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## I. Summary of Evidence for QEP Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement/Standard</th>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Evidence</th>
<th>Pages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CR 2.12</td>
<td>The institution has developed an acceptable Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP) that includes an institutional process for identifying key issues emerging from institutional assessment</td>
<td>The topic selection and identification processes were comprised of broad-based involvement and representation. To identify key issues, the QEP Steering Committee utilized institutional and survey assessments, including findings from a USG Board of Regents study (<em>College Degree Access for Coastal Southeast Georgia</em>), results from a strategic master planning needs assessment, and quantitative and qualitative data from the 2009-2010 Foundations of Excellence (FOE) in the First College Year project.</td>
<td>6-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR 2.12</td>
<td>… and focuses on learning outcomes and/or the environment supporting student learning and accomplishing the mission</td>
<td>The importance of service-learning as a student learning strategy is clearly reflected in the mission of the institution and the value of service-learning as a pedagogy is strongly supported by the literature. The College’s mission is to investigate, capture and disseminate 21st-century knowledge and skills, blending student-centered classroom education and innovative service-learning to provide students with a solid foundation to support lifelong learning and leadership and appreciation for social responsibility, global awareness, diversity, and engaged entrepreneurship. The QEP is focused on 13 measurable student learning outcomes in four objective areas: (1) developing critical and creative thinking and reflection skills; (2) enabling enhanced understanding of course content; (3) enabling community engagement and promoting leadership; and (4) promoting social responsibility, global awareness, and openness to diverse perspectives. The QEP includes a plan for the institutionalization of service-learning that requires development and assessment in six related areas: (1) faculty development and support; (2) student involvement and leadership; (3) community partnership development; (4) program development; (5) institutionalization; and (6) assessment.</td>
<td>6-7; 27-29; 59-64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS 3.3.2</td>
<td>The institution has developed a Quality Enhancement Plan that (1) demonstrates institutional capability for the initiation, implementation, and completion of the QEP;</td>
<td>The College is prepared and fully committed to allocating the necessary staffing and financial resources to successfully complete the proposed QEP. The College has established a Center for Service-Learning to serve as a hub for service-learning institutionalization and assessment efforts. The proposed timeline has been carefully designed to allow for the planning, implementation and assessment of the QEP over a 5-year period.</td>
<td>36-65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) includes broad-based involvement of institutional constituencies in the development and proposed implementation of the QEP; and</td>
<td>Broad-based involvement in the development of the QEP and the proposed implementation was achieved through a call for topic proposals open to the entire Brunswick and Kingsland (Camden Center) campuses. Multiple open forums were held to answer questions from proposers. Topic proposals were accepted from faculty members and staff; a total of thirteen were submitted, including two work groups of six faculty/staff members representing the fields of Education, Humanities, Nursing, Social Science, and Student Affairs. The Implementation Subcommittee of the QEP Steering Committee collaborated with other subcommittees to develop ideas for QEP implementation; monitored the piloting of a service-learning program; and developed a plan to commit institutional resources to support the QEP over a five-year period. Additionally, the QEP reflects endorsements by faculty, staff and students.</td>
<td>8-26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) identifies goals and a plan to assess their achievement</td>
<td>The College has identified 13 student learning outcomes. To ensure that each of these outcomes is effectively measured, the College will pursue both course-level and institution-level assessment strategies. Assessment data will be gathered through quantitative (surveys, checklists, syllabi, student performance on reflective assignments) and qualitative (interviews, focus groups, open-ended surveys, reflection journals) evaluation practices. Each service-learning course is required to include specific and measurable student learning outcomes that align with the stated QEP objectives as well as program assessments. The QEP contains a detailed assessment plan that will evaluate measurable student learning outcomes and monitor service-learning program implementation at the institutional level.</td>
<td>56-65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
II. Executive Summary

To enhance student learning, the College of Coastal Georgia has selected Learning through Engagement: Service-Learning as the topic for its Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP). The development and implementation of the selected QEP fits well within the College's mission that clearly identifies service-learning as an integral part of the institution.

