensmith described certain elements of the partnership which one party does control because they are responsible for it. His responsibility is to create the class component. Red Cross is supposed to control what students will be doing on-site in their volunteer activity. However, each of these components is discussed with the partner and they confer to ensure that each is living up to the expectations that they have of one another. So it is truly viewed by Dr.
Klingensmith as a mutual partnership agreement. Rod Cook seems to agree with Dr. Klingensmith assessment of partnership control. "Actually I have seen it evolve into a pure partnership where there really is not one entity in control. I think that for the most part and what I’ve seen, we state what our needs are, the Newark campus responded, they helped recruit students that needed the program themselves. So it’s been a shared or a mutual agreement to meet both of our needs. I think that the key to this is that both sides at least in my mind, both sides have approached this as how can we create a win/win situation and in this case a win/win situation. Because the student also wins rather than looking for barriers which I don’t think happens when you have two organizations who are really trying to work together." The model described by both Klingensmith and Cook was built over time. Roles differentiated; trust relationships developed; no control issues surfaced because the system had equilibrium. David Walker sees equity between Dr. Klingensmith as the higher education faculty member and Rod Cook as the Executive Director of the Licking County Chapter of Red Cross. "Well I would say it would be the Executive Director and whoever it is from OSU that is in charge of the program."

The next question under the heading of operations asked each of the individuals to share their perception of how problem solving occurred within this partnership. Again, the respondents seemed to provide very similar responses. Dr. Klingensmith had previously expressed that the partners had openly discussed problematic issues and come
to a mutually agreeable resolution. One party or the other might need to manifest that resolution. “These problems are very rare. It’s important to note that there have been problems but they are a rare occurrence. In fact I would say most quarters I don’t really confront any issues.” Rod Cook echoed the fact that there had been very few problems which required he and Dr. Klingensmith to confer. When pressed to identify strategies that had been utilized or would be utilized in problem solving, Mr. Cook did have a definitive response. “Well it would depend on the level of the conflict. If it was something that could be handled, for example let’s say it is student behavior. That’s something that can be handled here. If however the behavior escalates that’s when I feel I would be able to contact the Newark campus and be provided support for that situation. We have to make sure we are communicating and trying to resolve the issue before it escalates. Let’s just hope that never happens. We have been lucky but I believe part of that is due to the fact that if we are more selective to or open to having students here. Either way it seems to be working.” To Mr. Cook, communication is a key component regarding how the partnership must be processed. His expectation is that there is an open communication style where both parties are expressing their needs and that, if there is some point of challenge, then there is an open dialogue. David Walker seemed to support this perspective as well. He also indicated that there had been little problematic issue with the partnership. However when pressed about potential problem resolution processing he also shared a collaborative approach after he personally tried to resolve
the issue. “If they’re working directly with me I would want a talk with them about it first and see if we could resolve the issue. If it was too complicated than I would bring someone from the university in on it.”

The third question was posed only to the two service agency professional. Rod Cook and David Walker were asked to describe their physical facilities. Rod expressed his belief that their organizational facilities were lacking in many areas. “The facilities are less than adequate. In fact seriously this is one of the barriers to expanding the program. We just do not have the physical space to house more. If we did, we would probably have more students. This is something we have been working on for a year and a half.” David Walker was more descriptive of the physical space but was also very concerned about a lack of adequate space as well. “Well we have the building with a bunch of walls and we have three departments here we have our blood services are disaster services, our armed forces and emergency services we have a garage with disaster vehicles we have trailers with disaster supplies ready to roll. It’s actually way too small. We are in the process of trying to find a new facility.” Both Mr. Cook and Mr. Walker viewed their physical structure as a limitation to the service learning partnership.

The next question was once again posed to all three of the participants. The question asked them to share their perception of how the partnership was marketed. Each of the three respondents had a differing perspective on this topic. Dr. Klingensmith focused his response on marketing the course to students and on potential marketing from the service
agency as well. “The course is marketed of course. One of the things that we do not do well in this process is communicate with students. We do that the old way – I mean it’s terrible. And you’ve heard this before and Bill Macdonald (Dean/Director of Ohio State Newark Campus) has heard this before. We need some way and, if it’s a paper, even if its electronic, we need a physical student paper. And in that paper I would market the course. What I am saying is that we just don’t get in touch with students well. It is that we don’t market things, we put up table tents or posters or sign in the cafeteria and we all ignore it. And even with email, I email my students weekly and I would bet no more than nine percent use it, maybe not even that high. I think on this campus a very realistic process is that you probably get a lot of marketing by word of mouth. Students who have experienced it and had a positive experience tend to share. One of the strongest student communities on campus is the Somalis and I have 4 or 5 Somali students a quarter who are working at the Somali center in Columbus. I have absolutely no problem with that – it is super, it’s wonderful. But, the way it’s been marketed to them is one has told the other and usually when one comes to see me it usually someone that’s told them cousin, friend and they have been told that Dr. Klingensmith will give you credit for this service experience. So yes it is word of mouth an especially among that group. I would say occasionally I see marketing from the community service agency but rarely. I was trying to think of any that type specifically and I am hard pressed to give you a real good example of that. Yeah I don’t see it. Usually Ill get someone telling me I
have a need for this and can you come up with a student or students.”

Rod Cook seemed to reinforce Dr. Klingensmith’s perception that marketing was very limited from the service agency stand-point. “I don’t think it is right now. Nothing outside of just word-of-mouth with the agencies. And I am not really sure to what extent it really needs to be.” David Walker had no idea how marketing occurred related to the partnership. “I really don’t know. Rod may know that but I don’t.”

Traditionally, higher education does not market programs or courses. They are available and described in the course bulletin. Marketing however somehow violates academic standards. All universities have multiple goals but none should be marketed any more than the others. Students should make choices without outside marketing influences. Students should chooses majors and courses because they choose to do so with academic advisors and not because of marketing. Courses are not products to be sold. A student should choose physics for example because the student is connected to science and physics, not because and ad sold the student on the idea. The business and sales model really has not place in higher education or in many professions. Professor Klingensmith described this but seems to advocate change toward a business model.

The final question under the operations category asked each respondent to address how the partnership is financed. Each of the three participants agreed that financing was
minimal. Dr. Klingensmith saw this as exclusively the responsibility of the university.

“Strictly by the university. The university provides my salary which is the real significant expenditure here. The agency in fairness to them too will expense some kind of upfront cost in preparing for planning asks. But that’s all with the expectation of a return.” Rod Cook’s perception of financing is that the majority of fiscal expenditure comes from the service agency. “Well on the Newark campus, I am not real sure. I am pretty sure it probably has some state grants or maybe federal grants, from this end basically this agency has taken it upon itself to make sure that whatever the partnership needs will be provided. We provide a lot of in-kind needed financing. We provide the location, the time by the staff, resources necessary to perform whatever the function is that I needed. It is not a heavy financial contribution from either end but it is a lot of facilitation point to it. It requires more me and my time involved. Some organizations may look at that as a barrier but I see it as an opportunity because I know if I spend let’s say two hours a week supervising students that will free me up 10 hours a week for something I can get to now.” David Walker confirmed Rod Cook’s perspective that in kind support and staff time were two critical investments. However he found this time well spent because “it takes less time to do that than to try to do all that yourself.” In this realm of financing there certainly seemed to be a lack of understanding as to what each partnering group provided to support the partnership, but agreement that the outcome or benefit outweighed the expenses.
Competency

The next area of exploration had to do with best practices, learning outcomes, and overall impacts of partnering. Dr. Klingensmith believes the university’s best practice, particularly related to his specific course is exposing students to the community and community needs. “Within my course specifically what we do best is expose students to many opportunities. What we do best is show them the variety of things and it is in fact in some cases showing them how the group serves the community. Here is the Director explaining how it functions. Here is how the group takes care of issue. Now other courses may do other things but that’s what we do best.” Cook first gave his perception of what Red Cross does best and then he included best practices in service learning. In his mind, Cook believes that training and development are best practices coordinated by the Red Cross and this focus makes for an easy incorporation of students into a service learning experience. “Since we are so training focused on everything we do, bringing in students into the partnership is just second nature to us.”

The next question asked the respondents to identify what they thought the other partner did best and brought into the partnership. Dr. Klingensmith sees the service provider as community problem solvers and did not address best practices for service learning per se. He indicated that only the students could answer this question for service learning. He did not know. Rod Cook was also hesitant to specify the best practices of Ohio State Newark in service learning. He did however focus his comments on the
selection of students to the Red Cross organization. “Well just specifically to this agency well again I don’t know if it’s just been pure luck or what but for me it’s been the recruitment and selection process has been very good. We have been so fortunate to have had so many good students.” Hence, neither party identified best practices of the other except for “sending us good students” from the Red Cross. Neither party seems to know much about what the other does, rather only the students know.

The next set of questions posed to the respondents focused on eliciting their thoughts on what, if anything, they hoped to learn from their partnering organization through this process. The answers provided by each participant were intriguing.

Dr. Klingensmith centered his response around the notion of fostering a greater understanding of the community. “Well I always learn something more about how the community works. I suspect that you know we all have a limited amount of time but I know that I have learned more about the community through this. I know I have made some decisions about where I want to spend my volunteer time based on hearing from agencies. You know I’ve learned that I don’t want to work with some of those agencies. I mean for me if I’m going to ask students to volunteer, it either has to be really productive or fun and at this point in my life I’ll take fun over really productive. I mean I want it to be something I feel good about and feel rewarded by doing and yeah I’ve been able to select where I wanted to work based on some of my experiences with these agencies in the course.”
Rod Cook focused his response more on improving his particular organizations operational effectiveness. “As far as learning I would say how we may be able to improve what we do in a couple of different ways. Number one on a let’s say management level, but more importantly getting different perspectives from the students point of view and I don’t know if there is room in here to talk about the downfalls of our organization but the challenges our organization has is that it's usually umm driven by the older respective generation. So getting a younger more youthful perspective.” David Walker added his perspective that he had a renewed appreciation for college students and their capacity to contribute to his organization and the “common good”. “Well I’ve learned there still good kids in the world. And that’s very important because all you hear anymore has about bad kids and nothing positive. And there are still student who want to be invested in a community. It’s hard to track down people to serve an organization like this because they can make two or three times the money outside of social services. And then I’ll have to commit this level of time either.”

The follow-up question posed to Dr. Klingensmith, Rod Cook and David Walker asked them to each identify what they hoped to learn, if anything, from the students who served in the service-learning experience. Dr. Klingensmith provided his thought that the students in the course could provide him good feedback on their service experiences and the course content itself. “I would expect to learn which experiences are the best. I would expect them to help me improve the program. I don’t think I have a lot of
Rod Cook had a specific hope to learn more about the students perception of the Red Cross via their service in this partnership. “I want to know what is their perception. How do they make meaning of the Red Cross and what it stands for. And in everything we do for example the way we interact with volunteers. Is it I’ll say youth friendly? From that to more globally, is what we do an interest to the younger adult?” Mr. Cook had been very candid that the Licking County Chapter of the American Red Cross had a volunteer body that was heavily comprised of senior citizens. He actively wanted the service learning students to give their impression of the Red Cross organization from their younger perspective. David Walker seemed to further add to Rod Cook’s perspective of wanting a fresh and youthful review of the organization. “Young people have fresh ideas too. I have a hard time myself because of my age and I've been at the organization since way back in the beginning when I think things were done right now I think everything is done wrong but young people come in and they don’t know all that old stuff so they take the current level of the organization and make it work.”

The follow-up question that was presented next asked each of the participants to share what they believed their partnering organization will learn anything from their own organization via this partnership. For Dr. Klingensmith, he anticipated that the Red Cross would certainly learn more about the nature of Ohio State Newark students. “In some cases I think there has been the agency gaining a better understanding of our mission, certainly a better understanding of our students.” For Rod Cook he too did
anticipate that the Newark Campus would learn something from the Red Cross chapter.

“*I would hope so. A couple of things, number one how to work with community partners and I don’t mean this in a derogatory manner its more on a global nature that often time an institution of high learning sometimes referred to as the ivory tower so maybe to learn what it really is like in the real world. And then being able to take that learning experience and apply it I their everything from their curriculum to how you operate to make things more realistic to prepare students for how to handle the world.”* It was Mr. Cook’s hope that the university would utilize the partnership as somewhat of a learning laboratory. He professed a desire for them to better understand the working of a non-profit agency and to share this with their students. David Walker provided his interpretation that the two organizations were engaged with one another on a more regular basis than ever before and he hoped this would foster some learning opportunities from the Red Cross. “*Well I would hope so. I know that we spend a lot more time with the Newark campus than we used to. We take some of our programs there and use the classes for disaster training. I don’t remember doing that back years ago.*”

All three organizational representatives were then asked the follow-up question inquiring if they anticipated the students who service in the service-learning experience will learn anything from their organization via this partnership. Dr. Klingensmith focused his thought on the outcomes for students. “*For the student one of the big things for doing this is something to put in their resume. You know the resume builder is an*
element that I talk to them about. You know it is the thing that sets you off from someone else that has attended the university. That’s why I use it as one of the focal points as to why am I doing this. You want to earn credit for it but it does provide you with something marketable on your resume.” In contrast, their outcome goal is very different from that discussed previously by Professor Hennen in Sociology. Resume enhancement was not the goal; transformed awareness of stereotypes was the desired outcome. Resume development was the wrong motivation.

Rod Cook took a more theoretical approach to this question. His hope was that students would become more engaged in the community both in the short and long term. “Number one, a better appreciation of the community and of themselves.” This perspective was also shared by David Walker but in a more minimal perspective as he hoped students would continue to volunteer with the Red Cross. “Yeah I think so. My ultimate hope is that they will become volunteers with organization. You know Molly is still actually a volunteer. So it is happening now.”

Finally, under the competency category, Dr. Klingensmith was asked to tell about the partnership’s impact on the service that Ohio State Newark offers. Initially, Dr. Klingensmith was hesitant when answering this question but after some reframing of the question, he said their partnership highlighted Ohio State Newark’s need for more service learning effort. “The campus as a whole probably needs more buy in from people and it needs. I don’t know if its need or it lacks a coordinated effort.” Klingensmith sees the
service learning partnership is a positive venture for Ohio State Newark. It helps the university fulfill its mission. It exposes students, faculty and staff to the community. He is concerned that there is a need for a more concentrated effort to continue to encourage and facilitate such experiences.

Cook was asked to identify potential impact the partnership has had on the Red Cross Chapter’s personnel, agency operation, policies, physical facilities and services. On personnel, Cook said, “Actually several. By getting students here we’ve been able to almost re-invigorate some of our older generation. I think I mentioned earlier that the one case in which we had and still have the person with multiple disabilities working in our office and that has opened the eyes of the paid staff as to the abilities of this individual. Indirectly an impact, I mentioned before, some students are now becoming volunteers and still working with us.” So, staff became re-motivated; even perceiving others differently. Finally, students also became long-term volunteers.

On operations, policies and physical facilities, Cook said that they learned how to adapt their physical facilities to get more out of the space available. They adapted their facilities to disabled volunteers. They learned to trust young people. They were forced to challenge their assumptions about people and facilities.

How has the partnership impacted the services that your organization offers? “It freed us up to do more. And not only that, but what the students did themselves helped increase our capacity.” All of these responses seemed to indicate that the
partnership for the purpose of service learning was an investment in time and energy and that it increased workload, but it was an investment that was well spent. In the case of Red Cross there was some minimal impact on their facilities design so that it could be more accessible and accommodating to students with disabilities. However this was offset by the organization's ability to learn from the particular disabled student as well as other “youthful” students as well. The Red Cross chapter was also able to utilize the increased labor pool that the service experience brought to them in order to provide a larger array of services to their constituents.

Leadership and Management

The final component of partnership that was examined was leadership and management. Perceptions of leadership roles, understanding of service learning, apprehensions or concerns, and change processing within the partnership were examined. The first question posed in the leadership and management category asked each of the three respondents to identify what specific role they play within their respective organization. Dr. Klingensmith focused his response on his role of Assistant Dean for Civic Engagement. He noted that he wished he had spent more time developing this role.

“I’d love to tell you of all the things that I wish I had done, I wish I had been given the role about 5 years ago and had the chance to really develop it into what it really should be. But I’m afraid my 9 month contract with a month and a half to go. Again I really
think it serves the university serving the community and with more time it will evolve. It has to be more important than just to the person serving in that role. Klingensmith has an official role as the Assistant Director for Civic Engagement and one facet of this is his service learning course. He is both a designated and real leader for service learning at Ohio State Newark.

Cook had a very definitive answer to this question. He explained that he was the organization’s chief executive officer. “I think personally I am looked at as being the leader of the organization and in a leadership role as you very well now I put on many hats. I become the spokesperson, the face, the decision maker, the buck stopping here kind of person. And in relation to this partnership I had to agree that this was something my organization wants to invest in. I had to educate our group and make sure that the staff and everyone understands what we are trying to do and trying to accomplish.”

Once again, he is the designated and real leader for this partnership at the Red Cross. David Walker said, “Everything Rod asks me to. Everything from setting up safety city to building safety city signs. Actually just about anything that Rod thinks we need to do.” Walker implements whatever the leader asks him to do.

When asked about the concept of service-learning surprisingly, Klingensmith did not have a definitive theoretical conceptualization of service learning. “Oh wow, I’m really better at community service, I know what that means. Even civic engagement I can get by with that. I think service learning involves educating the student through real work
experiences. I guess that’s how I conceptualize. I would need about two weeks to refine the definition, but off the top of my head that’s what I would say.” In fact, he implemented his class more as a volunteer program than a service learning program. He apparently has not read nor studied service learning as an educational concept. He basically implements what he knows. This was contrasted to the well defined understanding of the various components of service learning presented by Rod Cook. “Well I’ve already mentioned that it’s probably deeper than most since I have had many years of first-hand experience working in the service learning field. Plus I have the added benefit of having previously worked at the Newark campus so I know about the culture. Good planning by both sides of the partnership and that entails good, open communication. An equal experience for the participants. And for me probably the most critical feature of service learning is the follow-up and debriefing. And more than just debriefing, but the educational component debriefing of not only extracting from the participants what they think they’ve learned but how do they think they are going to apply what they’ve learned to life in general or their experiences at the Newark campus.” This reverse comprehension of elements of service learning was an interesting feature present in this particular partnership. It could help explain Mr. Cook’s desire to be more involved and informed of the students final perception and conceptualization of their service learning experience with the Red Cross organization. David Walker self admittedly did not have any real understanding of the nature of service learning. “I think
that students just learn what the organization does. What the organization does on a regular basis. Personally I would say, I don’t know really how to say this, I hope it would help them to be more organized and I just don’t know how to word it.” Thus it was obvious that Rod Cook had to be the driving force behind the service learning process for the Red Cross organization.