The College involved a broad range of constituents from across the entire campus – faculty, staff, students and administration – and the community in a year-long initiative of research and intense discussion to consider various ideas for the QEP. After identifying student engagement as a broad-based topic with a particular emphasis on service-learning, the QEP Steering Committee articulated the following service-learning goal: to integrate and enhance student learning and development through hands-on, experiential activities that also meet community needs. The four primary objectives undergirding the QEP goal are to: (1) develop critical and creative thinking and reflection skills in all students; (2) enable enhanced understanding of course content; (3) enable community engagement and promote leadership; and (4) promote social responsibility, global awareness, and openness to diverse perspectives.

The College chose service-learning as its QEP because of its proven strength as a pedagogical tool to help students achieve a broad range of important personal and academic outcomes. Service-learning will be a key mechanism to help the College’s students develop the intellectual skills they need in a 21st-century context that requires adaptability, sophisticated knowledge, problem-solving capacities, and self-directed learning skills. Additionally, the College’s commitment to service-learning enhances its broader institutional goals of encouraging civic engagement among students and increasing outreach to local communities.

The QEP implementation protocol provides a comprehensive blueprint for the broad-based institutionalization of service-learning in a way that will enable realization of the QEP’s objectives and ultimate goal. The Plan encompasses a wide range of programmatic issues, including support for faculty development, incentives and rewards; community partner development and participation; and student involvement and leadership opportunities. Additionally, the plan provides assessable benchmarks and goals that will be used to guide and monitor the College’s progress toward completion of the QEP.

Planned assessment methods include evaluation at the course-level and institutional-level, as well as annual performance reports and planning retreats. The Office of Institutional Effectiveness, working in conjunction with the Center for Service-Learning, will report annually to the President’s Cabinet, Faculty Senate, Staff Assembly, Student Government Association, internal and external advisory boards, and the College community on the QEP’s progress and use of results to make needed adjustments for the enhancement of student learning.

The intent of the QEP is to ensure that all students take at least one service-learning course before graduation. Students enrolled in baccalaureate degree programs will be expected to enroll in additional, upper-level service-learning experiences as the College’s course offerings continue to expand over the next five years.

The long range goal is to build capacity for the practice of service-learning so that the College of Coastal Georgia will become Georgia’s College for Service-Learning.
II. Institutional Overview

Founded in 1961 as Brunswick College, the institution has gone through various transformations. Focusing on the needs of the surrounding communities, the College became Coastal Georgia Community College in 1996. In June 2008, with approval from the University System of Georgia (USG) Board of Regents, Coastal Georgia Community College became the College of Coastal Georgia, a state college authorized to provide baccalaureate degree programs.

At its annual meeting in December 2008, the Southern Association of Schools and Colleges’ Commission on Colleges (SACSCOC) granted the College initial approval as a Level II institution to offer baccalaureate degrees in business administration, early childhood/special education and middle grades education, and nursing. In March 2009, as part of the transition to state college status, the College sought and received approval from both the USG Board of Regents and SACSCOC to discontinue the technical programs, effective July 1, 2009.

With the College’s change in institutional status – moving from two-year to four-year – a new mission statement was developed and approved by the USG Board of Regents in August 2009. This new mission statement articulates the core principles of an access institution while incorporating goals to become a destination institution with strong scholarship, worthwhile community linkages, and exemplary student development.

The SACSCOC substantive change review team visited the campus in February 2010 and had no recommendations for the College. At its June 2010 Board of Trustees meeting, the Commission on Colleges reconfirmed the College as a Level II institution authorized to offer baccalaureate degrees.

In an effort to continue its progress as a new state college, the USG Board of Regents approved the offering of baccalaureate degrees in biological sciences and health informatics in April 2010. SACSCOC subsequently approved both degree programs in August 2010. One year later (April 2011), the USG Board of Regents approved two additional baccalaureate degree programs in mathematics and psychology, which were also approved by SACSCOC in July 2011.

With eight baccalaureate degree programs1, four career associate degree programs2, five associate of arts for transfer pre-majors3, and 34 associate of science for transfer pre-majors4, the College is expanding as a comprehensive undergraduate institution, providing an outstanding education for tomorrow’s leaders and citizens through an emerging emphasis on service-learning, global awareness, and engaged entrepreneurship.

---

1 Biological Sciences, Health Informatics, General Business, Early Childhood/Special Education, Mathematics, Middle Grades Education, Nursing, and Psychology

2 Clinical Laboratory Technology, Hospitality Management, Nursing, and Radiologic Science

3 Art, Communication, English, Modern Foreign Languages, and Philosophy

4 Agribusiness, Agricultural Economics, Chemistry, Computer Information Systems, Computer Science, Criminal Justice, Dental Hygiene, Environmental Economics and Management, Fisheries and Aquaculture, Forest Environmental Resources, Forestry, General Studies, Geology, Health and Physical Education, History, Information Technology, Mathematics, Medical Records Administration, Medical Technology, Occupational Therapy, Physical Therapy, Physician Assistant, Physics, Political Science, Pre-Dentistry, Pre-Engineering, Pre-Medicine, Pre-Pharmacy, Pre-Veterinary Medicine, Psychology, Recreation, Respiratory Therapy, Sociology, and Wildlife
In academic year 2010-11, the average semester enrollment was 3,300 students. The College serves a diverse student body. Table 1 provides a student demographic snapshot.

**Table 1: Spring Semester 2011 Student Demographic Snapshot**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Type</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Headcount</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Joint Enrollment</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Freshman</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>Full Time (12 + credit hrs)</td>
<td>1786</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Undergraduate Transfer</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>Part Time</td>
<td>1481</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Degree</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Returning</td>
<td>2799</td>
<td>Full Time Equivalency (FTE)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transient</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Race</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Residency</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian/Alaska Native</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>In-State</td>
<td>3012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>Out-of-Country</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>657</td>
<td>Out-of-State</td>
<td>209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>2140</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undeclared</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>Non-U.S. Citizen: resident</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Non-U.S. Citizen: non-resident</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ethnicity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Citizenship</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>97</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>774</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undeclared</td>
<td>2396</td>
<td>California</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>State Origin</strong> (top 10)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 23</td>
<td>1587</td>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>2979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23-29</td>
<td>797</td>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 +</td>
<td>883</td>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sex</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>2263</td>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>1004</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Degree Level</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>County Origin</strong> (Georgia, top 5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate (Transfer)</td>
<td>1817</td>
<td>Brantley</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baccalaureate</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>Camden</td>
<td>736</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Associate</td>
<td>686</td>
<td>Glynn</td>
<td>1350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certificate</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>McIntosh</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Degree</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>Wayne</td>
<td>225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Baccalaureate</td>
<td>433</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

5 University System of Georgia Academic Data Mart, Spring Semester 2011
IV Identification of the Topic

A topic that is creative and vital to the long-term improvement of student learning (providing support for compliance with CR 2.12 “focuses on learning outcomes and/or the environment supporting student learning”)

Phase I: Emergence of Service-Learning

The research of the University System of Georgia (USG) Board of Regents identified the importance of community engagement and applied learning.

In December 2007, Dr. David Morgan, a former USG academic officer, produced a report entitled College Degree Access for Coastal Southeast Georgia. The study was to determine whether baccalaureate programming should be offered by the then-named Coastal Georgia Community College to benefit residents in southeast Georgia. One of the study’s key findings was that “developing this educational asset into a state college would also provide students attending other USG institutions the opportunity to take advantage of the unique historical, natural, artistic and economic assets of the region. Many students could benefit from internships and field experiences that draw upon these resources, including those related to preserving the unique character of the area.”