Next, the participants were to discuss any apprehensions or concerns they had with their partnering organization. Klingensmith shared that he did not have any apprehensions because of the many relationships he had established with various service agencies as part of the Leadership Licking County program he facilitated. “None, again it goes back to the fact that I had pre established relationships with most of the agencies.” Rod Cook had two definitive concerns going into the service learning partnership. “What type of student might I get? Or would I end up with more headaches than benefits.” David Walker reiterated his original concerns regarding the college students would not add to but rather detract from the services of the Red Cross. “You know as I told you when we first added the courses I had a lot of apprehension about those young people coming in. But it just turn out not to be true. I think they’ve been a godsend to us.” There was overall agreement by all three partners that the unknown elements of the program were initially frightening but all three were also pleased with the outcome of the partnership.

When asked about their specific role in this service learning project, Klingensmith
stated that he had a facilitative role in this process. “My role is primarily as a facilitator. I provide an opportunity for people to come together to look for service experiences. And then I allow for the opportunity for those participating to seek more engagement with the group of their choice. Almost with every group not, with every person but with every group, you know at some point someone says “aha” this is what I want to do, this is really important. And if I’ve done a good job there will be a lot of those aha moments.”

Rod Cook saw his role as the primary facilitator of the partnership from the agency standpoint. Additionally, he reiterated his desire and expectation to be a part of the student outcome and meaning-making debriefing process. “For the most part I have a quite good understanding, for example I am the key point of contact for the agency, the spokesperson for the agency, the educator internally for the agency. I think this will be asked later but I will bring it up now whether I can play a role in this or not, a key part of the debriefing where we find out the outcomes.”

David Walker perceived his role as a direct facilitator of person and project. He also expanded his thoughts about his role to encompass promoting social consciousness. “My role is to identify those projects needs that the students could do to benefit our organization and just to supervise and coordinate as well. I guess I really think that hopefully they will leave here having more of a humanitarian approach to their dealings with the other people outside of the campus and in real life. I hope they want to care about people more.” Professor Hennen and the service learning literature would agree. It appears that participation in service learning
has affected David Walker. He says he has progressed from worrying that students could not do anything for him to seeing the students as a valuable asset, to advocating greater social consciousness for the students.

Cook and Walker were also asked about the demands on people and their roles in order to accomplish service learning at the Red Cross. Cook shared that it took a great deal of effort beyond his role to make service learning happen. He identified the various types of positions necessary to facilitate such a partnership. “I think it goes beyond just me. I mean I have to have buy-in from the staff, especially staff. Who I am going to assign to work with the students depends on who is coming in and I assign the participants to be supervised by the staff so they are actually more the daily supervisor. Buy-in by the staff is very important. David Walker seemed to reinforce the statements of Rod Cook at a more base level. He simply shared that there seemed to be participation in the program by members of the Red Cross organization at all levels. “You know everybody took part of it even the accounting folk.” Hence, in order to make service learning happen, the leaders have to accomplish “buy in” by all the staff.

The next question in the leadership and management category asked all three respondents to share how they worked with their partner organization. Dr. Klingensmith had shared earlier that he would connect with the various service providers at those sites to ensure that students were meeting the requirements of those organizations. Rod Cook too had identified the various roles he played to facilitate the service learning partnership.
One important element for which Cook assumes responsibility is the broad based, service learning strategic planning. Walker works primarily through cook in relation to service learning. “I worked through Rod in this process. He was the primary conduit.” Hence, Cook and Klingensmith appear to make the service learning relationship work for their organizations and it appears that it works because of their personal commitment. Additionally, the fact that their values are consistent with service learning objectives appears to be a key factor.

When discussing day-to-day operations, Klingensmith, Cook and Walker said that various staff work with the students on a daily basis. Depending on the staff needs and the students’ interest, everybody in the organization is involved in making the program work day-to-day.

In terms of day-to-day operations of the academic class, Klingensmith was the person responsible. He designed the class and the activities to promote student reflection on their experiences at the Red Cross.

When asked about negotiating changes in the partnership, Klingensmith shared that this responsibility belonged to the individual instructor and the agency representative.

“In my case it would or could be me or whoever sees the need, I think we are open enough that if there is a problem that is identified that needs resolved, either can bring it forward for open discussion if there is a problem. Sometimes I think we are just not able to supply the students the agency needs and I always feel a little guilty about that but on
the other hand part of the mission is to expose them to different opportunities. So even though the agency may feel that we haven’t got anything out of this yet, they had the opportunity to tell their story to a body of students and I perceive that as a pretty useful exercise for them. Planting the seeds for maybe ten to twenty years. Maybe you are not rewarded today but in the long run there is a benefit.” Rod Cook saw this role as his responsibility for the Red Cross. Walker agrees with this assessment. “If I see anything that needed changed then I would bring it to Rod’s attention.”

The last topic covered actual changes in the program that had to be implemented. Dr. Klingensmith had not perceived any need for change in the program that had to be implemented. Rod Cook also seemed to echo the sentiment. He too did not perceive any needed changes within their partnership other than “the only thing I’ve already shared is the recommendation of sharing the outcomes.” He also agreed with Dr. Klingensmith regarding the process of negotiated change should a need be identified. Interestingly, David Walker who was initially apprehensive about this partnership experience said the following, “Well I would like to see more, more students assigned. We have lots of work for them to do. Well you know I was apprehensive at the beginning about having the students do it, but once I saw the quality of the work then I thought this was for the best of everyone. I think this has been very positive for the organization.”

To sum up, the service learning partnership between Professor Klingensmith and the Red Cross has worked well for the Red Cross and helped them extend their services and
the quality of those services. There were some limitations due to physical facilities, even after adapting the facilities. Professor Klingensmith’s version of service learning operates somewhat like a volunteer program with in-class processing, rather than classic service learning. He sees his service learning project as an extension of his participation in Newark’s Community Leadership Program. He is trying to expose Ohio State Newark students to the Newark community and the multiple services offered within the community. He does not have course content that that is the focus of the service learning other than the service per se and the building of greater awareness of the community and its services. He hopes his student volunteers will make a permanent commitment to be community volunteers. The Red Cross agrees with this emphasis and already has students who have become volunteers after the course.

Rod Cook as the Red Cross director has conceptual understanding of service learning, he works to achieve “buy-in” with his staff, and wants to know more about the outcomes for students who volunteer at the Red Cross.

The partnership was created by the 2 central players, Professor Klingensmith and Rod Cook. They already knew and trusted each other because of prior community contact; hence, building trust and a relationship was not a task had to be accomplished. Klingensmith also did not have the explain service learning to cook. In fact, Cook knew the subtleties of the service learning process better than Professor Klingensmith. Hence, another possible educational and buy-in task was not needed in this relationship.
There has been few problems in the operation of this service learning partnership and little need to consider changes. Rod Cook would like to have a formal evaluation of outcomes for students. It is not clear whether this desire will be addressed or not, especially with professor Klingensmith retiring. The maintenance of the service learning program after professor Klingensmith retires is an issue yet to be engaged.

Professor Klingensmith initiated this service learning program partially in response to an Ohio State Newark request for service learning proposals for funding and mostly out of his own personal commitment to leadership in community service. This internal personal commitment seems very important and if the university decides to continue the program after he retires, finding another professor with a similar commitment may be an important factor to the continuation of this effort.

Case Three

Background

Dr. Sonny Caldwell is a non-tenured English professor at OSU-Newark who is in her fifth year with the university. This is the third university/college where Dr. Caldwell has been employed. She has moved off the tenure track process to split her time between teaching courses and administering the OSU-Newark Writing Lab. Dr. Caldwell elected to incorporate service learning into an advanced 500 level English/Rhetoric (English 567) course at OSU-Newark. This is the first course Dr. Caldwell has taught where service
learning was a required element of the class though this was the third section of the course which she has elected to incorporate this process.

For the purpose of designing the service learning experience, Dr. Caldwell partnered with the United Way of Licking County. As was previously mentioned, the United Way of Licking County supports and funds 55 programs at 23 service agencies within the county. The community service partnering agency was represented by both the Executive Director; Donna Carpenter and the Community Impact Director, Sylvia Freil. Carpenter was instrumental in setting up the service partnership while Freil oversaw the actual service projects in which the students were engaged. Carpenter has been the Director of the United Way of Licking County for eight years. Freil has been in her position with the agency for five years.

Analysis

All three of these individuals, constituting the service learning partnership case three, were presented with the same series of questions about the nature of their partnership and experience. The following are highlights of the seven core partnership components identified by the Berquist, Betwee, and Meuel (1995) model and adapted for the exploration of service learning partnership development.

Structure
The first of the seven components of partnership organizational mission, purpose, goals, and objectives were reviewed.

The mission of the organizations as described by both partner representatives was again fairly distinct; however, a tone on community engagement was relayed by Dr. Caldwell, more so than the other faculty participants. Dr. Caldwell described the mission of The Ohio State University at Newark as a regional campus. “I think that perhaps more now than even two years ago, the mission is to really umm help cultivate this community in lots or ways, you know, not just by recruiting local students but by you know kind of augmenting the reputation of Ohio State and the community. I think another part of the mission is to act as a flagship. I think that cultivating ties that are more long term cultivating this area would be high up on the list.” Carpenter, as Director of the United Way of Licking County was very specific about their organization’s mission. “Our purpose is to identify the needs within the community and then to raise funds to meet those needs and that is specific to Licking County Ohio. In its primary health and human service focus type of needs”. Freil echoed this definition. “Simply to raise and distribute funds to meet the community needs in Licking County human services specifically. We also will work to identify the needs of the community not just raise funds but to identify needs to direct those funds where needed to.”

When asked how their respective organization missions were similar to or different from their partnering entity, there seemed to be a disconnect between the faculty
members perception of the service agency’s mission and the service agency members perception of the university’s mission. Dr. Caldwell described the mission differences as “I think they have a less comprehensive group or audience that they service. They are more highly focused on a certain population. The United Way is what we call a clearing house of a lot of basic fundraising for groups. They focus a lot on more of some of the administrative aspects of those groups than provide direct service. I think that universities are basically different in their purpose and mission.” When prodded as to any similarities between their respective missions and/or purpose Dr. Caldwell did not perceive that there was much coherence or overlap between the two. When the question of mission similarities was presented Dr. Caldwell shared “Umm, sure the whole lack of money” and, when further asked about mission or goal similarities, she added “Well another similarity I see is that both sides of the experience – the agency based part and the academic part- have one contact person. In the academic part it is me, in the agency it is whoever, but it is an individual. And usually that is the agency’s choice because they do not want people underfoot saying “who do I talk to, who do I talk to”. So students don’t deal with Donna (the Director) because there is no concrete reason to”. Carpenter seems to have a much more integrated concept of the organizations respective missions and purposes. When posed the same question as to mission/purpose similarities and difference, Ms. Carpenter shared, “I think the place where they’re most similar is that through learning and assistance both organizations help individuals within
our community. I am sure there is also assessment done by the university in order to help students to enroll in the right type of courses the same way we’d do assessment of needs and then fund a program to meet those needs so probably more similar than we think. One divergence of mission as you would think of it is obviously we do fundraising across the community by volunteers and while the university does generate some money this way, it relies much more on tuition and other revenue generators. I’d say that by far is the most different rules the two have”. Clearly the community service agency partner has a more inclusive and integrated perception of the two organizations mission and purpose.

When posed the question of organizational goals, the two partners seems to have a more integrated and compatible perception in this area. However, Dr. Caldwell does purport a measure of pessimism as to the realization of those goals. “The one thing I want to say (about shared goals) is the reciprocal relationship but it is not. Students just see it is volunteering and not so much as learning from the experience. The reciprocal relationship and the learning they should be experiencing is highlighted from day one but many student just never get that. They simply see it as volunteering. So the shared goal with the community organization of the reciprocal learning is not actually realized. Hence, the learning objectives and the 2-way learning (students learning course content and its use at the agency and students learning from the agency about the community, and the agency learning about the use of language in their publications) is not happening for many students. In Caldwell’s perspective these students just see
themselves as volunteers.

Carpenter and Sylvia Freil seem to take a more optimistic view of organizational goals and the potential for shared goals with the university. When asked if she perceives any shared goals with the university, Carpenter said, “Oh definitely I think that’s obvious with students being here. They will get a great sense of the United Way’s role in the community and that in and of itself is a real learning experience.” She added that she thought the students learned about a non-profit agency and its operations. She indicated that most students say, “I didn’t know that you did so much”. Hence, she focused on the students learning about her non-profit organization and not about language per se. Freil added, “Our goal is so that they continue volunteering either with the United Way or another agency so they see the value of that time spent”. Again, the agency focus is on continued volunteerism, not language use. Basically, class content is lost.

**Shared Direction**

The second of the seven components of partnership that was examined was shared direction. Within this core component issues of defining partnership, exploring motivation for partnering, and understanding expectations of partnering were examined.

Dr. Caldwell phrased her perspective of partnership as “not being blinded to differences in organizations, needs, agendas, but it makes sense for you to work together because you do share common goals, or you work together to serve your individual goals
and toward some measure of common goals. Dr. Caldwell emphasized that there was individual and some common goals and the shared goals are appropriately labeled by the term “partnership”.

This contrasted with the opinions expressed by the two service agency representatives. As the Director of the United Way of Licking County, Ms. Carpenter seemed more intent on partnership in terms of shared learning. Ms. Carpenter described her perspective of partnership by stating, “it means that organizations and individuals within those organizations come together and work together for a mutually agreed upon end for whatever time. It has been determined that you both can produce more together than individually. You can learn from each other and actually have results that come from specific assignments. It is more an issue as partners that both of the two sides sort of speak to how they really feel. That you’ve learned, contributed and benefited and did it from such a relationship”. There is a much stronger emphasis on the concept of reciprocity and mutual benefit from the perception of Carpenter than Caldwell.

When pressed as to both the motivation for participating in the service learning partnership and the expectation(s) of that partnership, Dr. Caldwell alluded to some of her motivations for partnering in this process as “some of it for me too is that it keeps from getting bored. It also seemed like simply a good idea and that there was no one else who seemed to want to do it. I thought it was important for our school and the community”. There are multiple assumptions in her perceptions. Individually, she may
be bored with her work and this gives her an unusual outlet for her energy. Service learning is a good idea for students and worth supporting. No one else was interested in the project, so she did it. This contrasts interestingly with the rationale for partnership formation in this service learning experience as defined by the two service agency representatives. Ms. Carpenter emphasized that the partnership made real talent and skills of the students available to the agency. “We certainly utilize skills to get certain jobs done and projects completed. This certainly gives us opportunities to showcase in a real hands on way the many ways we do what we do within our offices and therefore how that impacts the community. So many people, especially the students leave here with a better understanding of not only what the United Way is as an organization. So I think they end up knowing much more about us and we certainly learned from them along the way too. I know some discussions that my staff members have with them (students) provide direction. It allows staff members to be open to both listening to and giving information to and from students. It really is a two way street of learning”. The partnership is seen as a means to both expand the mission and purpose of the agency while making students aware of United Way programs, services, and philosophies. In addition, Carpenter perceives that her staff aids the students in finding direction in their lives. She sees mutual benefits; however, once again, there is no mention of the use of language, or course content in her perceptions.

On exceptions that they had for the service learning partnership, Dr. Caldwell
responded to this question in terms of her needs. She knew nothing about service learning and had never done a service learning project in the past. She wanted to learn about service learning conceptually and about her host agency. In essence, she wanted the agency to be her mentor on service learning. “So I guess to me the mentoring relationship – between mentor and teacher – is reciprocal as well. I see this as true with the agency as actually my mentor”.

Ms. Carpenter presented a more outcomes oriented approach when defining expectations for the service learning partnership. “I have an expectation that we would have good, I wouldn’t necessarily say good, that we would have working projects that were really beneficial to us and not just busy work, really things that need to be done and that the students would use their skills to do that enhancing their skills at the same time. And that they would learn about us. So I think it is learning about the United Way as an expectation. And to come out of that experience with both sides being much more knowledgeable about each other.” Here we see that tangible outcome expectations include work product, knowledge enhancement for both student and agency staff, and the need for reciprocity.

The next line of questioning focused on the perspective of the various needs of the two organizations, either the university or the United Way agency. When asked to relay her perception of the needs of The Ohio State University at Newark that would be met within this partnership, Dr. Caldwell shared “well I would say the whole notion of
outreach is something that this campus has been after. This program certainly furthers that objective. So outreach is certainly one. Expanding the notion of diversity on campus as well. Students are exposed to others who may not be like them.” Dr. Caldwell identified two specific goals of the university, 1) outreach and engagement, and 2) diversity enhancement and enrichment that could be further through this service learning partnership. She was informed and aware of two university goals and how this partnership would advance them

So too, Ms. Carpenter and Ms. Freil identified specific needs and goals of the United Way agency that could be furthered via this service learning partnership. Ms Carpenter stated “one outcome could be as specific as we really need to get this project or activity done or it might just be a special project or program that the professional staff never had the time to complete. So it really has caused us to be focused on making sure we are prepared and that everyone has a good experience. That they (students) do learn and that they perceive this as well spent and they recognize that yes that this may mean spending half an hour shredding papers but the activity has a meaning and a purpose”. This partnership gave the United Way person power to get more work done and it motivated the staff to think in advance how to direct and support the students. Ms Freil reinforces that belief when she shares that “they (students) did complete some of the work that needed to get done and they did provide input of some of those.” We see the value
of the students’ service in assisting the United Way on specific projects and tasks that have meaning for both the service agency and the students as well.

The next question was more personal in nature. What did they expect to get out of the partnership personally? Dr. Caldwell identified her perspective on this topic as “to learn something about my community and the surrounding area. To really get a feel of who is in our community and the contributions they make. To move off the mainstream of our community and interact with others who make a difference. To expand the creativity of my courses and the impact they make on student and the community. To fulfill my service commitments as a faculty member as well. I think most of the people we work with – I would change that to some of the people we work with - feel service learning is only volunteerism and I want to change that perspective. I want to help make my colleagues aware of the true value of this experience.” Here we see a desire for more of a personal connection to the larger community and to the members of that community who provide service. Additionally there is a personal desire to forward her goals as a faculty member and to forward the notion of service learning as a worthwhile academic endeavor and not just be seen as volunteerism. Hence, she had multiple and complex goals.

Ms. Carpenter and Ms Freil take this question in a different direction. Ms Carpenter responded to this question with, “I personally would like feedback from the university, you yourself, the instructors, the professionals of the campus as to what the
students felt about the experience and that will help us as we hopefully continue the partnership. Another expectation is that my staff will have learned a thing or two in regards to how to prepare for and ensure that someone coming in for short term project work is provided with guidance and support to have a good experience”. So, Ms. Carpenter desires evaluative feedback on student outcomes from their experiences at the United Way. She wants her staff to be organized and skilled at making short-term help a meaningful experience. Ms. Freil adds to this with her perspective. She states, “I would love to have more students as we’re working on that community blueprint. There’s a need almost every step of the way for something that students can assist us with. So it’s the things that I don’t have time to do that a student can hopefully take the time to really make it a quality experience and product. For instance, we have a pharmacy card that we’re trying to distribute and it’s a discount card and I would dearly love to have a student checking with some of the local pharmacies to see if they would accept the card. And it probably does take a phone call and some conversations and footwork to get this distributed and going the extra mile that students could help with and their usually more than willing to probably do” Both Ms. Carpenter and Ms. Freil approach their own personal involvement in the service learning experience from a “get the job done” perspective. Ms. Carpenter wants to ensure that qualities work experiences are designed and applied in this process. She sees this as an opportunity to facilitate staff development within her organization as well. Ms. Freil identifies her personal involvement as applied
in the work realm. This is an opportunity to attend to some of the organizations desire initiatives that might otherwise not be broached.