In response to Dr. Morgan’s study, and as part of the transition to state college status, the College specifically articulated its commitment to service-learning for the first time in 2009. It emerged out of a dynamic planning process related to 2020 Vision: A Decade and Beyond, a comprehensive initiative to refashion the institution’s strategic master plan. It was through this strategic planning process during academic year 2008-09 that the College experienced significant changes in its purpose and scope. 2020 Vision placed future physical development of the College campus squarely into the strategic context of academic, student/campus life and community/economic development strategies and priorities. Based on the needs assessment conducted to address values, themes, and strategic questions, service-learning evolved as a learning strategy that figured prominently in the new vision (brand) statement: “Providing outstanding education for tomorrow’s leaders and citizens through service-learning, global awareness and engaged entrepreneurship.”

The 2020 Vision initiative also included an effort to revise the institution’s mission statement, with the College’s President’s Cabinet affirming the revised mission.

The commitment of the College to its new mission – stated below – is realized by the development and implementation of the QEP. The College’s new mission statement, representing the core principles of an access institution, incorporates the goals of becoming a destination institution with an emphasis on strong scholarship, community linkages, and exemplary student development. The mission statement, approved by the USG Board of Regents in August 2009, reads:

As a state college of the University System of Georgia, the College of Coastal Georgia offers targeted baccalaureate programs of study, pre-baccalaureate programs of study for transfer,
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associate of arts and associate of science degrees, and serves as a portal to graduate education. It is the mission of the College to:

- Foster academic excellence and individual development in a supportive environment that expands access to higher education and career preparation and enriches student lives;
- Investigate, capture and disseminate 21st century knowledge and skills, blending student-centered classroom education and innovative service-learning to provide students with a solid foundation to support lifelong learning and leadership and appreciation for social responsibility, global awareness, diversity, and engaged entrepreneurship;
- Provide accessible and affordable higher education to a wide spectrum of learners, from recent high school graduates to returning adults; and
- Engage actively with the community and region through many avenues, including professional development programs, economic development partnerships, service-learning, public service activities, early college programs, applied scholarship, and cultural enrichment experiences.

Foundations of Excellence
Building upon its new institutional mission and strategic master plan, the College embraced the opportunity to participate in the 2009-2010 class of four-year institutions with Foundations of Excellence® (FOE) in the First College Year. This partnership with the Policy Center on the First Year enhanced the College’s ability to align its goals and action plans for student learning, success, and persistence within a liberal education curriculum. The rigorous program also has helped the institution to identify areas that need improvement and to map pathways for success, including the formalization of a service-learning program.

The College has utilized the FOE study to promote excellence in support services for overall student success as well as to address retention issues related to course and degree completion rates. During the FOE needs assessment phase in the late Fall Semester 2009 and early Spring Semester 2010, the College collected and analyzed faculty/staff and student survey data. Among the recommendations emanating from the final FOE comprehensive report was the need to develop a synergistic service-learning program.

At the time, service-learning strategies were not widely integrated across the campus and have had limited applicability to freshmen. Interestingly, when faculty and staff (N=90) were asked in the Foundations of Excellence Faculty/Staff Survey for Four-Year Institutions about how the institution encourages students to become engaged in enriching educational experiences such as service- learning and undergraduate research, only 20% noted “high” or “very high”.


Foundations of Excellence
Faculty/Staff Survey for Four-Year Institutions (October 2010)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>To what degree does the institution encourage students to become engaged in enriched educational experiences such as research with faculty, service-learning, and internships?</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very High</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slight</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additionally, of the 346 students who completed the *Foundations of Excellence Student Survey for Four-Year Institutions*, only 3.4% said they would find service-learning “to be the MOST rewarding experiences as a CCGA student.”

Foundations of Excellence
Student Survey for Four-Year Institutions (November 2010)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Which would you find to be the MOST rewarding experiences as a CCGA student?</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Financial Aid</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarships</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advising</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New degree programs</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entertainment options</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clubs and organizations</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dining options</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus ministry</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-campus residences</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service-learning</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercollegiate athletics</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intramural activities</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These *Foundations of Excellence* survey results suggested the need for broader strategy to educate students and faculty on the merits and practice of service-learning. To this end, the College has promoted a comprehensive and systematic understanding of service-learning and how it could be effective for students, faculty, and the community.

**Phase II: Topic Selection Process**

With a new institutional mission, a revised master plan and the Foundations of Excellence initiative acting to advance service-learning as an institutional strategy, the process for selecting the topic of the QEP was initiated in academic year 2009-2010, in preparation for SACSCOC’s reaffirmation of accreditation. QEP topic selection forums were offered in September 2009 on
the Brunswick campus and at the Camden Center in Kingsland, Georgia. The forums provided faculty, staff, and students with an opportunity to learn more about the QEP and allowed the College to provide answers to questions concerning topic proposal submissions as well as a timeline for the development of a successful QEP prior to the on-site committee visit in Fall Semester 2011. A sample e-invite follows:

Additionally, plans for how the College would complete both the Compliance Certification and QEP were discussed during these information sessions. Faculty learned that they would have an opportunity to affect the future of the College and its students by developing and proposing a QEP to address student learning.

In October 2009 a Call for Topic Proposals was issued, inviting faculty and staff to submit short topic papers. The Office of Institutional Effectiveness sent email solicitations to faculty and staff, inviting them to put forth a topic proposal using an electronic form that contained seven key sections:

1. **Topic** – Give your idea a working title that should be descriptive of the focus.
2. **Summary** – Provide a brief description of the proposed topic.
3. **Student Learning** – Discuss what aspects of student learning are to be affected by this topic. What are the goals and objectives for improving student learning? Why is it important for student learning in this area to be improved at the College?
4. **Description and Scope** – Provide a narrative description of types and sequence of activities being proposed, detailing the timeline for initiation that would be used in the development of and completion of the elements of the QEP.
5. **Resources** – Identify all the resources necessary to develop, deploy and monitor this topic, including a brief budget of estimated costs.
6. **Assessment** – Describe the kinds of assessments that would be possible to demonstrate the effects of the QEP activities on student learning. What kinds of measures and instruments would be used? What kind of assessment schedule should be followed?
7. **Bibliography** – Describe any works cited in the preparation of this topic proposal, including major sources that would be used in the development of a research-based plan.

Another important tool to encourage submission of topic proposals was the QEP web page; it provided background on the role of the QEP in reaffirming SACSCOC accreditation as well as offering a helpful timeline. The web page also served as the portal where all members of the College community were invited to submit QEP topic ideas through a PDF submission form [Exhibit 1].

By December 2009, thirteen faculty and staff had submitted topic proposals, including two work groups of six faculty/staff members representing the fields of Education, Humanities, Nursing, Social Science, and Student Affairs.

The suggested topics included the following:

- **Advancing Student Success via Service-Learning**
- **Putting the College in the Community through Engaged Learning**
- **Integrating Lecture and Laboratory Sessions in Astronomy, Geology and Physics.**

After proposals had been submitted to the Office of Institutional Effectiveness, the SACSCOC Leadership Team convened to carefully review the summaries of each of the three candidate topics. The Leadership Team examined and assessed QEP topic proposals extensively using a rubric established in advance that considered four key questions:

1. Is the proposed topic focused yet has broad interest and relevance?
2. How well are the identified student learning outcomes associated with the proposed topic?
3. Is the proposed topic potentially viable with respect to the likelihood of adequate resources?
4. Is the proposed topic potentially viable with respect to overall acceptance as being very important?