The next question posed to the individuals who comprise the third case study was what they hoped their organization would gain from the project. Dr. Caldwell responded by sharing “another form of content that can make a difference within the community. I hope this will give the university some form of capital with the community. I also hope it will help people outside the university walls. Of course most people within the university do not practice service learning. I hope my colleagues can learn from my experiences”

So, she has 3 hopes, 1) university gains social capital in the community, 2) the project actually helps people, and 3) the project will help spread service learning among other faculty members.

Comparatively, Ms Carpenter shared her hopes of the partnership for the United Way. “I would hope that the students, having completed their internships, will review the United Way in a more positive manner or that they just will have learned about the United Way in general. Many never really knew about us. I hope to give them a sense of the value that we bring in relation to the community and hopefully that they will volunteer in the future and maybe become donors.” Sylvia Freil added that it was her hope that this relationship would provide “a better quality project or product. I always feel good especially with myself and the agency whenever we can give someone else the opportunity to do something to contribute in a meaningful way and to teach a little bit”.
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From the responses to the questions it can be extrapolated that Dr. Caldwell’s primary hope and interest that the university can make a positive contribution to the local community and build positive relationships with that very community as a result. Additionally, she again shares her desire to influence her faculty colleagues on the virtues of service learning as an academic construct. From Donna Carpenter’s perspective it seems that she hopes students will become exposed to and create a sense of understanding toward the United Way organization and maybe create a long term investment with the group. Sylvia Freil again echoes her consistent theme of enhancement and enrichment to the project and programs offered via the United Way.

Finally we concluded our interview questions by asking the three individuals to identify what service their organization provides (university or United Way agency) and to share how they believe that service to be affected by the service learning partnership.

Dr. Caldwell stated that “I haven’t thought much about the second question, but the first question makes me think of the phrase “open admission”. We basically provide access to the masses. Everyone in our process can think of themselves as a learner. We are able to work with people as a person of reflection. They may struggle but you know, we provide opportunity to those that are place bound or who need an alternative to selective admission. I am not exactly sure exactly how our organization will be affected by the service learning experience. I am sure the university will be exposed to a number of individuals who may not have had exposure to it in any other conditions. We will have
possibly made advocates for the university from those individuals who served with us in the partnerships”. Dr. Caldwell focuses on learning and reflection and becoming a learning person through reflection. This applies to her students and to staff at the United Way. She wants them all to become reflective learners. Additionally, she hopes the United Way will become an advocate and supporter of the university as a result of this service learning project.

Donna Carpenter stated, “I believe our main purpose of service would be knowing, identifying and prioritizing, and funding solutions to community needs. Really knowing what is going on and the underlying root causes. I would tell you that within recent activities that we’ve had the interns involved with such as a meeting for the community blueprint, they have had the opportunity to at least hear reports and compile information. I know that one individual (student) that was here has expressed a great deal of interest in coming to assist our organization outside the normal schedule to do some work within that community blueprint. From both the community needs assessment and from the fund raising side, they have helped us look at some types of reporting and how we put together its mission to present to community leaders, and to or the community council. We actually have a student right now who is helping us write some various news releases in regards to some books that we are donating to the library to tell our story.” Hence, the quality of the assessment, publications, and other tasks of the United Way increase because of the students.
Systems

Systems means organizational operations, values, beliefs, behaviors, and communication flow.

On operations, Dr. Caldwell said, “The whole service learning experience is fairly new to me. I thought it was my responsibility to find out not only as much as I could about service learning, but service learning in this particular department, in this particular course. So I wound up chatting on line with a couple of people who teach (English) 567 on the main campus, requesting their syllabi. Then I researched a number of organizations who might be interested in being a partner and then went ahead and contacted those people. I would say more than half of them were very interested and very agreeable to the opportunity. I soon learned that partnering was pretty easy but follow-up was my responsibility as well.” So, Dr. Caldwell learned she was the organizer. She designed, initiated, implemented, problem solved and did all the follow up. She was the face of Ohio State Newark. These are more roles than many faculty are used to filling.

Donna Carpenter responded to this question with an overview of the operations of the United Way from the Board of Directors to the front line service providers within the organization. She described a tightly coupled system.

How does Ohio State Newark and the United Way make decisions? Dr. Caldwell reiterated that she as the faculty member who had created the course service learning
construct was the primary decision maker of the program. In a loosely coupled organization like Ohio State Newark, decision making is diffuse. It can be totally in the hands of one person for a project like this particular service learning project. Donna Carpenter saw decision making within her organization as a more collaborative process with multiple individuals participating from the administration, that staff and volunteers.

“Well because we are a pretty, no very collaborative type of organization, it depends on what you need and who you need to get your input from in order to make decisions. Also, if we are going to impact the community we would actually go to the community to gather information. Now whether that’s through our division, our committee members who are representatives of the community as volunteers, or internally from an operations type of decision making standpoint. As the Executive Director I provide the direction where I can because the boardroom has hired me to provide that service. But I also use of a huge amount of input from the staff because they really are the experts on what they do because it’s their business. So it’s probably more team focus and collaborative.”

Carpenter describes a system that is a single system with political dimensions. The Executive Director needs to understand who and where you coordinate with others. The Executive Director is the ring master and although there are given hierarchy and politics, the organization is ultimately a team and collaboratively joined in making decisions.

Sylvia Freil described a system where there is some independent idea generation but a collaborative approach in terms of making those logistics decision. “That depends on
what the decision is I guess. I pretty much decide what direction I would like to go with the project and then I run it by my supervisor. There may be other times that she has a project that she may want to see get done so she lets us know exactly how she wants it - like with the community blueprint. I generally if I have a doubt or a question especially if it involves another partner, I can run it by my supervisor to get an additional perspective." In other words, logistics and tactics flow between the Executive Director and a project chair. Sometimes the project chair is left on their own accord and sometimes this is not the case.

The third question within this category asked each of the three participants to describe what their organization’s values. Dr. Caldwell shared that she believed the university valued a strong “town-gown” relationship and collaboration with the larger community. “I think it’s the solid relationship that it can build with the town. This is extremely important here because of the strong local support for the university. We have donors here who give several millions of dollars to build buildings on our campus. So I think service learning supports that relationship. I think it also, this is kind of vague and I have thought of it off and on. It kind of submits a sense of the school in the community and the community in the school. In some extent I feel that service learning has been around for a long time and in different forms like practicum and internships. I know they are not identical but they are similar. I think sometimes that connection to the community takes a back burner in the vision of the campus but with service learning it
becomes the core value.” Are regional universities community and regionally oriented land-grant entities, at least mostly? Are regional universities research universities like their parent Ohio State Columbus? Professor Caldwell believes they are at least largely regional and community land-grant universities and promoting the common good with the community is valued as a conscious goal.

Donna Carpenter was very passionate in her response that the United Way valued its constituents – the people of Licking County Ohio. She also shared that the organization valued collaboration and teamwork with other organizations for the purpose of promoting the common good. “I would say we value people and people as who they are, not necessarily as what you might want them to be. I would also say that we value honesty and directness and team efforts and supportive kinds of styles and approaches. And, we value direct communication because to my knowledge none of us possesses the ability to read other’s minds so we really do need to raise issues and make suggestions because everyone brings something to the table and whatever that diversity is whether within your life experiences or whatever you bring has valuable. So you must be careful to be inclusive or you’ll miss out on things.” Sylvia Freil seemed to support Donna Carpenter’s assessment of United Way values though in a more succinct manner. “Really in meeting their needs that are out there. Making the donors happy. Making sure that it’s really customer service focused with our donors, are agencies, and our customers.”
The next question was something of a follow-up to the previous one. Here, the three participants were asked to describe what their organization believes. Dr. Caldwell centered her response to this question on the belief that the university held regarding the positive nature of community outreach and engagement. She tied this to service learning as supporting this belief. “I would say the people who create the base, faculty along with senior administrators, value and believe in community base and community outreach more in their support of service learning. If you were to attempt to serve to community. I think the university perceives service learning to be a highly interactive process between the institution and the community. It is hard to pin point actual beliefs outside of that context.” Donna Carpenter shared the United Way’s belief in the intrinsic value of every person. Additionally, the United Way believes that they can and do make a difference in local community members’ lives. “We really believe that all people start each and every day expecting to do their best they can do and to do the right things. We believe that our organization needs to support that and continue improvement and positive approaches. We really believe, as we talked about the mission and vision, believe that our work that we do whether its determining the needs of the community or developing plans for fund raising or what whatever, everything we do we believe can make a difference in the lives of people.” Sylvia Freil added her perspective in the belief of people having needs and the role of the United Way in responding to those defined needs. “I think that there is a belief that there are some specific needs and that people want to see their contributions
going to projects they can make a difference. And we believe that we’re good at partnering with multiple entities and helping people come together toward a common shared goal are shared vision. And there’s a belief that people want to give, want to help, and want to volunteer. And that’s very important and is meaningful I guess.”

The next question was an additional component to the previous two questions. This question asked the professor and the Executive Director to describe their organization’s behavior(s). This was a more difficult question for the three participants to comprehend and answer clearly. Dr. Caldwell focused her response on the university’s pension for highly interactive partnerships and collaborations. She described partnering as a behavior exhibited extensively by the university. “Again, I perceive that the university tries to make this a highly interactive process. There is a great deal of collaboration with the community agency partners. Problem solving is definitively on the agenda in this process as well. I know I hope to tackle a real problem or need with the agency. If you have a need that real and important, it’s meetable and has not been met then we will sit down and talk and work something out. I want to underscore that the agenda within service learning are quite complex and may reach into a number of areas and one of the things I even put in my syllabus is the true value of partnership in behaviors and concepts. This is to make it clear that it’s not just about writing letters and papers in an office but to help an agency make a difference in their work with people who need it.” Donna Carpenter also shares her perspective that the United Way is very
cooperative with other groups and individuals “I would say that our behavior is one of a team oriented approach, where collaboration is pervasive. Yes, I would say the behaviors are very much team oriented. I would say that from our board to our volunteers we are very connected. I often think what can I do or how can I help in this team approach.”

The next question in the systems category moved away from a focus on the individual’s specific organization and now focused on the partnership. This question asked the three participants to share how they would describe how the service-learning partnership operated. Dr. Caldwell had previously described her perception of the collaborative approach and cooperative working relationship that had been established. Donna Carpenter seemed to also acknowledge a close collaborative working relationship between the university and the United Way. Open communication and a focus on preplanning the experience were key elements in her mind. “I think operationally from number one being given notice that there were students available, developing a kind of timeframe, clearly understanding the expectations for the students in a class experience so that we can do our best to match up our intentions. So I think the whole well defined process makes it much easier because we don’t have a lot of time to waste. Either one of us, on either side, could provide input to say well this is not going exactly the way we thought. So I think the whole structure in early-on communication is essential and very important and I don’t really know if there is a core evaluation by the student, or by us, or
by the university but I would think that there probably is because from the supervisors, the staff, and the students are the ones who will or have done that.”

Next, the respondents were asked to describe how the partnership makes decisions. Dr. Caldwell felt that she herself had done a great deal of leg-work initially designing the experience as well as outlining many of the logistics of the partnership. In her mind, this eliminated the need for many decisions to be made during the course of the service learning experience. “Largely up front. As I am sure you are aware, most non-profits are understaffed and over-extended and I have found that in most of them there really isn’t a lot of extra time on their hands. So I really try to plan as much as possible before I go into the meeting with the agency administration. I go and visit places and talk to people and I ask them what’s on their minds about this partnership, what do I need to start thinking about and then try to devise a strategy for the program. It’s a very task focused process and identifying this is what needs to get done.” Donna Carpenter seemed to agree with Dr. Caldwell’s assessment that preplanning and open communication were key components to making a successful venture for all involved. “Well and I guess the place I go back to is that same discussion comes to mind. It was the meeting with Sunny a couple years ago and she basically presented along with you and some of the students that would be working with. We were able to see this could happen and we asked questions and I felt like there was a real dialogue back and forth saying you know I think we can do this and the students would benefit from this. So the
dialog really helped us get to what I think are reasonable expectations on both sides.”

Sylvia Freil too stated the importance of open dialogue and having Dr. Caldwell provide clear expectations at the beginning of the process. “I would say with Dr. Caldwell we would communicate openly. She would let each of us know what she needed and what her goals were and when the students came here we worked out what project they would be working on.”

This next question asked them to describe what they believed the partnership valued. Dr. Caldwell rolled her response to the question of the partnership values, beliefs and behaviors into one singular statement. “I think that the partnership values are reinforced via the service learning experience and it relates to helping and serving certain populations in need. Service to the community seems to be the most prevalent shared value and belief.” Donna Carpenter shared her perception that the partnership values worthwhile learning experiences for the students involved in the service learning process. “I would think the partnership values at least seeing the students in action with our staff and those sorts of things. I think there really is a value that people have a good experience that they learn, that they feel like their time and talent has been used.” Sylvia Freil seemed to echo the sentiments espoused by Donna Carpenter. She too believed the partnership valued “meaningful experiences” for students. “I guess to give the meaningful experience to the students and to be exposed to two different organizations. They were exposed to a whole different meaning. That they are exposed to the United
Way. And that’s not just what the students learned that’s what the partners learn about each other.”

The next two questions in the systems category asked the respondent to share what beliefs are manifest and/or behaviors demonstrated in the partnerships. As was previously mentioned, Dr. Caldwell had provided one single answer for this set of questions. “I think that the partnership values are reinforced via the service learning experience and it relates to helping and serving certain populations in need. Service to the community seems to be the most prevalent shared value and belief.” Donna Carpenter had a broader view of the partnership beliefs and behaviors. “I think the beliefs are of learning on both sides and that there will be a contribution made actually from the communities to what is accomplished during the partnership experience.” When discussing partnership behavior Ms. Carpenter added “I would say for my side I hope that professional support of knowledgeable efforts are experienced by the interns. I would say without exception that the efforts put forth by the interns during their time with us has exceeded our expectations.” She seemed to focus the partnerships behaviors on sustaining a viable service experience onsite at the United Way. Sylvia Freil provided a response on her perception of the partnerships beliefs and behaviors that closely mirrored the response of Ms. Carpenter. “The beliefs that were manifest was the importance to do a project like this for students to provide an experiential learning base to learning outside of the classroom To give them a meaningful experience in which they contributed
to something.” As for organizational behaviors, Ms. Freil summed her perception as “again the behaviors that were demonstrated in the partnership I think were open dialogue. Yes they let us know that their time restrictions how long the quarter less what needs to happen by certain times if Dr. Caldwell didn’t communicate that the students certainly did. And that was nice to know those pieces.”

On communication flow in the partnership, there seems to be total consensus on this matter. Dr. Caldwell reiterated that she had conducted a good deal of work before meeting with the United Way administrators. She shared how she presented that work to them and they in-turn dialogued about the merits of the proposed process. She also indicated that once agreement was met regarding the process of the service learning experience, the two partnering groups kept open lines of communication available to them in the form of telephone calls and e-mails. Donna Carpenter described a similar process when she responded to this topic. “I think communications flow consists of the contact from the university saying we should enter into this partnership. We were told how students would participate with us in this process and our response was very positive. We all came to a clear understanding of what the expectations are from both sides as to what is going to occur, what the outcome should be, the time that should be spent so and so forth. So I think it is clearly setting those expectations initially. And I think we’ve always thought that when any question or concern cropped up that all we had do was pick up this the phone or send an e-mail or whatever. That was great
because I’ve never been bashful about that my life.” Sylvia Freil also shared the benefit of Dr. Caldwell’s preplanning and open lines of communication especially contrasted to a faculty member that was also working with the United Way who had not planned well and did not communicate openly. “It was generally good and it was open. I would have to say with a one student who was doing general service work didn’t even know who the professor was. The one that I think was a little more formalized was Sunny Caldwell. We had contracts and everything and there is a difference when those happens because the student on what they should be doing and so were we.”

The final question presented in the systems category asked the three participants to share how the partnership was guided or shaped by their individual needs. The responses to this question were centered upon each individual specific needs within the service learning program. Dr. Caldwell was very focused on her goals as a teacher.

“That might be best described by stating the need to change students’ relationship to learning. Helping students understanding of the role of writing within their life. Enriching our students writing behavior and their relationship to writing. Many students will go through their whole college careers think of writings as a chore and as a means to an end. They do not feel like it is a point of attachment to anything other than school performance. The service learning experience has the potential to show them writing in a whole new light. Writing is yours. It doesn’t belong to the university it is yours. You are the creative force with language. Writing is not just for performance.” So, Dr.
Caldwell interpreted the question in terms of her needs as an instructor, her value commitment to her discipline. She did not focus on Ohio State Newark’s needs per se. She wants to change how students view writing in their lives and to view it as a way of expressing their power and influence. The use of language within the service learning experience at the United Way was a valuable means to this end. Donna Carpenter felt that the service learning partnership brought additional staffing and support to meet the needs of the United Way and the United Way’s needs were her needs. “I would say from our needs, we never have enough staff to get things done so we have things that are put off that we’d really like to the write like a paper on this or we’d really like to do some research in this area. We know we could use some research done by the students and that just takes time that we do not usually have with our regular staff. I think that just being able to utilize those skills from the students really helps us with those things that are important to us but we would never get it done.” Sylvia Freil also saw great value in the work product generated by the service learning students. “Well I would say the project or the product that they (students) were working on. This was so valuable in ways to meet our needs; saving the specific project work was a value in substance to the organization.”

Operations

The fourth of the six components of partnership that was examined was operations.
Control of the partnership, problem solving, communication, physical facilities, marketing and financing were examined.

When asked who do you perceive to be “in control” of this partnership and why, Dr. Caldwell had a definitive perspective on this question. She perceives that she as the faculty member maintains the primary locus of control. “In control of the partnership – I think you mean there’s the agency, the students and me. Probably me and why is in that most cases I am the one to start the process. I say “Hi, we are doing this process and I’d like to talk to you about possible participating. This is how it works. That this is a writing course and how it could connect to them. Students, I’ve had some students who once they were in, were in control of the process. I think also there is also the sense that the agency sees themselves as recipients of service and that means someone is giving them something so the giver is in control. And the students, a few if them are willing to step up and some do. I would love to see a more equitable distribution of power amongst those three people or those three parties.” Caldwell perceives that control comes from several sources. She has the vision for the project in the first place and she has conceptual control of what it will be. She has her learning goals just described above. She initiated the service learning contact and then shares in designing the project with the United Way. Some students take responsibility for themselves and their learning once they are exposed to service learning. She believes that the United Way needs the help and they defer to the help-giver. She desires to share the power of control.
seems to agree that initially the faculty member does have control of the partnership but that perspective shifts to the service agency as the experience unfolds. “Well I think that the university is in its role at the initial start of it because they have the resource that’s been made available to us. I would tell you that we on a day to day basis have control, if you will, based upon how we manage the process. How well we are providing a good experience and how well we utilize the students and I consider that to be the control because if you don’t do that well you shouldn’t have them. So it’s sort of control and responsibility.” Sylvia Freil seemed to concur with the perception of Donna Carpenter but also added that students themselves had a measure of control in the process. “That’s an interesting question. There is control from two different levels. One the control of specifically what was getting done I had control of that. The timeline the university had control of that. The amount of time that was spent working on the project, student had control of it.” So, from Carpenter and Freil’s perspective, the Untied Way controls day to-day operations and supervision and Ohio State Newark controls timing, the students and the strategic design of service learning. These perceptions correspond to the two kinds of leadership in the leadership literature to be discussed in Chapter 5.

The next set of question within the operation category asked each of the three respondents to describe how problem solving occurs within the partnership. Dr. Caldwell perceives that up-front communication, consistent dialogue throughout the experience and some evaluative practice afterwards is important. “Well about once a week we take
an hour in class period and debrief and do trouble shooting. I ask if anything has come up this week we want to talk about. And through this process I have discovered things like agency mentors not providing timely feedback. So students would go into the setting for two hours and have nothing to do because the person hadn’t given them feedback yet. So I always invite students to bring up problems and we all talk openly about how to solve them. We brainstorm possible solutions. I just don’t tell them how to solve it. And sometimes for the problems there are no solutions. So that becomes my problem solving. What I do is talk that over with the agency mentor partner looking at potential resolutions to the issue. If the student is more of the problematic area, I had one placement that the student said I do all this stuff and half the time there is no one for me to give it to. I called the agency partner and asked if there could be some sort of regularized appointment or something or let someone on staff know that and be a contact person for him. I have found that upfront communication between the partners is very important.” Hence, during reflection and debriefings, problems surface, possible solutions the students can implement are created and for some problems, Professor Caldwell talks to the United Way directly. So, classroom reflection covers both reflection about writing and about organizational implementation problems. Students learn how to solve writing problems and how to behave in an organization. Thus, there are actually 2 learning agendas.
Donna Carpenter shared that she did not perceive that any real problem had developed within the partnership with Dr. Caldwell but that a problem solving process had been designed. “I don’t know that we’ve had any, but I think it really goes back to the comments made earlier that we can just pick up the phones and an e-mail to one another if there’s some issue. I would also tell you that if we had an issue it would not be let go for very long at all, that’s our responsibility. I see us working together because if we have this partnership we are each equally responsible for ensuring that we get to those objectives and that we meet those.” There is a distinction in Donna Carpenter’s perception between “problems and issues”. A problem apparently is something that the partnership has not been able to solve. An issue is something they deal with directly and promptly an in ways that meet both their needs. There have not been any problems in the partnership and they have settled issues promptly and to both parties satisfaction.

Sylvia Freil was able to operationalize her response with an actual example related to the service experience with Dr. Caldwell. “I would say that that was after the first set of students had come through, Dr. Caldwell called and we talked about how everything worked out. We had three students working on a similar project together and they kept a notebook on their ongoing communication with each other. I didn’t like the way that worked out because each to of the three students was working on one project. I didn’t know who was doing what although they did and we did get an ultimate product but it was hard to know if they did their work equally and who was responsible for what.
That was difficult to having multiple students working on it. So she (Dr. Caldwell) was open to rethinking this and I would assume the students talked about so much within the class that they would want to redo that process again as well.” As the day-to-day supervisor, Freil wanted detailed information on progress of projects and who was contributing what to those projects. She raised the issue/problem and they found a response.

This led into the next question which asked each of the participants to identify how communication was processed within the partnership. As was previously noted, Dr. Caldwell identified an open communication strategy with direct contact between herself and United Way representatives. Donna Carpenter viewed this process similarly as well. Sylvia Freil shared that students often dictated the level of dialogue that occurred. “Some of it just depends on the student and how open they were to talk to us and to each other. Some are not willing to criticize a process and were uncomfortable doing that, but some certainly did make suggestions. Some students didn’t want to rock at all and some were very candid.” Again there was congruence between the partners related to the importance of open dialogue and communication by all the partnering entities.

The next question was posed only to Donna Carpenter and Sylvia Freil. The two service agency administrators were asked to describe their organization physical facilities. Both Carpenter and Freil shared both positives and challenges related to their facilities. Carpenter described the facilities as somewhat dated and small but adequate.
“Well it’s a base that we’ve occupied now for probably close to eighteen years and it actually probably still has the same wallpaper and carpet that we move into. We have shared offices in some cases with more than one person in most of our 14 offices. There is a central entrance way into the United Way Office. There is a break room to offer. We are in one of those older environments with hard walls rather than in the modular pieces that you often see. We have space that is set aside for volunteers. This is a commitment to like the interns. We have a couple of computers therefore there’s some space for people to work on things like that. So we’re located on this second floor of the National City Bank building and if there was a concern about our location it’s more a fact that there’s not much signage and the ability to find us it is somewhat of a challenge. But that’s not always a downside. People often think United Way does more direct service that it really does so signage could cause us to have visitors that we would really need to send to an agency because we don’t provide that from the central location so there’s a part of me this is maybe that’s OK.” So, the United Way assesses needs, coordinates services, raises funds to meet needs and does not provide direct service. Their facilities are appropriate to their mission. There is little about facilities and volunteers of service learning students’ needs in their analysis. Sylvia Freil too describes the facilities as being adequate but somewhat limited by its placement within the National City Bank building. “I do know from talking to Donna that being located inside of a bank building is sometimes a blessing and a curse. In terms of the work that we do you
don’t necessarily need the masses coming to you because you’re not the direct service provider. So it is easy to be located here, but for the visibility of the organization itself, recognizing the names out there because it is connected to a larger bank building you don’t get your name out there as much.”

The next question in the operations category was posed to all three participants. They were asked to describe how the service learning partnership was marketed. Dr. Caldwell focused her response on how the course experience was marketed to students. She did not feel that institutionally, service learning was marketed as a special program. “Well I put up flyers in the Winter (quarter) listing all the ways the course is a good thing, and discuss the course in some of my previous courses. I talk to other faculty because it is an inter-disciplinary experience and not just English and composition. I invite students from all disciplines. The course description is highlighted. In terms of organizations, I talk with them and try to nail down the experience. I don’t think we market service learning experiences as a university in anyway. I think you know when I first started this, they were happy to see it and I was provided seed money one summer to hire a student to do some online research and help get a proposal together. But aside from that, I don’t feel like I am going to get any recognition.” Hence, Professor Caldwell believes that the university does not market service learning or her course in any way. If it is marketed, the professor does so. This is probably true of all courses. They are listed but not marketed unless the individual professor facilitates that process.
Donna Carpenter believes the reputation of the United Way as a provider of positive experiences for volunteers is key. “Well I really think it’s been one on one marketed. I believe I have been very pleased that we are perceived to be a partner in the internship. I think that hopefully it says that we provide a good experience and that students have benefited from being with us and we are an important part of the community so come and learn and experience with us.” Sylvia Freil had limited knowledge of how the partnership might be marketed. “I wouldn’t really be able to tell you. I don’t think that we market it. It seems to be more from the institution or university standpoint.” Overall there seemed to be minimal marketing of the service learning partnership either on campus or within the greater community.

The last question under the operations category asked the three participants to identify how the partnership was financed. Dr. Caldwell had previously identified that she was provided a small amount of initial monies to help create the service learning course concept but beyond that there minimal financial investment from the university. “I actually worked to make sure that all of our sites are within walking or a short drive distance for the kids. I teach the course in the Spring so there are no travel problems or issues. I know this seems kind of petty but you know our students are always complaining about the amount of hours they work and stuff like that and to have to put in two hours extra seems to be a hardship that I try to minimize.” Donna Carpenter identified the level of support that the United Way contributes to the partnership as a financial
investment. She states that the level of staff time and support constitutes a financial commitment to the partnership. “Well obviously from our side we have to balance each sheet so to speak. Its takes staff time to prepare the work for all the people (student) but I figure the tradeoff is if we had to hire someone to come and do the work it would cost certainly more than what we pay in hard dollars for staff time. Obviously the university has invested time and effort into interacting with us getting the students here. Its basically we just sort of absorb it into our operating budget. And did you know we work with more than 130 volunteers an average year.” Sylvia Freil shared that she believed that the United Way provided a great deal of in-kind support to the service learning partnership but that the university also contributed resource in order for students to complete their service experience. “A lot of that in-kind support and service. When you talk about the site, the students were often come in here with me. They would often work on their own computers or the computers at school because the computer we have here for volunteers is not necessarily up to the same standard they’re used to.” It seemed that both parties, the university and the United Way, believed they contributed in part to the overall financing of the service learning partnership.

**Competency**

The fifth of the six components of partnership that was examined was best practices, learning outcomes, and overall impacts of partnering were examined.
The first set of questions within the competency category asked the University faculty member and the Agency Director to identify what their respective organization does best and what are their organization’s best practices in the service learning partnership. Dr. Caldwell provided a response which focused on the academic design of the partnership. She shared that the university best practice within the service learning partnership were “setting up both a theoretical and a pragmatic disciplinary model.” This contrasted fairly sharply with the response provided by Donna Carpenter. Ms. Carpenter focused her response on identification of concerns of the community and then developing teams for problem solving. “I would say it’s a big picture concerning what we do best and we’ll talk about maybe how that fits in the partnership. I would say the thing that we do best is facilitating, coordinate discussions and identification of issues and then bring people together to work on those issues.” These responses seemed to correspond with the functional roles played by the faculty member and the agency director. Dr. Caldwell identified theoretical design and pragmatic application as the critical strength offered by the university. Donna Carpenter cited community problem identification and response team development as the service agency’s core strength.

The second question asked the Professor and the Agency Director what they believed the other partnering organization to do best in relation to the service-learning partnership. Dr. Caldwell seemed to agree with Donna Carpenter’s assumption of the United Way’s prime asset within the service learning partnership. She indicates that the United Way is
very adept at identifying community needs and organizing response to those needs. She also identifies the United Way’s ability to provide hands-on experiential learning to university students. “I think that they know a great deal about the community and community needs. I think some agencies are more creative thinkers. I think that they are masters of advocacy of community members. I think that they understand the process of incorporating volunteers. They have had experience with interns, volunteers, practicum and stuff like that. They also are able to provide some successful guides and modeling for our students. I think one thing they bring that I cannot is to give students a sense of the real world perspective. I think they translate that real well. They are able to share information in a way that doesn’t happen in an academic setting or place.” Donna Carpenter shared that she believed that Ohio State Newark’s best practices were identifying and training good quality students and creating operational frames for the service learning program to work. “I think it appears to be that based upon the quality of students that we’ve had, that they do a real good job of making matches or at least that the students coming in really understands service learning. You know we have had good work ethics of people who have shored up so many basic things. And so I think it was important for us to understanding what the time frames are and all of the operational pieces that we talked about before and having those kinds of expectations right up front so we can deal with those. And I think the follow-up that we have periodically to talk about how things are going and again the comfort level that if there was an issue that we
certainly could connect.” Again, there seemed to be congruence between Donna Carpenter’s perceptions of the university’ best practices and the thought of Dr. Caldwell on that same issue.

The next series of questions asked the respondents to identify what, if anything, they hoped to learn from partnering with either the United Way in the case of Dr. Caldwell or with Ohio State Newark in the case of Donna Carpenter and Sylvia Freil. Dr. Caldwell identified a desire to learn just about anything from this partnership. “Just on principle I think that in the same way that people say sharks are eating machines, people are learning machines. So it kind of like for me, like rushing into a sprinkler, something’s going to happen and its going to be interesting. You know you’re going to get wet but that’s good. I am just willing to learn from whatever happens. I have enormous respect and admiration for both academic and non-academic work and for the people that perform the kind of community service work that we see.”

Donna Carpenter seemed to present a more focused response to what she was interested in learning. She expressed a desire to receive direct feedback from the students who were active participants in the service learning program. “Well I think for me personally and for the organization too, we want to be sure that we would really get good feedback from the students and to learn what we to the well and if there are many things that we need to change based on the interns experience.” Sylvia Freil also seemed to have a desire to learn from the experiences of student servicing within the partnership. “I
hope to learn about the perspective of others to the United Way and how we communicate our organization. When I talked to Dr. Caldwell’s class that’s the one piece of perspective I really wanted to grasp from those that were younger. It was somewhat energizing in some way as well personally.”

The next question asked the respondent to share what if anything they hope to learn from the students who serve in the service-learning experience. Dr. Caldwell shared that she typically learned something from students in every class though it was not possible to predict what that might be. He also echoed her hope to learn about how students could bet serve the service agency “Oh God, I don’t think I have any hopes I just have confidence that it is going to happen. It’s one of those terrific things about teaching period because most of the teachers I know will tell you, you know every quarter is filled with surprises. One of the things that I particularly hope to learn, you know in a deliberate way, is how people in the agencies handle it. Writing problems, whether it is difficulty in writing blocks or getting things done or whatever it may be. Addressing their various audiences. For example in their fundraising, the United Way has to use their corporate offices and try to get corporations to contribute their time by allowing their employees to spend a week or with United Way fundraising projects

Donna Carpenter restated her desire to receive feedback from the students in the service learning program. “Okay well I hope that we would get back from them feedback in the ways of questions and things while they are here. And also if they have the
opportunity to do in an evaluation after their assignment is over, if we can receive that it would be good. But I hope that what they were taught here, they would ask the questions, make suggestions and wonder about why things happen the way they do.” Sylvia Freil also reinforced here earlier statement that she wanted to learn about the student’s perception of the United Way. “One of the things that I know in my mind with the United Way is that it is difficult to understand what is the central purpose of this central office. Since you are not the direct service provider you look at what service needs are out there in the community and you fund a multitude of service providers. But from a lay person, how do they know that? How do they know about the United Way and how it works? I think that talking to the students to find their perspective to that question it is a great way to gauge their understanding and what they know about this. If you’re going to help us market that, you would be that individual we’d like to market to. So how could that message be effectively delivered. Yes that would be very useful.” Donna Carpenter and Sylvia Freil both shared a desire to hear directly from the students regarding their perceptions of the United Way, their services, and how they market themselves. It is unclear if a formal mechanism for such feedback is implemented though in my observations none were presented.

The next question in the competency category asked each of the participants to share if they anticipated that the other organization would learn anything from their organization. Dr. Caldwell provided somewhat of a convoluted answer to this question.
It seems that she perceives the United Way to be something of a teaching entity, outside of the confines of the traditional university classroom. She felt the United Way learned from the university that they are under-prepared for the students and they also learn about teaching. They learn about clear use of language themselves. They learn how to clean-up a text, focus on the main point, and do less story telling. Donna Carpenter shared that she would like the United Way to be perceived as a viable community resource by the university. Her perception is that the university would learn more about the community and community resources via its partnership with the United Way. Sylvia Freil added that again the focus of learning about the United Way would come form the experience of the students who participated in the service learning experience. I would say it’s probably what the students would communicate. “Since we did meet with Dr. Caldwell, and the students are here that I worked with, they all seemed to have much more knowledge about the United Way and what we do. They all seem to have a much better conceptual base to understand what we do, how we do it, and how they could be connected to that.”

The respondents were then asked what they perceived the students would learn. Dr. Caldwell had previously identified that she hoped students would learn actual hand-on skills with language and how to function and solve problems in an organizational setting. Donna Carpenter hopes that students will learn about the United Way but also what working with and for any similar non-profit agency would be like. “I hope that we’re a
very good example and represent what its like in a nonprofit organization. We expose them to the concepts of all the various places that we work with. I would like to think that they learn about other service provider but that kind of depends on which process they are working for. One of the things that we have done this year is to create an orientation for interns. You know they are really short term temporary employees and I believe there are certain levels of information that they should have access to and things like that so we have begun doing the process.” Sylvia Freil echoed her belief that students learned about the United Way and its particular services. “Yes I think they learned about our organization especially the students who worked on our project. They should learn about us and our needs and the community and their needs. They were involved in the day to day process and I think that they seemed to be very interested in the process here.”

Finally, under the competency category, Dr. Caldwell was asked to tell about the partnership’s impacts on Ohio State Newark. She says, “Well I think it does in that it connects us with the community and our environment. And that is, ok try this - it connects us in a very operational way. We can go out and help build a playground and that’s a service, “it’s a do for” - it’s something we are doing for the community. At its best service learning is a “do with” and I think you know again that its back to experiential learning and some of the case study models that show impact and the benefits that this brings.” In Dr. Caldwell’s mind, the service learning partnership is a positive venture for Ohio State Newark. It helps the university fulfill its service mission to the local
community and teaches students about this as a goal for themselves also.

Carpenter was asked to identify potential impacts on the United Way’ personnel, agency operation, policies, physical facilities and services. The first part of the question focused on any impacts regarding United Way personnel. “I think that it has been a challenge to them and that’s not intended to be a negative but to challenge them to always make sure that they have thought through and planned for and prepared for the interns to be here. So that they to get meaningful work done and the intern as a result has a meaningful experience. So I think that has definitely been an impact because you have had to do worked differently, prioritize differently so on and so forth. I think that really it’s the priority setting on how to divide this up during the day.” So, the staff have to pre-plan for the students and what they will do also.

Were there impacts on your agencies operations and/or policies?

“I would say it’s impact probably on the operations is really being able to get done things we have said we wanted to get to some day. I think it is the ability to help us move along our list of substantial “to dos”. In term of policies, I don’t know that there’s any direct impact.”

Were there any impacts on the organizations physical facility?

“We’ve actually anticipated that hoping that we would have volunteers so that we’ve had a little bit of space that allows at least a work station. But sometimes they’ve had to
spend time in the break room providing what materials we could provide them. It has caused us to just adapt in order to accommodate and make things available to them.”

How has the partnership impacted the services that your organization offers?

“It has allowed us to do some things that we never would have gotten to. It definitely allows us to utilize the intern to get to this in a more timely manner so we have results sooner. It was a major benefit to us.” Hence, the amount of work and the timeliness of that work improved.

All of these responses seemed to indicate that the partnership for the purpose of service learning was an investment in time and energy and that it increased workload, but it was an investment that was well spent. In the case of the United Way there was some impact on their facilities in term of providing service learning students work spaces while onsite. The United Way was also able to utilize the increased labor pool that the service experience brought to them in order to provide a larger array of services to their constituents.

Leadership and Management

The final component of partnership that was examined was leadership roles, understanding of service learning, apprehensions or concerns, and change processing within the partnership.
The first question presented within the leadership and management component asked each of the three respondents to share what role they play within their respective organization. Dr. Caldwell had a very unique perspective to this question in that she served the university as both a faculty member and an administrator. She had the opportunity to look at the service learning partnership through multiple vantage points.