Rather than opting for one of the proposed topics, the Leadership Team focused on a recurring element in two of the three proposals: service-learning and engagement. Work group members representing two of the topic proposals – *Advancing Student Success via Service-Learning* and *Putting the College in the Community through Engaged Learning* – were asked to reconvene as a collective and submit an integrated topic proposal. After several discussions, this collaborative decided that the broader scope of student engagement would be narrowed to a more focused emphasis on service-learning. In its discussions, the work group felt that for the College to meet its service goals (noted in the institution’s revised mission statement), it should encourage faculty and students to apply academic knowledge in ways that contribute to the social, economic, cultural, spiritual, and ethical quality of life in the Coastal Georgia region. The work group embraced service-learning as a way to teach students a sense of community,

---

8 The QEP website can be viewed at [http://www.ccga.edu/SACSCOC/QEPoverview.asp](http://www.ccga.edu/SACSCOC/QEPoverview.asp)

9 The Leadership Team consists of the President, Vice-President for Academic Affairs, Vice-President for Student Affairs, Vice-President for Business Affairs, Associate Vice-President for Academic Affairs, Director of Institutional Effectiveness, and Chair of the Reaffirmation Team.
responsibility to others, a desire to resolve problems within society, a commitment to become more involved in the community, and deeper concern for one’s fellow citizens. Subsequently, the “refined topic” that emerged from this collaborative initiative was entitled *Learning through Engagement: Service-Learning*.

President Valerie Hepburn later announced the QEP topic selection in her “Welcome Back” address at the beginning of Spring Semester 2010, and she extended an invitation to faculty and staff to serve on the soon-to-be-named QEP Steering Committee.

**Phase III: QEP Steering Committee Formation**

In April 2010, a QEP Steering Committee consisting of 15 members was formed and charged by President Hepburn to refine and fully develop the selected topic. The Committee had a broad-based membership, including faculty, staff, administrators, and a student representative. Additionally, Drs. George Dupuy, Reaffirmation Chair and Professor of Marketing; Clayton Hurd, Director of Service-Learning and Assistant Professor of Anthropology; and Jim Hughes Lynch, Director of Institutional Effectiveness, served in an *ex officio* capacity, providing counsel and support to the Committee. Listed below are the members of the Committee, including their title, area, and role:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Holly Christensen, M.Ed.</td>
<td>Director, Camden Center</td>
<td>Academic Affairs</td>
<td>Chair; Marketing Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carla Bluhm, Ph.D.</td>
<td>Assistant Professor of Psychology</td>
<td>Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences</td>
<td>Implementation Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Butcher, Ph.D.</td>
<td>Director of Residence Life</td>
<td>Student Affairs</td>
<td>Development Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandra Crum</td>
<td>Full Time Student</td>
<td>Student Government Association</td>
<td>Marketing Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leon Gardner, Ph.D.</td>
<td>Assistant Professor of Chemistry</td>
<td>Mathematics and Natural Sciences</td>
<td>Assessment Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dawana Gibbs, M.S.N.</td>
<td>Associate Professor of Nursing</td>
<td>Nursing and Health Sciences</td>
<td>Assessment Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michelle Ham, CPA</td>
<td>Controller</td>
<td>Business Affairs</td>
<td>Implementation Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kay Hampton, M.S.N.</td>
<td>Associate Vice-President for Academic Affairs</td>
<td>Academic Affairs</td>
<td>Implementation Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debbie Holmes, Ed.S.</td>
<td>Dean of Information Commons</td>
<td>Library</td>
<td>Development Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stacy Howe, M.Ed.</td>
<td>Coordinator, Center for Academic Advising</td>
<td>Academic Advising</td>
<td>Development Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claire Hughes, Ph.D.</td>
<td>Associate Professor of Education</td>
<td>Education and Teacher Preparation</td>
<td>Development Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leo Mundy, Ph.D.</td>
<td>Assistant Professor of Sociology</td>
<td>Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences</td>
<td>Implementation Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niki Schmauch, M.Ed.</td>
<td>Coordinator, Learning Center</td>
<td>Learning Center</td>
<td>Assessment Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew Smith, B.A.</td>
<td>Director of Student Activities</td>
<td>Student Affairs</td>
<td>Marketing Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tony Wege, M.A.</td>
<td>Professor of Political Science</td>
<td>Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences</td>
<td>Marketing Team</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Following its appointment, the QEP Steering Committee began to convene on a regular basis, meeting a total of 12 times since May 2010\(^\text{10}\).