“That’s a very interesting question because I have wondered about that since I stopped being an Assistant Professor. You know I have two hats typically. One is as the Coordinator of the writing lab. The other is the Director of the First Year Writing program. Those are my official designations. Neither of those is faculty. She called herself a community guide and added, I feel I do a lot of trouble shooting, I do a lot of across the board, you remember that whole thing about the classroom and about how a bunch of people didn’t want to teach first years. I got that straightened out through utilizing the writing lab. So I tend to be – I’m not, I’m not – I am trying to answer your question. I don’t want to sound like I am being overly self-promoting, but I do the writing program stuff and my teaching and a lot of the things that are related to how the university looks to itself and the community. So I find myself as kind of - it’s something that I find interesting you know I want us to look professional but I want our image to reflect the realities of what’s going on in Newark. So in some respect I would call it a belief system and I do it very deliberately.” Dr. Caldwell seemed to encapsulate her self perception of the role she played within the university through the term “community
guide”. She perceived her role as crossing faculty and administration barrier and extending to contact and work with the larger community.

Donna Carpenter expressed a narrower and definitive description of the role she played within the United Way. Her key word choice when describing her role was “clarifier”. Her self perception was one of defining roles, needs, expenditure…etc. “Well my official title is Executive Director and I really see that role as being a facilitator with the professional staff and the other staff like the volunteers so I am a clarifier. I’ve kept their role throughout my professional career so that means often that you are clarifying differences between people. But obviously I am also responsible for some of those mundane things such as financial reporting and management of the organization. A significant piece of my work is in terms of dealing with our donors and fund raising development efforts. A lot of community relations representing the United Way is a fairly significant part of the job. And answering dissertation questions when called upon!”

Sylvia Freil defined her role specifically within the context of the work she performed for the United Way. “I work with our funds distribution division, with volunteers on allocating money to all the programs, and providing staff support to all our programs. I work hard to make sure I am informed on all of the organizations we fund to help them make informed decisions. And I work on specific partner initiatives. I also work on any liaison roles within our partnering organizations.”
The next question in the leadership and management category moved to a more theoretical perspective. The question asked each of the respondents to share their understanding of the concept of service learning. Not surprisingly each of the three had different perceptions of the notion of service learning. Dr. Caldwell provided an esoteric definition of service learning. “I am going to use the definition that a guy named Herman Siddle once described and probably because I never get to use this saying. Service learning is a blind man’s search in a dark room - no wait, it’s a blind man’s search for a black cat in a dark room in which the cat is not there. I think that service learning is one of those things that is still evolving. My hope is that it will continue to evolve. And I always feel a little crummy, not totally crummy, just a little when new text books come out because I feel that there are many developments in the field but the time you get it in a text book it is a little past the curve.” Dr. Caldwell had previously defined some of the concepts of service learning like reinforcing the learning of the course he was teaching, and that it is a reciprocal process. Her perception of service learning was that it was an evolving discipline. This was her main perception. Detailed conceptualization was not provided. Donna Carpenter presented a very pragmatic perspective to the notion of service learning. He described a process where students applied themselves to a volunteer effort with a service organization and learned from that experience. “I think if I was a student who was asked to participate in a service learning project, I would view it as an opportunity to provide some service using my skills and
ability and interest to work with an organization volunteering my time to help accomplish whenever they need me to do. And of course you should hopefully learn a lot from this because if you don’t learn then why do it.” Sylvia Freil had a closely coupled definition of service learning to the one provided by Donna Carpenter but expressed more of the need for a reflective element in the process. “It is volunteering or providing a volunteer service but there has to be a reflective piece built into the process to understand what we did, and why we did it. It’s that additional piece that is reflected to help make meaning and understanding of the volunteer action and behavior.” Planned reflection is a significant part of the service learning experience for the students and the agency.

The third question in this category asked each of the three participants to share any apprehensions or concerns they had related to the service learning experience with their respective partner. Dr. Caldwell shared that initially, the service learning partnership experience was so new to her that she was unaware of what to be concerned about. Her true concern seemed to be in moving participant within the service learning experience from a focus on volunteerism to one of learning. “That I knew nothing, nothing – I had never even heard of it. Then it began to go well. I guess the only serious fear that has actually come to pass is that it would be real, real hard to get people out of the volunteer mode both students and community agency members.” Ms. Carpenter was concerned that the United Way organization needed to specifically ensure a high quality learning experience for the students who were participating in the service learning program. “I
think my greatest apprehension is that we’d do things well on our side for the students to have a good experience. Because that can really reflect upon us positively or conversely negatively, so that was my greatest apprehension going in. So it is an investment in time and materials in making sure that we’re ready for it. So to investment in the quality of the learning opportunity.” Sylvia Freil was more concerned with her personal knowledge of the subject matter that the students in the service learning experience would be focused upon. “I generally didn’t have any apprehensions are concerns that the student was coming here from the social service program because that’s who I am what I know. I have apprehensions with students who might be coming in with their focus more on marketing because that’s not my strength or area of expertise when I was still the contact person for that individual or those groups. I did run the work by Donna (Carpenter) with the intention that she knew what the groups were doing. And so it was a subject matter expertise area and I just wanted to be sure that students were doing what we needed and what made sense to them as well.”

The next question in this area asked each of the respondents to share their understanding of their specific role within the service learning process. Dr. Caldwell had previously indicated her role as providing the impetus for the service learning experience as well as the general guidelines and process for the experience as well. Donna Carpenter hared her perspective of her role as the service agency director was to ensure a collaborative approach between the university and the United Way agency. He felt her
role was to be informed of the university perspective and needs and to make this work cooperatively with her agency staff and their need a well. Ms Carpenter perceived her role as a direct link between the university faculty member and understanding their expectation and her own organization and their particular needs. Sylvia Freil saw her role as specifically orchestrating the experience of the students while they were serving with the United Way. “My specific role would be to ensure the students have a meaningful experience and to give them feedback on what they have been doing. It’s not just the work that they are doing but also how they’re coming across because they do want that feedback. But my primary role is to ensure they have a meaningful experience.”

The next question presented within the leadership and management category asked the to service agency participants to share their understanding of specific people and roles needed within their agency to facilitate the service learning partnership. Donna Carpenter shared her perception that it took several individuals within the United Way who were dedicated to creating quality experience for students within the service learning program. “Well obviously we need individuals to have projects and efforts they really need to have done but that they also need to know how to provide directions and support to somebody that is here for a short time with pretty flexible schedules. So I think it’s real important for them to be able to be fairly good communicators and that includes listening even though some people don’t consider listening a communication skill.”
Sylvia Freil once again reinforced the notion that it was important that everyone in the United Way organization be willing to work directly with service learning students even if their particular role within the organization did not necessarily coincide with the projects being completed by those students.

The next question was posed to all three participants. The respondents were asked how they work with the other participating organization to facilitate this service-learning partnership. Dr. Caldwell had once again previously responded to this question. She had outlined the precipitating work she conducted with the United Way management to design the service learning program. She also added her ongoing communication with those same individuals to ascertain the progress of the service learning experience. Donna Carpenter discussed her role in originally designing the service learning experience with Dr. Caldwell but also added her role as being an advocate for her United Way staff in dealing with any changes to the program if warranted. “Well in the initial conversations I collaborated with Dr. Caldwell to design the program but also behind the scenes I am also endorsing this for the agency. Because the staff are the ones who deal with them, I think that it’s also that I need to be involved because they need to have confidence that if someone needed to raise an issue about the experience, they could certainly give me a call or come see me.” Sylvia Freil added that she participated in open communication with both Dr. Caldwell and Donna Carpenter in designing the service experience for students experience at the United Way. She described herself as the
primary point of contact for Dr. Caldwell and the students once the program began. She
was also responsible for verifying that students actually conducted their required service.

“I think with Dr. Caldwell it was very good to have that meeting to put all the parameters
on the table and to know what we could do and what uses the student should be used for.
I would recommend that any group sit down to clarify roles. It certainly helps make our
job and the students’ job that much easier.”

Next, the two service agency participants were presented with a question asking
them to identify who handles and is responsible for broad basic strategy on how their
particular organization relates to the service-learning program on the Newark Campus.
Both participants presented the same response. Donna Carpenter readily identified
herself in this role. “It would really be me who would represent us to their institution.
We have the ability for folks to do some sort of volunteering with us either from Ohio
State, COTC or other organizations in the community so I think having had that
experience has helped us become better at supporting these interns as they come through
the process.” Sylvia Freil too identified Donna Carpenter as serving in this capacity for
the United Way.

The next question in the leadership and management category was once gain
presented to all three participant. Each of the respondents was asked who handles and is
responsible for day-to-day operations with students who serve within the service-learning
partnership. Dr Caldwell made if very clear that she herself did not fulfill this role. She
shared that in any of the partnerships that she perceived as successful there was always a primary point of contact for her and the students in the program. “If they show up or not, monitoring attendance – no I’m not going to fill out an attendance sheet. I tell people that if they are not coming when they said they would or not doing the work they said they would then I need to hear that and I’ve never really had a problem with that. So, expect there is one organization this quarter that did not have a primary point of contact with me or the students and that’s hard. I don’t think I will even continue work with that organization after this year. It is true that many agencies don’t have a place for the students to work and they can do some of that work at home or you know in the university computer lab or something like that, but I really think having a place to work is going up in my estimation.”

Donna Carpenter confirmed that the United Way utilized many staff member within the service program, but that within their system they also utilized a primary point of contact. This person was Sylvia Freil. “It would be whatever staff member and they typically are what I would consider one of the key management team. There are three of these exceptional individuals responsible for marketing and community impacts. I really believe the key is to use the senior management as a team. The specific individual would be depending upon which area needs to have work and what needs to be done. The one responsible would work with the individual to create what those experiences are. When we first started this work with Sunny Caldwell, and she’s one of the first individuals we
worked with, they worked with Sylvia.” Sylvia Freil also identified herself a the person responsible for this role though she reinforced her earlier statement about soliciting other staff members within the United Way when subject matter expertise was necessary and they were key to the quality of what happened with students day-to-day. They were the operationalization of all the concepts and preplanning conducted by the professor and the service agency staff.

The subsequent question was a variation of the theme presented previously. The three respondents were asked who handles and is responsible for day-to-day operations with the instructor(s) of class within the service-learning partnerships. Dr. Caldwell had previously indicated that he would work with the same primary point of contact identified in the previous question. Donna Carpenter added that this would once again be the staff person working directly with the students “I would say in that event it would really probably be the staff person with whom the student is really working closely with.” Finally, Sylvia Freil concurred with Donna Carpenter assessment and saw herself as the primary person in this role.

The next question posed to the three respondents asked each to identify who handles and is responsible for negotiating changes in the partnership after operating for a while and they see need for change. Dr. Caldwell identified herself and the community service agency representative depending upon the nature of the situation. “Well sometimes me, sometimes the community partner depending on the specific nature of what the issue is.”

313
Donna Carpenter felt this responsibility lay in the hands of the particular United Way supervisor of the service learning students. “Well I would think that it is still back to the supervisors who directly are working with the students. I try to stay out of that day to day grind unless they need me. I would be available if there were an issue and they needed any help.” Sylvia Freil identified herself in this capacity but also agreed that Donna Carpenter would step in if Sylvia requested any assistance. Hence, from the United Way’s point of view needs for change come from supervisors of the students on day-to-day basis.

The last two questions posed to all three participants asked them what have been the needed changes within the partnership and how does the change process occur. Dr. Caldwell indicated that in this particular partnership with the United Way, there had been no substantive need for change. Those minor issues that were identified were dealt with “largely over the phone in negotiation and discussion”. Donna Carpenter also was at a loss to identify any substantive issues that requires change within the partnership between the United Way and Ohio State Newark. She did identify a desire to be more informed regarding the students’ formal evaluation and perceptions of their experience at the United Way. She does identify this concern was shared with Dr. Caldwell and positive conversation ensued. “I’m not aware of anything that we’ve had to change and I don’t know that I’ve had to send a thing to change. The only thing that I’ve picked up on may be some more formalized evaluation and from my conversations, I can say we talked
about that. *I believe she does a very good job upfront but may need to develop procedure to ensure that you’ve heard OK here’s what we need to make sure we know the student’s perspective.*” Sylvia Freil could not identify any issues that needed to be changed within the service learning experience with Ohio State Newark. She identified a potential process of negotiation between Donna Carpenter and Dr. Caldwell should some change be necessary in the future.

To sum up, the service learning partnership between Professor Caldwell and the United Way has worked well for the United Way and helped them extend their services and the quality of those services. Professor Caldwell spent a good deal of time learning about the pedagogy of service learning and translating this knowledge of best practices to a collaborative preplanning process with agency representatives of the United Way. She is trying to expose Ohio State Newark students to the Newark community and the multiple services offered within the community. She hopes to expose students to social issues and raise their awareness and consciousness of these issues. Additionally she wants to show students the power of language and how it can be utilized in organizations.

Donna Carpenter as the United Way Director has conceptual understanding of service learning, she works to achieve “buy-in” with her staff, and wants to know more about the outcomes for students who volunteer at the United Way.

The partnership was created by the 2 central players, Professor Caldwell and Donna Carpenter. The two individuals participated in significant preplanning processing in
order to design and facilitate the service learning experience. This process allowed for relationship and trust building to occur between the two participants. Caldwell did not have the explain service learning to carpenter. Carpenter was well versed in the conceptualization and the process of service learning. Hence, another possible educational and buy-in task was not needed in this relationship.

There have been few problems in the operation of this service learning partnership and little need to consider changes. Donna Carpenter would like to have a formal evaluation of outcomes for students. It is not clear whether this desire will be addressed or not. The maintenance of the service learning program has been established and the course and corresponding service learning partnership between Dr. Caldwell and Donna Carpenter has been scheduled for the following academic year.

Summary

Chapter Four contained the results of the study and a detailed account of the interview protocol and subsequent analysis of transcriptions. Chapter Five discusses key findings of the study in relation to the scholarship on civic engagement, as well as reflects on action research. Lastly, Chapter Five presents recommendations for future research and practice.
CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

Synthesis of the Study Purpose

The purpose of this study was to explore the following: 1) The nature of service-learning partnerships as understood by participating community services agencies and higher education faculty members, 2) An understanding of how service-learning partnerships are established by and with participating community service agencies and higher education faculty members, 3) An understanding of how service-learning partnerships are maintained, 4) An understanding of how service-learning partnerships are renewed, 5) An understanding of how service-learning partnerships are changed, 6) An understanding of the impact(s) service-learning partnerships have on the participating community service agencies staff, employees, physical facilities and services provided, and 7) An understanding of the potential differences made on each of the six previous questions by the type and variation of service provided within the service-learning partnership. Through an extensive interviews and observations and subsequent analysis of these data from the partnering agents of faculty ranks of The Ohio State University at Newark and the service agencies of Sharon Glyn Senior Apartments, The Red Cross Chapter of Licking County Ohio, and the United Way of Licking County Ohio, an understanding of partnership development was illuminated. The means, manner and
practice that each of the three service learning partnerships implemented in this study, and the partnering entities willingness to share their experiences and deconstruct the partnering process, helped to identify and clarify the multiple questions asked by the researcher.

As was mentioned at the onset of this study, Berquist, Betwee, and Meuel (1995) describe effective corporate partnerships as represented by six lenses: 1) shared direction, 2) structure, 3) systems, 4) operations, 5) competency, and 6) leadership and management. According to the authors, each of these elements is for examining a partnership. Within the construct of service-learning partnership, each of these lenses were used when defining the nature of the relationship and subsequent measurement of the degree of success of these partnerships. These lenses provided a way to explore the research questions.

**Discussion of significant findings**

The pedagogy of service-learning has been the object of numerous studies. The popularity of service learning as a teaching method has increased significantly as it makes for an effective strategy for engaging students in their communities. Much of the scholarship on service-learning illustrates its effect on student learning and is written from a campus point of view. The scholarship validates service-learning as an effective teaching method with long-term implications for the creation of engaged students (Astin,
et. al., 2000). However, little has been written about service-learning from the community-faculty partnership perspective.

Here I will describe trends, patterns and issues that emerged from an analysis of the interviews both within and across the three cases. I will examine the issues raised and compare these trends and patterns with the literature on service learning and partnership development particularly and with relevant issues related to higher education administration. Each of the seven research questions of this study will serve and the organizer for this synthesis.

**Findings Related to Research Questions**

The first research question within the study related to the nature of service learning partnerships. I will present the findings of this question last, as it will serve as both a summation of the overall experiences of the eight participants within the study, as well as segue into the relationship of these findings to existing literature.

The first research question we will probe related to an understanding of how service learning partnerships were established by and with participating community service agencies and higher education faculty members. Three critical patterns emerged from the interviews with the various participants. First, each of the three service learning partnerships was originally the brainchild of an individual faculty member. All three faculty members shared a personal commitment and passion for social issues, a need for
students to be aware of these issues, and community development. The professors’ commitment initiated these projects. Interestingly, there was little to no actual reward system for their participation with service learning. No additional compensation was granted either monetarily or in terms of furthering aspirations of tenure. Each faculty member initiated and participated in these partnerships due to their personal passions and commitments. The second pattern that emerged related to the commitment to service learning by the Ohio State University at Newark as an institution. The university offered small seed grants for service learning projects. Each of the three faculty members applied for and received a small seed grant to create and establish their service learning partnership(s). There was a financial investment, albeit a small one, from the higher education institution that supported the efforts of the three participating faculty. The third pattern found in this section on partnership establishment related to the fact that the participating community service agencies were all approached by the faculty members from Ohio State Newark to create the various service learning partnerships. The service agency personnel were not the initiators of the service learning partnerships. They responded positively to the overtures of the various faculty members. However, each of the three service agencies had some previous experience with service learning partnerships and they already knew service learning concepts and processes. Administrators of the three participating community agencies knew that participating in service learning usually meant that they could provide more services and do so in a
timely manner. Their previous experience with students participating in service learning programs was positive and they perceived that these students did good work and brought value to their agency’s mission.

There were several important issues raised in the discussion of service learning partnership establishment related to higher education. These issues are related to the purpose and mission of the university, the roles played by the faculty within that institution, and criteria used for promotion and tenure. As a regional (branch) campus of The Ohio State University, the Newark campus is committed to serve and respond to the needs of its local community. The university is rooted within the Newark community and it plays a central role in addressing needs expressed by the community. As a regional campus, Ohio State Newark needs professors who are willing to focus some of their time and energy on serving the needs of the local community. Service learning is seen as a vehicle to facilitate this type of faculty service. This is evidenced by the seed money provided to faculty willing to invest in service learning course design. The main campus of The Ohio State University however has chosen consciously to move from being a land-grant institution to being a research university. In many ways it is looking to its regional campuses to fulfill the mission of its land-grant heritage such as open admission, strong teaching and serving the needs of the state. However, the basic process of promotion and tenure utilized at the central campus of the Ohio State University in Columbus, which is based upon the merits of research and publication and not on service,
is also used at all regional campuses including Newark. Thus a paradox exists. The regional campuses need to be more connected and attuned to the needs of their respective communities and the faculty are encouraged to serve in these community connections. If faculty members do make these commitments and create service opportunities, however, they reduce the time and energy that they can use for research and their own promotion and tenure. Faculty members who elect to participate in service learning may well be punishing themselves in terms of promotion and earning tenure. The university has different missions for regional campuses but utilize the same criteria for promotion and tenure decisions as the main campus.

In the three cases reviewed in this study, the faculty participants were all in different places related to their professional roles and aspirations. In case one, Dr. Hennen is trying to live out his values and convictions while still trying to earn tenure through the Sociology department. In case two, Dr. Klingensmith had already received tenure within the Geography department. He also has participated for decades in in the leadership Licking County program. His course had been a loose service learning design in that it focused on the merits of volunteerism within the community with some small components of reflective practice. He was also in the process of retiring and thus has little concern about the confines of the university promotion system. Dr. Klingensmith has already received tenure and had no worries about the negative consequence that might occur should he focus on service learning initiatives. Finally, in the third case, Dr.
Caldwell had given-up the tenure process. She still partially serves as a teaching faculty member but she also has an administrative role within Ohio State Newark. She found it easier to live out her values without the burden of remaining within the confines of OSU’s tenure process. This dual appointment as teaching faculty member and administrator would likely not happen on the central Ohio State University Columbus campus where there are little to no non-tenure seeking faculty members. It is interesting to note that as of this writing, Dr. Klingensmith has retired from the University and his service course has been taken over by Dr. Caldwell. She has adapted the nature of the course to incorporate full service learning processes including multiple and consistent reflective practices. The course has a focus on sustainability and an environmental “green” theme within the campus and larger community.

To sum up, service learning is a labor and time intensive teaching strategy. Faculty members who choose to use it will invest more of themselves in their teaching than faculty members who do not do so. If research is the main criteria for promotion and earning tenure, service learning may be a risky commitment. Nevertheless, personal commitments to learning outcomes fostered by service learning led the faculty seeking faculty member to initiate service learning partnerships. The other two faculty members had similar personal commitments but no longer had tenure goals.

The second research question related to an understanding of how service learning partnerships were maintained. We consistently heard the importance of open
communication coupled with the need to know and trust one another as participants within the service learning partnership as key to maintaining the partnership. In addition, preplanning efforts, both individual and joint, and prompt problem solving efforts were important in maintaining the projects.

All three cases discussed the importance of the faculty members and the community service agencies conducting and coordinating preplanning efforts. In case one and case three the faculty members conducted a great measure of “homework” prior to soliciting the service agencies for potential service learning partnership. Dr. Hennen spent a good amount of time learning about the Newark community and the specific agencies with which he hoped to partner. Dr. Caldwell also conducted this review of the community and its agencies but also thoroughly immersed herself in the concepts of service learning. She researched service learning pedagogy and best practices before approaching service agencies for potential partnership. Within case two, Dr. Klingensmith had pre-established relationship with the agencies with which he partnered through his work with the Licking County leadership program. He had already worked through operations practices with his agency partners. In all three cases both the faculty and the service agency personnel stated that these preplanning efforts helped them establish rapport with one another and built a sense of trust between them. Rapport and trust lead to open communication and direct problem solving. To sum up, joint preplanning builds rapport and trust. In turn, rapport and trust leads to open
communication and direct problem solving. Joint detailed preplanning seems to be the key to this sequence.

Within the arena of problem solving, there were few problems identified in any of the three cases. This was widely attributed to the detailed design and mutual preplanning conducted by the faculty members and the service agency representatives. All participants in the administration of the service learning partnership identified the conscious preplanning and mutually agreed upon processing as the key to limiting any significant problems. When there were small problems the partners went into “maintenance mode”. That is to say, that the partnership participants would participate in open, direct communication with one another and they would deal with the situation directly.

The third research question related to an understanding of how service learning partnerships were renewed. There were two main themes that emerged from an analysis of participants perceptions of renewal. Firstly, all three agency administrators wanted a formal evaluation on the service learning experience effects on students. The service agency administrators wanted to know the following: 1) Students opinions on their agency and services; 2) Any students attitudinal changes toward the people served by their respective agency; 3) Students awareness of social issues and needs within the local Newark community and, 4) The desire, if any, of the students becoming a long term volunteer beyond their service learning commitment.
The second theme that emerged within the renewal was the faculty members desire to assess whether the students were more critically aware of and sensitive to social issues and needs. All three faculty members shared that generating this kind of student awareness and sensitivity was a key area of importance to them. They all wanted to assess if students were changing in these ways.

In all three cases, no formal evaluation existed. Neither the community agencies nor the faculty members’ desires were currently addressed. Again we see a paradox. For the faculty, extra time and energy would be needed to design and implement such evaluative studies. The time and energy spent on such an evaluation study might have negative impact on promotion and tenure unless these results were publishable as a research study. To date, no such studies are planned.

All three service learning partnerships have been renewed. In the first case, the sociology course partnership with Sharon Glyn Senior Apartments is being continued during the 2008-2009 academic year. I am unaware of any formal studies on outcomes that have been incorporated into the experience. As was previously mentioned, the leadership course taught by Dr. Klingensmith has been taken over by Dr. Caldwell since Dr. Klingensmith’s retirement from the university. The course has received an infusion of traditional service learning design elements including multiple forms of reflection. The model of the course has changed from leadership development to an emphasis on ecology and greening within the community. The third case involving partnership
between Dr. Caldwell and the United Way will continue during the spring quarter and the focus will remain on rhetoric. As far as I know, none of these partnerships have incorporated the formal evaluative process discussed by the various participants.

The fourth research question focused on how the partnerships were changed. During the year, there was no evidence that any substantive changes were made to the partnerships. This was stated by all participants of the interviews and was represented tangibly by my personal observations of the service learning sites. This appears to be the case because each professor did their homework, projects were jointly predesigned in detail, and maintenance processes were defined and used.

The fifth research question sought understanding of the impact(s) service learning partnerships have on the community service agencies staff, physical facilities, and service provided. Overall, all three agency participants indicated that the service learning partnership had direct and positive impacts. They all wanted to continue the partnerships in the future regardless of whether their services were direct, indirect, or mixed. Additionally, all three agencies had students who continued to work with them after the service learning experience had ended.

In terms of the agencies’ physical facilities, there was minimal impact. Each agency purported the need to adjust their scheduling of facilities in order to accommodate the needs and timing of the student participants. Additionally, each site allocated some small space for students to conduct their service. In the case of the Red Cross, some
adaptation of their facility was required to enable a student with physical disabilities access to and utilization of the structure.

In terms of impact on agency personnel, several patterns were seen to hold true through all three cases. In each case, the lead staff person (Agency Director in cases 2 and 3 or Lead Service Administrator in case 1) within the agency participated with the professor in the detailed planning of the service learning experience. The leader also trained their staff in the process that would be utilized in the service learning experience. Additionally, the lead staff person educated their fellow staff members as to why their organization was participating in the service learning partnership. As for the staff members who were working directly with the students to administer their volunteer efforts, all of them shared that they had spent personal time and effort to facilitate this experience. They all indicated that it required a good deal of effort on their part. However, they also indicated that they were able to conduct more service to their constituents and do so in a timely manner thanks to the service provided by the students. They also espoused the virtues of the students in that they believed the quality of the students efforts were excellent. Thus, the staff believed that the time and energy invested within the experience was well spent and they would do it again.

When asked about what they had learned from the project, the leaders and the staff who worked with the students learned different things. The leaders did not learn new service learning concepts or practices. However, they did seem to become
recommitted or reestablished to their commitment to partnering with the university. Additionally, they seemed to deepen their personal knowledge of service learning. The employees of the agency learned about the concepts and components of the service learning process. They also learned acceptance and trust of students as competent additions to their agency team. It is interesting to note that all three of the courses in this study were taken voluntarily by students. These potential outcomes could have been different if the courses were required and not self selected.

The sixth question asked if there were any differences made on each of the previous six questions based upon the type and variation of the service provided within the service learning partnership. In this study, there was no significant difference on the variables examined based upon direct, indirect, or mixed service delivery applied during the service learning experience. All three cases involved self motivated professors. All three cases incorporated extensive joint planning and implementation strategies developed between faculty and service agency participants. All three cases maintained their service learning partnership and problem solved in a similar manner. All three cases made adjustments in the facility scheduling and assigned specific locations within their facilities from which students could work. All three cases found an agency administrator who introduced the concepts of service learning to their employees/staff who in turn implemented the service learning process. Finally, all three cases described a desire for formal evaluation of student outcomes and thus far this does not seem to be happening in
any of the three cases. There was case consistency across the board that did not seem to be impacted by a variation in the type of service delivered during the service learning experience.

The first question posed as a purpose for this study was to explore the nature of service learning partnerships as understood by the participating community service agencies and higher education faculty members. Berquist, Betwee, and Meuel (1995) model of effective corporate partnerships and the work of Creighton (2006) will be used to respond to these questions. Berquist, Betwee, and Meuel (1995) describe six important dimensions of partnerships. Creighton (2006) describes six common themes or indicators of engagement between universities and community service organizations. Upon review of the two structures, I found significant correlation between the two systems. Each provided a relevant construct in which to examine the mature of partnerships as understood by the participants of the experience. These two systems can be integrated as shown in Figure 1. I will use this integration as a means of summarizing the nature of these partnerships.
Within the category of structure, there was consistency across the three cases on issues of participants’ perspective on mission compatibility. There seemed to be a general perspective that there was mission compatibility between the partnering organizations. In all cases, the partners viewed their organization missions as points of collaboration rather than competition.

There was less of a mutual agreement on an interpretation and potential alignment of each organization goals. In each of the three cases, we find slight variations in organizational goals. Within case one, Dr. Hennen discussed his goals for the service learning partnership as very personal in nature and focused on making sure that the service learning experience instilled a sort of awakening to the plight of underserved
peoples by the participants of the service learning experience. Jean Bush seemed to have much more of an operational approach to goals. Her focus was on creating interesting and unique opportunities for her constituents to experience. In case two, Dr. Klingensmith discusses his goal of connecting students to volunteer and leadership opportunities within the Newark community. Rod Cook shares his goal of expanding the services offered by the Red Cross. In case three Dr. Caldwell was very focused on the goal of students grasping learning objectives while Donna Carpenter and Sylvia Freil were focused on students learning about the United Way and adding to the services delivered by their organization.

There were multiple areas of mutual commitment shared by the partnering entities in all three cases. The promotion of service by all three faculty members was passionate. All parties (faculty and service agency staff) purported a commitment to educating students as current and future leader. Additionally there was an intentionality of learning on behalf of both partnering entities. All of the partnering individuals wanted students to learn about social issues and have a better understanding of the needs of the community. Overall, there was a great close alignment in the category of structure.

**Shared Direction - Equitable Treatment and Mutual Commitment**

In the category of shared direction, there was general agreement on the definition of partnership. Except for Dr. Hennen in the first case, all participants of the study
viewed partnership as a very positive venture that allowed each party a better opportunity to complete their individual goals. The motivations for and expectations of partnering seemed to differ for the three faculty members who identified their motivations for partnering as personal passions for social awareness, commitment to the development of the community, and student growth and personal development potential. This contrasted with the very functional perspective of the participants from the service agencies who consistently identified the motivation of increasing their volume and type of services delivered to their constituents as well as the capacity to do so in a timelier manner.

All participants in the three cases discussed their desire to develop a positive relationship with each other as an affiliate organization. Each person eluded to the importance of trust and open communication to the establishment of shared direction and mutual commitment. All partners mentioned the importance of working collaboratively with one another but at times for differing reasons. There was certainly an emphasis on the importance of civic responsibility as all partners specifically mentioned the need to expose students to social issues and to develop them as potential leaders. All of the partnering individuals espoused the importance of the intentionality of learning about the social issue surrounding the particular population served by the community service agency. There was always a level of respect and cooperation between the faculty member and the agency staff in all three cases.
Systems - Mutual Commitment and Clarity of Expectations and Roles

The systems category exemplified the most glaring differences between the university and the community service agencies. It became very evident that the university was a loosely coupled system (Weick, 1976). The university and its faculty representatives had “fuzzy” goals and objectives. Often these were defined from a personal perspective. Often they were multiple and somewhat contradictory. Faculty often vacillated in their understanding of their particular role within the university. Faculty described themselves as everything from an organizer, teacher, researcher, leader, follower, to an ambassador. This contrasted greatly with the tightly coupled systems represented by the community service agencies. These groups had well defined missions, goals and purposes which staff readily understood. When the parties were asked to define their respective organization’s values, beliefs and behaviors, this proved to be difficult for the three faculty members but was easily answered by the community service agency members. As a loosely couple system, there are multiples belief and value structures represented within the university setting. These could be held at a departmental level, within a particular college or by senior administrators. As tightly coupled systems, community service agencies had fairly uniform and often written values and belief statements which were often exemplified in the behaviors of the staff.
On a different note, the discussion of decision making processes utilized illustrated congruence between the three cases studied. All participants discussed their belief that a great deal of preplanning and jointly designed processes minimized the need for much decision making within the partnership. The importance of open dialogue and communication, building trust with one another, and establishing rapport with one another was a common theme that carried across almost every category reviewed.

**Operations – Effectiveness of Communication and Usefulness of Service Learning**

Within the operation category, the issue of who was “in control” of the partnership was a moot point. It seemed that although the participants may define who they believed to be the authority for specific elements of the partnership, there was no need to identify a person or group as being in control of the overall partnership. The participants all identified the importance of preplanning and joint processing in limiting problems and changes in the partnership. The fact that they had worked together to establish agreed upon processes and approaches created little need for control by any individual. This collaborative approach to planning and communication exemplified several effective partnering strategies defined by Creighton (2006) including valuing open, and sustained communication; identifying decision makers for achieving goals that are central to partnership; organizing a system for instructing students about service and for coordinating effective placement in cooperation with community partner; and creating
a forum for conversations between both parties to engage in a dialogue that helps establish mutualism.

When discussing how the partnership was marketed and financed, all partners agreed that there was a minimal investment in both areas. The small seed grant monies that were allocated to the faculty to design their service learning courses was identified by the three faculty participants. Marketing of courses at the university was not something emphasized and, in fact, is contrary to customary practice. Courses are rarely marketed individually beyond general publication in a course bulletin. The service agencies contributed in-kind financial support via facilities, employee time, and small amounts of supplies.

**Competency – Usefulness of Service Learning and Sustainability**

Within the competency category all partners identified the collaborative nature of the partnership as key to its success. There was value placed on protocols that create and sustain a long-term relationship and the development of new projects and collaborations overtime. The willingness of the faculty and community service agencies to plan jointly and communicate openly was viewed as instrumental for the success of the partnership. All members of the three partnerships were viewed as competent by their partnering agency representatives. The fact that the faculty “did their homework” and got to know the community and its needs as well as learn about their specific partnering organization
was seen as key to establishing competency and buy-in by their partnering group. The rapport and establishment of relationships that occurred prior to the service learning experience was vital to this sense of competency. This willingness to collaborate and work within a cooperative framework exemplified many of the characteristics of effective partnership highlighted by Creighton (2006). There was a willingness to strengthen personal relationships between the faculty member and the community partner. Additionally, it can be extrapolated that the partners exhibited quality commitment to strengthen the intellectual capacity of community partner personnel, building agency and empowering constituency.

There was agreement that all participants in the three cases studied wanted to know more about student learning outcomes. The faculty and the service agency staff wanted to know what students garnered from their experience. Faculty and agency personnel wanted to know if students’ attitudes toward social issues had changed. Additionally both groups wanted to know if students were more likely to continue their volunteer efforts after the service learning experience was completed. The service agencies also wanted to know about the perspectives of the students regarding their organizations upon completion of their experience.

**Leadership and Management – Clarity of Expectation and Roles and Synergy**
Within the leadership and management category many aspects of understanding respective roles within their organizations was difficult for faculty once again due to the loosely coupled nature of the university system. It was more difficult for faculty to articulate their specific roles and responsibilities within their organization. This was not the case for the community service agency members. Their respective roles within their group were clearly defined and were very hierarchical. Interestingly, the three service agency leaders had all had previous experience with university student volunteers and/or service learning. They were all familiar with the concept and processes of service learning. Dr. Hennen, in case one, was familiar with service learning pedagogy. However, Dr. Klingensmith was not well versed in the concepts and practices of service learning and had little interest in learning or incorporating these into his course. Dr. Caldwell was not versed in service learning theory or practices either but she took it upon herself to learn.

In each case, faculty and agency directors worked collaboratively to chart the course of the partnership. They worked jointly on defining the parameters of the partnership and the service learning experience. The agency administrators in turn educated their staff as to why this partnership was important and what each staff members role would be in its implementation. This also helped clarify roles and expectation of each of the partners.
There was an area of significant difference between the faculty members and the agency personnel found in the leadership and management category. The faculty in each case discussed the need to minimize the burden or extra work that the partnership would place on agency personnel. Dr. Hennen shared that he wanted to minimize any additional “organizational stress” on Jean Bush and the Sharon Glyn staff by adding any more work load. This desire to minimize additional work caused the faculty to not see the service agency staff as an extension to their teaching. Faculty did not ask agency personnel to engage in discussion with students regarding their in-class study. Faculty minimized the processing and reflection task that agency staff could possibly have engaged in with students. The agency staff all articulated a desire to be more involved in helping students make connections between their in-class learning and their experiential learning opportunities. The all discussed how they would like to know more about what students were studying and how they could make the information “come alive” in their organizational works with the students. This was another reason that agency staff asked for outcome evaluations of students.

Overall the partners in each of the three cases reviewed were very pleased with their partnerships and planned to continue their relationship into the future. The quality of the students and their work were viewed as very good by the service agency members. There was a feeling of pleasure from the collaboration and all parties that they mutually benefited from the collaboration.
In summary, each of the six dimensions of partnership development as described by Berquist, Betwee, and Meuel (1995) structure, shared direction, systems, operations, competency, and leadership and management directly corresponded to six indicators of engagement as outlined by Creighton (2006). Based upon the interview responses with the 8 participants in this study, a clear perspective of how the various participants made meaning of their experiences was highlighted. The examples provided by the various partnership participants; 1) illuminated perspective on the nature of service-learning partnership from their respective experiences; 2) illuminated how their respective partnerships were established; 3) provided an understanding of how their respective partnerships were maintained; 4) discussed how and if their partnership were renewed; 5) provided insight into how the partnerships were changed and by whom; 6) shed light onto the partnership’s impacts on the community service agency’s staff, employees, physical facilities and services provided and 7) provided insight that there was no substantive differences made on each of the six previous questions by the type and variation of service provided within the service-learning partnership.

A discussion of these applications is presented along with the literature of service-learning and partnership development theory. In addition, some issues that appear to be major contradictions uncovered during data analysis are presented. Finally, I offer the limitations and strengths of this study followed by implications of this research for the Ohio State University at Newark Service, and for further research.
Relationship of Findings to Existing Literature

The literature review that formed the basis of this study covered three main areas. These areas included civic engagement and the role and basic concepts of service-learning on the college and university campus, building a service-learning partnership, and partnership development theories and processes.

Civic engagement and the role and basic concepts of service-learning on the college and university campus. My review of the civic engagement and basic concepts of service-learning on college and university campuses literature in Chapter 2 organized these concepts into four major categories. These categories included: civic engagement, service learning defined, service-learning on the college and university campus, and benefits of service-learning as a pedagogy. While partnership and partnership development may be an implied thread woven into the fabric of some of these areas, it was not specifically a focus of service-learning research. The linkages made here contribute to new, emerging perspectives in understanding how partnership development can be understood in the framework of service-learning.

Building a service-learning partnership. Chapter Two presented an historical body of scholarship focused on core factors and themes related to establishing a successful and sustainable partnership between higher education and community partners (Blythe, 2004; Bringle and Hatcher, 2002; Bullough, et. al., 2004; Cox, 2000; Darlington-
Hope, 1999; Fullbright-Anderson, et. al., 2001; Leiderman, et. al., 2003; Risley, 1992; Shaffett, 2002; Vernon, et. al, 2002).

This study was grounded in the local realities of the Newark Ohio community and treated the previous studies as benchmarks. I was able to draw parallels among studies and enhance my understanding of meaning making of service learning partnership development. The most important and relevant difference of this study compared to previous works centered on service learning partnership, was the focus on understanding the perspectives of both partners. The incorporation of direct interview and observation of both the community service agency personnel and the faculty members who comprised these partnerships was unique to the literature. The results of this study were not consistent with Risley’s (1992) findings on the importance of a commitment from the leadership at the partnering institutions, development of sharply focused goals, and assessment of the impact of the partnership. This study suggested that though there was importance on a commitment from the leadership of the community service agency, it was not the commitment from formal leaders within the university but rather from the personal motivations and passions of the individual faculty member. Additionally, this study found that there was some measure of goal differential and that a more important alignment between the partnering groups was that of organizational mission compatibility.
The monograph *Building Partnerships with College Campuses: Community Perspectives* (Leiderman, et. al., 2003) included community organization leaders in its research about the challenges of partnerships and developed recommendations for implementing successful community/campus partnerships. The monograph presented several major core elements or common themes present in successful campus-community partnerships and detailed the perspectives of the participants accordingly. Several of the core elements found aligned with this study’s research. For instance, the monograph consistently discussed the development of relationships of equality between faculty and community partners and emphasized mutuality of commitment between the two. Creighton (2006) calls this mutual commitment. The Leiderman study as well as this study, reinforces the importance of documenting both the faculty and the community-partner perspective.

**Partnership development theories and processes**

Though the vast majority scholarship devoted to partnership development is found in the discipline of business, these studies and do inform service learning partnership work. (Aldisert, 2001; Berquist, Betwee, and Meuel, 1995; Chathoth, 2004; Flagg, 1992; Grayson, 1998; Hamel, Doz, and Prahalad, 1989; Kanter, 1994; Lei and Slocum, 1991; Senge, 1990; Weiner, 1990; Yoshino, 1995). This study took general corporate-
based partnership theory and practice and applied these to the domain of higher education service learning partnership development. Through the application of this study, it became quite evident that there is a need to explore the concepts of tightly coupled and loosely coupled systems. The university is a loosely coupled system with inconsistent mission and goals. The faculty member plays multiple roles within that structure. Community service agencies are generally tightly couple systems with clearly defined missions and goals. Community service agency personnel know their respective roles and their place within the organization. The literature pertaining to partnership development theories and processes have been centered on corporations and framed within a business context. This means that the partners examined have always been representative of two tightly coupled systems. It is important that at this juncture we now examine the work of Karl Weick to better understand loosely coupled systems.

In his work, "Educational organizations as loosely coupled systems", Weick uses the US educational system as an example of how loosely coupled systems are both prevalent and important for organizational function. Understanding an organization as a loose coupling of actors, rewards, and technology may help better explain how organizations adapt to their environments and survive amidst uncertainties. Weick espouses that that all organizations do not function with tight linkages. Some organizations, like educational systems, are more loose. Weick comments that most researchers make the assumption that one can "understand" an organization by examining
the formal structures, goals, and activities of an organization. Yet clearly there is another part of organizations that is informal, chaotic, yet somehow productive, adaptable, and crudely organizing. He proposes to create a new language and an alternative way to look at organizations that is sensitive to the "soft" side of organizations. Loose coupling "conveys the image that coupled events are responsive, but that each event has its individual identity and the coupling can vary over time" (p.14). It also suggests that you can break many organizations into largely self-functioning subsystems, and loose coupling is really the "glue" that holds them together. Weick observes that manifests of loosely coupled systems often are the following: 1) situations where several means can produce the same result; 2) lack of coordination; 3) absence of tight regulations; and 4) highly connected networks with very slow feedback times. While these manifests appear negative, they actually may help the organization by: 1) allowing the organization to temporarily persist through rapid environmental fluctuations; 2) improving the organization's sensitivity to the environment; 3) allowing freedom, local adaptations and creative solutions to develop; 4) allow sub-system breakdown without damaging the entire organization; and 5) allow more self-determination by actors such as faculty members.

Understanding the challenges and opportunities presented by a loosely coupled system like a university will enable partnership development to occur more naturally and more purposefully. By examining the critical components of loosely coupled systems as
they apply to service learning partnership development such as allowing more self-
determination by actors, in this case by the faculty member, a more successful
partnership experience can be facilitated.

Implications of the study
There are several implications and recommendations that can be made from this
study for faculty members of the Ohio State University at Newark, and potentially faculty
from any institution of higher education, who are proposing future service learning
course construction, community service agency administrators who are proposing to enter
into a service learning experience with a faculty member of a high education institution,
the student affairs profession, and further research. Implications and recommendations
are developed here.

Implications for higher education faculty proposing service learning course
construction. Service learning course construction is a relatively new process at The
Ohio State University at Newark. Basically, no more than eight faculty members have
actively participated in a service learning experience to this date. Thus, there is not a
long standing history and tradition of service learning partnering in this local community.
It is important to realize that this process of designing service learning partnership and
experience takes effort but can be done if the faculty member does their homework and
understands the concepts and practices of service learning as well as the needs of the
local community. It is equally important to note that the faculty member must establish
rapport and relationships with the agency they intend to engage for the service learning experience. Getting to know the agency and their personnel is an important step to successful partnership implementation. Once that rapport has been established it is critical that the faculty member and the service agency leader(s) work collaboratively to design their project. It is important that faculty who participate in this process are already committed to the idea and concepts of service learning as they may pay a price to do it in the university system which does not reward it in the traditional promotion and tenure process.

Another implication of this study for higher education faculty proposing service learning course construction is to utilize the interview protocol implemented in this study as a basis for partnership development with members of community service agencies within the local community. These questions, presented in a condensed and slightly modified format, could serve as the foundation for partnership development and allow both parties to review potential compatibility issues and perspectives. Two of the three faculty participating in this study professed to have little knowledge of the local community and the various service agencies represented within the community. Utilizing the various probing questions to elicit an understanding of the mission, goals, expectations, personnel, facilities, communication methods…etc of the service agencies would allow both the faculty member to develop both an understanding of the service
organization and a perspective of whether the two organizations would be potentially compatible and a “good fit” for partnering.

It is important that the service agency personnel not feel that they are simply being interviewed by the faculty member for some form of study or scholarly publication. As was seen in this study, a negative attribute that was at times applied to faculty by community service members was the perpetuation of the “ivory tower” syndrome where faculty were viewed as only interested in furthering their research agenda and not focused on community or community agency needs. It should be presented to the service agency administrators that this dialogue should be a “two way street” where the faculty member also shares their understanding of the university mission, goals, expectations, personnel, communication methods…etc in order for the service agency member to also decide if this is truly a potential partnering fit for their organization as well. This would help to ensure that the agency representative(s) would not devalue faculty members as only theoretical and disconnected from pragmatic understanding

Implications for community service agency administrators who are proposing to enter into a service learning experience with a faculty member of a high education institution. As was previously discussed there is not much history of service learning partnership development between local service agencies in the Newark Ohio community and faculty members of The Ohio State University at Newark. Few partnership experiences or templates exist with the Ohio State Newark campus on which to build a
foundation for successful partnership development. However, as was discovered in this study, all three of the service agencies had previous experience with volunteerism and/or service learning from another institution of higher education within the surrounding community. It is important to first learn of the agencies background and experience with service learning. The potential for service agency administrators to examine the successes and challenges of prior service learning partnerships could be quite valuable. If the service agency does have prior experience with service learning, a full implementation of the interview protocol utilized in this study may not be warranted. However, if the agency does not have previous experience in service learning partnership, I would suggest the potential benefit of utilizing and adaptation of the 43 questions formulated and applied in this study as a basis to create dialogue between service agency personnel who are approached for potential service learning partnership development and the faculty member of the higher education institution who is designing the overall program.

Certainly operational and philosophical compatibility between the two partnering entities was an issue that repeatedly manifests itself in a review of the three cases analyzed within this study. The importance of “pre-planning”, meeting, dialoguing, communicating about their respective organizations and their partnership expectations was repeated throughout this study. There is great potential benefit for utilizing the
probing questions employed in this study as a foundation for potential partnership review and assessment of compatibility. Examining issues of structure, shared direction, systems, operations, competency, and leadership and management could ultimately help both potential partners make an informed and enlightened decision whether to enter into such a relationship. Additionally, if the two entities did choose to participate in such a partnership, the interview protocol and subsequent responses would give both parties a kind of “partnership roadmap” by which they could review assumptions, expectations, and purported system and constructs that should be implemented within the partnership based upon the responses of the partners.

**Implications for the student affairs profession.** This study offers new perspectives in understanding the relationships between faculty and service agency administrators in service-learning partnership for student affairs. When developing programs that either bring together the concepts of service-learning, or support institutional service learning efforts, student affairs professionals who serve as facilitators between faculty and service agency personnel can make available opportunities that foster or enhance partnership development. On some campuses student affairs has an assigned role to facilitate the creation of service learning efforts and they coordinate those experiences once they exist. If this is the case, then this study suggests that the student affairs professional should recruit faculty who are already committed to the notion of service learning and have a
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passion for that type of experience. The student affairs practitioner should be knowledgeable about service learning concepts and be prepared to provide the faculty member with any information and/or resources they may need in order to speed up the faculty member’s “homework”. The student affair professional should offer to help make contacts with service agencies or suggest agencies as potential partners to the faculty. The professional could approach service agencies and learn about their organization and their respective needs. The individuals could then seek out faculty and courses that could be a good match or fit. Additionally, the student affairs member could develop presentations for faculty on the impacts of service learning on students and incorporate key service learning concepts as well. Finally, it is important that the student affairs professions realize that they should stay out of the way once the partnership has been established and leave the processing to the two direct partners.

**Consideration for future research.** Based on the process and the findings from this study, I propose several recommendations for future research that will add to the scholarship on campus-community partnerships. The recommendations reflect a continuation of the research presented in this study.

The first recommendation I suggest is that the study should be repeated with more than three cases of service learning partnership development. The replication of the study incorporating more case review will cast a wider net to gather the experiences of service agencies and faculty members as they develop their particular partnership experiences.
Additionally, I suggest repeating the study utilizing different types of higher education institutions. This study examined the experience from the perspective of a regional campus of a major research institution. A comparison can and should be made with the experiences of a private, liberal arts college, a technical or community college, or a research university. Differences in the nature of these experiences could prove valuable as professionals at these institutions attempt to develop or expand service learning initiatives. The same adaptation of different types of environments should be examined.

This study took place in a semi-rural setting. The study should be duplicated in a larger urban setting, and a truly rural setting to extrapolate any resulting differences.

This study involved three cases where all the student participants enrolled voluntarily within the courses. The second recommendation for further research is that this study be replicated with students required to enroll in the course. Examining student motivations for participating in the course and any potential impact it has on this process would be most enlightening.

Thirdly, I recommend that additional attention be paid to the type of service performed (direct, indirect, mixed) within the service learning partnerships. Though the differentiation in service type did not seem to have any impact on outcomes of this study, further study into this important variable is warranted.
A fourth recommendation is to examine the time and duration of the service learning experience. Future research needs to attend to the duration of the experience as one variable that could have influence on outcomes of the students and/or the agencies.

Finally, I suggest that development measure for both students and community service agencies be examined. Issues of student outcomes related to their participation in the service learning partnership experience could prove invaluable. Issues such as retention, social awareness, and educational enhancement based upon the purpose of the course all have significant relevance to this study. As was indicated by all the agency staff members within this study, they were very interested in knowing outcome measures such as students perceptions of their service organization, students perceptions of the community and community needs, students perceptions of their clientele, and students willingness to continue to volunteer either with their particular agency or others service providers within the community. All of these items are potential opportunities for further study.

**Summary**

The study of partnership development within service learning is still a relatively new phenomenon. The scholarly work that has been completed on campus-community partnerships is heavily weighted toward student outcomes and the role of the curriculum (Jacoby, 1996 p.92). The educational side of service-learning partnership tends to
dominate the research. This study focused on the nature of service-learning partnerships between community agencies and higher education faculty members, with particular emphasis given to the voice of the community agency partner. The utilization of the model presented by Berquist, Betwee, and Meuel (1995) describing effective corporate partnerships as represented by six lenses: 1) shared direction, 2) structure, 3) systems, 4) operations, 5) competency, and 6) leadership and management applied to the construct of service-learning partnership, was used to help define the nature of the relationship and subsequent measurement of the degree of success of these partnerships.

The principles of preplanning open dialogue and communication, joint processing, shared governance, trust and doing your homework resonated throughout the study. These are foundations for success of a myriad of programs but they seem to hold special merit in service learning partnership development. Hopefully the success of the three cases studied in this work will lay the base for future study and give voice to campus-community partnerships.
APPENDIX A

CONSENT FORM - DIRECTORS

July 11, 2006

Ms. Jean Bush
Sharon Glyn Senior Apartments
Newark, OH 43055

Dear Ms. Bush,

I am a staff member of the Newark Campus and a doctoral graduate student at The Ohio State University. I am in the process of completing my Ph.D. program in Higher Education and Student Affairs. I have completed all of the necessary coursework and examinations, and am now conducting research for my dissertation. My dissertation supervisor is Dr. Robert F. Rodgers.

I have been working with Service-learning programs for over five years. As you may be aware, Service-learning is a relatively new venture for the Newark Campus. The campus has had the opportunity to work collaboratively with the United Way of Licking County, The American Red Cross Licking County Chapter, and Sharon Glyn Senior Apartments in the establishment of service-learning opportunities for Newark Campus students. I am very interested in exploring the nature of these partnerships and how these service-learning partnerships are established, maintained, renewed and/or changed from the point of view of the service agencies. I hope to learn from your experience and perceptions of the partnership.

I am writing to request your participation in this study. My advisory committee has approved the research proposal and the study has been reviewed by the Institutional Review Board at The Ohio State University. Your participation would take place during Spring quarter 2006 and would consist of:

- One interview of approximately 2 hours that will be audiotaped. The interview will be conducted during July 2006 based upon your schedule of availability. A follow-up interview may be needed to clarify certain points or to ask a few follow-up questions.
• At the end of the interview process, transcriptions of the interviews will be provided to you for your evaluation and clarification. Later, my interpretations of the research questions will be provided for your comments.

I will also be observing some of your interactions with the Newark Campus staff and or faculty, as they work with your service agency, and students as they perform their service experience(s). In addition, I will be interviewing and observing other agency staff members who supervised the students in their service experience. Finally, I will ask to examine any documents such as minutes, agreements, memos, that contain information about the formation, maintenance, renewal, or change in the partnership.

Your participation in this study is completely voluntary. You may withdraw from the study at any time by notifying me at (740) 366-9395 or Dr. Rodgers at (614) 292-7700. All information collected is anonymous. I will use a pseudonym that you will select when identifying persons in the study. I will not be using any written surveys or instruments. Every effort will be utilized to maintain anonymity. Quotes from your interviews, however, may be used to illustrate a point in my dissertation and/or published article, but at no time will any individuals be identified.

If you are willing to participate in this study, please complete the enclosed participant Information Form and return it to me via the self-addressed, stamped envelope by July 15, 2006. You may also contact me at berry.19@osu.edu to indicate your willingness to participate in this research study by July 15, 2006. If I do not hear from you at this time, I will contact you by e-mail and by phone. Feel free to contact me at 740-366-9395 if you have any further questions. Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

John M. Berry
Doctoral Candidate
School of Educational Policy and Leadership
berry.19@osu.edu
740-366-9395

Robert F. Rodgers
Associate Professor
School of Educational Policy and Leadership
Rodgers.2@osu.edu
614-292-7700
July 7, 2006

Mr. David Walker
American Red Cross, Licking County Ohio Chapter
Newark, OH 43055

Dear Mr. Walker,

I am a staff member of the Newark Campus and a doctoral graduate student at The Ohio State University. I am in the process of completing my Ph.D. program in Higher Education and Student Affairs. I have completed all of the necessary coursework and examinations, and am now conducting research for my dissertation. My dissertation supervisor is Dr. Robert F. Rodgers.

I have been working with Service-learning programs for over five years. As you may be aware, Service-learning is a relatively new venture for the Newark Campus. The campus has had the opportunity to work collaboratively with the United Way of Licking County, The American Red Cross Licking County Chapter, and Sharon Glyn Senior Apartments in the establishment of service-learning opportunities for Newark Campus students. I am very interested in exploring the nature of these partnerships and how these service-learning partnerships are established, maintained, renewed and/or changed from the point of view of the service agencies. I hope to learn from your experience and perceptions of the partnership.

I am writing to request your participation in this study. My advisory committee has approved the research proposal and the study has been reviewed by the Institutional Review Board at The Ohio State University. Your participation would take place during the Summer quarter 2006 and would consist of:

- One interview of approximately 1.5 hours that will be audiotaped. The interview will occur in July 2006 based upon your schedule of availability. A follow-up interview may be needed to clarify certain points or to ask a few follow-up questions.
• At the end of the interview process, transcriptions of the interviews will be provided to you for your evaluation and clarification. Later, my interpretations of the research questions will be provided for your comments.

I will also be observing some of your interactions with the Newark Campus staff and or faculty, as they work with your service agency, and students as they perform their service experience(s). In addition, I will be interviewing and observing other agency staff members who supervised the students in their service experience. Finally, I will ask to examine any documents such as minutes, agreements, memos, that contain information about the formation, maintenance, renewal, or change in the partnership.

Your participation in this study is completely voluntary. You may withdraw from the study at any time by notifying me at (740) 366-9395 or Dr. Rodgers at (614) 292-7700. All information collected is anonymous. I will use a pseudonym that you will select when identifying persons in the study. I will not be using any written surveys or instruments. Every effort will be utilized to maintain anonymity. Quotes from your interviews, however may be used to illustrate a point in my dissertation and/or published article, but at no time will any individuals be identified.

If you are willing to participate in this study, please complete the enclosed participant Information Form and return it to me via the self-addressed, stamped envelope by July 14, 2006. You may also contact me at berry.19@osu.edu to indicate your willingness to participate in this research study by July 14, 2006. If I do not hear from you at this time, I will contact you by e-mail and by phone. Feel free to contact me at 740-366-9395 if you have any further questions. Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

John M. Berry
Doctoral Candidate
School of Educational Policy and Leadership
berry.19@osu.edu
740-366-9395

Robert F. Rodgers
Associate Professor
School of Educational Policy and Leadership
Rodgers.2@osu.edu
614-292-7700
APPENDIX C

CONSENT FORM - FACULTY

January 15, 2006

Higher Education Faculty Member
Address

Dear Dr.

I am a staff member of the Newark Campus and a doctoral graduate student at The Ohio State University. I am in the process of completing my Ph.D. program in Higher Education and Student Affairs. I have completed all of the necessary coursework and examinations, and am now conducting research for my dissertation. My dissertation supervisor is Dr. Robert F. Rodgers.

I have been working with Service-learning programs for over five years. As you may be aware, Service-learning is a relatively new venture for the Newark Campus. The campus has had the opportunity to work collaboratively with the United Way of Licking County, The American Red Cross Licking County Chapter, and Sharon Glyn Senior Apartments in the establishment of service-learning opportunities for Newark Campus students. I am very interested in exploring the nature of these partnerships and how these service-learning partnerships are established, maintained, renewed and/or changed from the point of view of the service agencies. I hope to learn from your experience and perceptions of the partnership.

I am writing to request your participation in this study. My advisory committee has approved the research proposal and the study has been reviewed by the Institutional Review Board at The Ohio State University. Your participation would take place during the Winter quarter 2006 and would consist of:

- One interview of approximately 2 hours that will be audiotaped. The interview will occur in February 2006 based upon your schedule of availability. A follow-up interview may be needed to clarify certain points or to ask a few follow-up questions.
At the end of the interview process, transcriptions of the interviews will be provided to you for your evaluation and clarification. Later, my interpretations of the research questions will be provided for your comments.

I will also be observing some of your interactions with the Newark Campus staff and or faculty, as they work with your service agency, and students as they perform their service experience(s). In addition, I will be interviewing and observing other agency staff members who supervised the students in their service experience. Finally, I will ask to examine any documents such as minutes, agreements, memos, that contain information about the formation, maintenance, renewal, or change in the partnership.

Your participation in this study is completely voluntary. You may withdraw from the study at any time by notifying me at (740) 366-9395 or Dr. Rodgers at (614) 292-7700. All information collected is anonymous. I will use a pseudonym that you will select when identifying persons in the study. I will not be using any written surveys or instruments. Every effort will be utilized to maintain anonymity. Quotes from your interviews, however may be used to illustrate a point in my dissertation and/or published article, but at no time will any individuals be identified.

If you are willing to participate in this study, please complete the enclosed participant Information Form and return it to me via the self-addressed, stamped envelope by February 1, 2006. You may also contact me at berry.19@osu.edu to indicate your willingness to participate in this research study by February 7, 2006. If I do not hear from you at this time, I will contact you by e-mail and by phone. Feel free to contact me at 740-366-9395 if you have any further questions. Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

John M. Berry
Doctoral Candidate
School of Educational Policy
and Leadership
berry.19@osu.edu
740-366-9395

Robert F. Rodgers
Associate Professor
School of Educational Policy
and Leadership
Rodgers.2@osu.edu
614-292-7700
APPENDIX D

PARTICIPANT INFORMATION FORM

Participant Information Form

If you are willing to be involved with this study, please complete this form and return it via the enclosed, self-addressed, stamped envelope by July 15, 2006 to:

John M. Berry, 16 Brecon Circle, Granville, OH 43023

By completing this form, you agree to an initial conversation regarding the exploration of the nature of service-learning partnerships as outlined in the enclosed letter. The researcher will be in contact with you about further participation once all forms have been reviewed.

Please feel free to contact the researcher at 740-366-9395 or via e-mail at berry.19@osu.edu if you have any questions or comments.

Your participation in this study is completely voluntary and you may withdraw at any time throughout the process. In addition, you will be asked to sign a consent form at the time of the first meeting.

Items on this form will be used to provide general background information in the study. Specific references in the study will be made using a pseudonym. The information in the box below will be used only a method of communicating with you during the process.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telenhone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-Mail Address</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Information about You

Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Date of Birth       Month _________  Day ______  Year ______

Race/Ethnicity          African American
                        ______ American Indian/Native American
                        ______ Asian American
                        ______ Caucasian
                        ______ Hispanic/Latino
                        ______ Bi-racial
                        ______ Multi-racial
                        ______ Other
APPENDIX E

INTERVIEW PROTOCOL - DIRECTORS

Interview Schedule for the Executive Director - Interview # 1

The first set of questions will be posed to the three (3) Executive Directors of the community service agencies partnering with the Newark Campus for the purpose of delivering service-learning opportunities for students of the Newark Campus. This interview process will be used to gauge their experience with and understanding of Service-learning.

Structure

What is the purpose and/or mission of your organization? 
How is your organization’s mission similar or different to that of the service-learning program of the Newark Campus? 
What are the specific goals and objectives of your organization? 
What, if any, shared goals do you have with the service-learning program of the Newark Campus?

Shared Direction

Tell me what the term “partnership” means to you. 
Why has your organization agreed to participate in a partnership with the Newark Campus Service-learning program? 
What expectation do you have of this Service-learning partnership? 
What needs of your organization will be met in this partnership? 
What do you personally hope to achieve or gain by your involvement with the Service-learning experience? 
What do you hope your organization will achieve or gain by involvement with the Service-learning experience? 
What service does your organizations provide? How do you envision this service being affected, if at all, by this partnership?

Systems
Describe how your organization operates from the Board of Directors to the staff delivering service.
Describe how your organization makes decisions.
Describe what your organization's values are.
Describe what your organization believes.
Describe your organization's behavior.
Describe how the service-learning partnership operates.
Describe how the partnership makes decisions.
What are the partnership's values?
What beliefs are manifest in the partnership?
What behaviors are demonstrated in the partnership?
Describe or anticipate the communication flow in the partnership.
How was the partnership guided or shaped by your needs?

**Operations**

Who do you perceive to be “in control” of this partnership and why?
Describe or anticipate how problem solving occurs within this partnership?
How do you anticipate communication regarding the partnership to be processed?
Describe your organization's physical facility.
How is or will this partnership be marketed?
How is or will this partnership be financed?

**Competency**

What does your organization do best? What are your organization's best practices in this partnership?
What do you believe the Newark Campus to do best in relation to the service-learning partnership? What are their best practices in relation to the service-learning partnership?
What do you hope to learn, if anything, from partnering with Newark Campus?
What do you hope to learn, if anything, from the students who serve in the service-learning experience?
Do you anticipate the Newark Campus will learn anything from your organization via this partnership?
Do you anticipate the students who service in the service-learning experience will learn anything from your organization via this partnership?
Tell about the partnership’s impacts on your personnel.
Tell about the partnership’s impacts on your agencies operations, policies or any other related issues.
Tell about the partnership’s impacts on your organizations physical facilities.
Tell about the partnership’s impacts on the service your organization offers.

**Leadership and Management**

What role do you play within your organization?
What is your understanding of the concept of Service-learning?
Tell me about any apprehensions or concerns you have or had related to the Service-Learning experience with the Newark Campus?
What is your understanding of your specific role within the Service-Learning process?
What is your understanding of specific people and roles needed within your agency to facilitate the Service-Learning partnership?
How do you work with the Newark Campus to facilitate this service-learning partnership?
Who handles and is responsible for broad basic strategy on how your agency relates to the service-learning program on the Newark Campus?
Who handles and is responsible for day-to-day operations with students who serve within the service-learning partnerships?
Who handles and is responsible for day-to-day operations with the instructor(s) of class within the service-learning partnerships?
Who handles and is responsible for day-to-day operations with the Newark Campus service-learning program administrators within the service-learning partnerships?
Who handles and is responsible for negotiating changes in the partnership after operating for a while and you see need for change?
What have been the needed changes within the partnership?
How does the change process occur?
APPENDIX F

INTERVIEW PROTOCOL - STAFF

Interview Schedule for the Service Agency Service-Learning Experience Supervisor

The following set of questions will be posed to the three (3) Service Agency Service-learning experience supervisors. These individuals have been identified as overseeing the service provided by students within the partnership with the Newark Campus for the purpose of delivering service-learning opportunities for students of the Newark Campus. This interview process will be used to gauge their experience with and understanding of Service-learning.

Structure

What is the purpose and/or mission of your organization?
What are the specific goals and objectives of your organization?
What, if any, shared goals do you have with the service-learning program of the Newark Campus?

Shared Direction

Tell me what the term “partnership” means to you.
What expectation do you have of this Service-learning partnership?
What needs of your organization will be met in this partnership?
What do you personally hope to achieve or gain by your involvement with the Service-learning experience?
What do you hope your organization will achieve or gain by involvement with the Service-learning experience?

Systems

Describe how your organization makes decisions.
Describe what your organizations values.
Describe what your organization believes.
Describe your organizations behavior.
Describe how the service-learning partnership operates.
Describe how the partnership makes decisions.
What are the partnerships values?
What beliefs are manifest in the partnerships?
What behaviors are demonstrated in the partnership?
Describe or anticipate the communication flow in the partnership.
How was the partnership guided or shaped by your needs?

**Operations**

Who do you perceive to be “in control” of this partnership and why?
Describe or anticipate how problem solving occurs within this partnership?
How do you anticipate communication regarding the partnership to be processed?
Describe your organizations physical facility.
How is or will this partnership be marketed?
How is or will this partnership be financed?

**Competency**

What do you hope to learn, if anything, from partnering with Newark Campus?
What do you hope to learn, if anything, from the students who serve in the service-learning experience?
Do you anticipate the Newark Campus will learn anything from your organization via this partnership?
Do you anticipate the students who service in the service-learning experience will learn anything from your organization via this partnership?

**Leadership and Management**

What role do you play within your organization?
What is your understanding of the concept of Service-learning?
Tell me about any apprehensions or concerns you have or had related to the Service-Learning experience with the Newark Campus?
What is your understanding of your specific role within the Service-Learning process?
What is your understanding of specific people and roles needed within your agency to facilitate the Service-Learning partnership?
How do you work with the Newark Campus to facilitate this service-learning partnership?
Who handles and is responsible for broad basic strategy on how your agency relates to the service-learning program on the Newark Campus?
Who handles and is responsible for day-to-day operations with students who serve within the service-learning partnerships?
Who handles and is responsible for day-to-day operations with the instructor(s) of class within the service-learning partnerships?
Who handles and is responsible for day-to-day operations with the Newark Campus service-learning program administrators within the service-learning partnerships?
Who handles and is responsible for negotiating changes in the partnership after operating for a while and you see need for change?
What have been the needed changes within the partnership?
How does the change process occur?
APPENDIX G

INTERVIEW PROTOCOL - FACULTY

Interview Schedule for the Higher Education Faculty

The first set of questions will be posed to the three (3) higher education faculty members of the community Newark Campus for the purpose of delivering service-learning opportunities for students of the Newark Campus. This interview process will be used to gauge their experience with and understanding of Service-learning.

Structure

What is the purpose and/or mission of your institution?
How is your institution’s mission similar or different to that of the community service agency?
What are the specific goals and objectives of your institution?
What, if any, shared goals do you have with the community service agency?

Shared Direction

Tell me what the term “partnership” means to you.
Why have you agreed to participate in a partnership with the community service agency?
What expectation do you have of this service-learning partnership?
What needs of your organization will be met in this partnership?
What do you personally hope to achieve or gain by your involvement with the service-learning experience?
What do you hope your organization will achieve or gain by involvement with the service-learning experience?
What service does your organization provide? How do you envision this service being affected, if at all, by this partnership?

Systems

Describe how your university operates in the administration and delivery of service-learning projects. What responsibilities do you have as a faculty member?
Describe how your university makes decisions in the service-learning area.
Describe what your university’s values in service-learning.
Describe what your university’s believes in service-learning.
Describe your university’s behavior in its service-learning projects.
Describe how the service-learning partnership operates.
Describe how the partnership makes decisions.
What are the partnership’s values?
What beliefs are manifest in the partnerships?
What behaviors are demonstrated in the partnership?
Describe or anticipate the communication flow in the partnership.
How was the partnership guided or shaped by your needs?

Operations

Who do you perceive to be “in control” of this partnership and why?
Describe or anticipate how problem solving occurs within this partnership?
How do you anticipate communication regarding the partnership to be processed?
How is or will this partnership be marketed?
How is or will this partnership be financed?

Competency

What does the service-learning part of your university do best? What are your university’s best practices in service-learning?
What do you believe the community service agency to do best in relation to the service-learning partnership? What are their best practices in relation to the service-learning partnership?
What do you hope to learn, if anything, from partnering with the community service agency?
What do you hope to learn, if anything, from the students who serve in the service-learning experience?
Do you anticipate the community service agency will learn anything from your organization via this partnership?
Do you anticipate the students who service in the service-learning experience will learn anything from your organization via this partnership?
Tell about the partnership’s impacts on the service your organization offers.

Leadership and Management

What role do you play within your organization?
What is your understanding of the concept of Service-learning?
Tell me about any apprehensions or concerns you have or had related to the Service-Learning experience with the community service agency?
What is your understanding of your specific role within the Service-Learning process?
How do you work with the community service agency to facilitate this service-learning partnership?
Who handles and is responsible for day-to-day operations with students who serve within the service-learning partnerships?
Who handles and is responsible for day-to-day operations with you as instructor(s) of class within the service-learning partnerships?
Who handles and is responsible for day-to-day operations with the Newark Campus service-learning program administrators within the service-learning partnerships?
Who handles and is responsible for negotiating changes in the partnership after operating for a while and you see need for change?
What have been the needed changes within the partnership?
How does the change process occur?
APPENDIX H

CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE

The Ohio State University Consent to Participate in Research

An Examination of Partnership Development Between Community Service Agencies and An Institution of Higher Education: Implications for Service-Learning.

Study Title:

Researcher: John M. Berry (Co-Investigator)

Sponsor: Robert F. Rodgers ( Principle Investigator)

This is a consent form for research participation. It contains important information about this study and what to expect if you decide to participate.

Your participation is voluntary.

Please consider the information carefully. Feel free to ask questions before making your decision whether or not to participate. If you decide to participate, you will be asked to sign this form and will receive a copy of the form.

Purpose: This study will focus on the nature of the partnership between three community service agencies and an institution of higher education for the delivery of service-learning experiences. The specific partnerships are between The United Way of Licking County, State of Ohio, the American Red Cross Licking County Ohio Chapter, Sharon Glyn Senior Apartments and the Newark Campus of The Ohio State University. The nature of the partnership will be explored through: 1) how the structure of the organizations interact; 2) describing both shared directions and unique needs of the two parties; 3) identifying the values, beliefs, decision making mechanisms, and communication patterns of the partnerships; 4) describing operations of control, problem solving, use of physical facilities, marketing and finance; 5) describing the impact of the partnership in personnel, policies and services; 6) identifying competent practices; 7) describing who learned what from whom; and 8) the leadership practices in establishing, maintaining, renewing and changing the partnership.
**Procedures/Tasks:** Your participation would take place during the Winter quarter 2006 and would consist of:

- One interview of approximately 2 hours that will be audiotaped. The interview will occur in February 2006 based upon your schedule of availability. A follow-up interview may be needed to clarify certain points or to ask a few follow-up questions.

- Permission will be secured from each participant to audiotape interviews. Interviews will be transcribed by the interviewer, and references to names and institutions will be removed. All audiotapes will be erased three years following completion of the dissertation process.

- Participants will have full access to information they provide in the study and the opportunity to review transcripts, summaries, and interpretations. This allows for modifications of transcripts and reactions to summaries and interpretations of the data. Both authors of this study will examine transcripts to identify concepts, patterns and issues. Upon completion of the dissertation process, all correspondence and transcripts that have any identifying information will be kept in a locked file within the researcher’s office for a period of three years and then destroyed.

- At the end of the interview process, transcriptions of the interviews will be provided to you for your evaluation and clarification. Later, my interpretations of the research questions will be provided for your comments.

**Duration:** The duration of your participation would occur from May 2006 to June 2006.

You may leave the study at any time. If you decide to stop participating in the study, there will be no penalty to you, and you will not lose any benefits to which you are otherwise entitled. Your decision will not affect your future relationship with The Ohio State University.

**Risks and Benefits:** Though a breach of confidentiality in this research protocol is unlikely, there is an inherent risk given the nature of the study. Participant may be identifiable due to the various characteristics and/or variables of study components. Possible consequences to this breach of confidentiality may include job performance indicators or review measures.

Though there will not likely be any direct benefit to the individual subjects of the study, derivative information may be of value to institutions of higher education as well as
community service agencies as they aspire to coordinate service-learning projects and initiatives.

The format of this study necessitates a minimum level of risks to the participants/subjects. The information/data garnered from the study should prove to be of value to the higher education community.

Confidentiality:

Efforts will be made to keep your study-related information confidential. However, there may be circumstances where this information must be released. For example, personal information regarding your participation in this study may be disclosed if required by state law. Also, your records may be reviewed by the following groups (as applicable to the research):

- Office for Human Research Protections or other federal, state, or international regulatory agencies;
- The Ohio State University Institutional Review Board or Office of Responsible Research Practices;
- The sponsor, if any, or agency (including the Food and Drug Administration for FDA-regulated research) supporting the study.

Participant Rights:

You may refuse to participate in this study without penalty or loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled. If you are a student or employee at Ohio State, your decision will not affect your grades or employment status.

If you choose to participate in the study, you may discontinue participation at any time without penalty or loss of benefits. By signing this form, you do not give up any personal legal rights you may have as a participant in this study.

An Institutional Review Board responsible for human subjects research at The Ohio State University reviewed this research project and found it to be acceptable, according to applicable state and federal regulations and University policies designed to protect the rights and welfare of participants in research.
Contacts and Questions:

For questions, concerns, or complaints about the study you may contact Robert F. Rodgers at 614-292-7700 or Rodgers.2@osu.edu.

For questions about your rights as a participant in this study or to discuss other study-related concerns or complaints with someone who is not part of the research team, you may contact Ms. Sandra Meadows in the Office of Responsible Research Practices at 1-800-678-6251.

If you are injured as a result of participating in this study or for questions about a study-related injury, you may contact Robert F. Rodgers at 614-292-7700 or Rodgers.2@osu.edu.

Signing the consent form

I have read (or someone has read to me) this form and I am aware that I am being asked to participate in a research study. I have had the opportunity to ask questions and have had them answered to my satisfaction. I voluntarily agree to participate in this study.

I am not giving up any legal rights by signing this form. I will be given a copy of this form.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Printed name of subject</th>
<th>Signature of subject</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AM/PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Date and time</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Printed name of person authorized to consent for subject (when applicable)</th>
<th>Signature of person authorized to consent for subject (when applicable)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AM/PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Date and time</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Investigator/Research Staff
I have explained the research to the participant or his/her representative before requesting the signature(s) above. There are no blanks in this document. A copy of this form has been given to the participant or his/her representative.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Printed name of person obtaining consent</th>
<th>Signature of person obtaining consent</th>
<th>AM/PM</th>
<th>Date and time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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