The Committee worked diligently on shaping the topic into a well-defined and manageable plan. Through extensive review and discussion of service-learning literature, institutional data, and current practices, the QEP Steering Committee reframed the general topic to its final form with the following overarching goal: \textit{to integrate and enhance student learning and development through service-learning activities and experiences that also meet community needs.}

The resulting topic, \textit{Learning through Engagement: Service-Learning}, focuses on four major student learning objectives:

1. Enable community engagement and promote leadership;
2. Enable enhanced understanding of course content;
3. Develop critical and creative thinking and reflection skills in all students; and
4. Promote social responsibility, global awareness, and openness to diverse perspectives.

Student learning outcomes to accomplish these four objectives were identified and are described in \textit{Section V – Student Learning Outcomes}.

\textbf{St. Marys United Methodist Church Foundation Grant}

To aid the College in the process of creating a synergy on campus surrounding service-learning, the St. Marys United Methodist Church Foundation (SMUMCF) awarded a generous grant to the institution in July 2010, after a competitive review process. This two-year grant, totaling $150,000, is being utilized to seed a new Center for Service-Learning and to initiate steps to make service-learning an integral part of the institution’s teaching, learning, and outreach activities. The grant has allowed the College to hire an experienced service-learning professional and faculty member to “jump start” the service-learning commitment and help guide the QEP implementation.

\textbf{Fall Launch}

College President Valerie Hepburn launched Fall Semester 2011 on August 8 in a campus-wide meeting of faculty and staff. She introduced new staff and faculty, reiterated the College’s vision and mission, reviewed progress on strategic goals, and highlighted key areas of emphasis for the coming year, including SACSCOC Reaffirmation and QEP implementation.

Keynote speaker for the morning was Dr. Kirby Godsey, author, current Chancellor and former President of Mercer University, and former member of the SACSCOC Executive Committee. Dr. Godsey oversaw his institution’s QEP, as Mercer University was one of the first institutions to develop a service-learning program for students.

A panel discussion moderated by Dr. Clayton Hurd, Director of the College’s Center for Service-Learning, included Dr. Godsey and four faculty members who piloted service-learning course instruction during Spring Semester 2010: Dr. Leo Mundy in sociology, Dr. Craig Gentzle in business, Dr. Kim Pause-Tucker in biology, and Dr. Elizabeth Wurz in English.

\(^{10}\) The minutes of the QEP Steering Committee meetings are available at \url{http://www.ccga.edu/SACSCOC/QEPoverview.asp}
QEP Endorsement
In August 2011, as a show of campus-wide endorsement, the Faculty Senate, Staff Assembly, and Student Government Association considered and formally approved the essential QEP elements, namely the topic and definition:

- Faculty Senate Resolution [Exhibit 2]
- Staff Assembly Resolution [Exhibit 3]
- Student Government Resolution [Exhibit 4]
V. Process Used to Develop the QEP

Evidence of the involvement of all appropriate campus constituencies (providing support for compliance with CS 3.3.2 “includes a broad-based involvement of institutional constituencies in the development...of the QEP”)

The process used to develop the College’s QEP consisted of varied activities that involved a diverse group of individuals – faculty and staff to students to local community leaders. The approach contained three critical components that spanned one-and-one-half years – formation of the QEP Steering Committee subcommittees; clarification of the QEP process; and preliminary service-learning professional development.

QEP Subcommittees
To more effectively direct the efforts of the QEP Steering Committee, members were appointed to subcommittees to address various aspects of the emerging QEP process. A brief description of the subcommittees and their respective roles follows.

Development Subcommittee
The development subcommittee was tasked with synthesizing the QEP Steering Committee’s working definition of service-learning with specific goals and objectives, including student learning outcomes assessment strategies and necessary resources. Additionally, the subcommittee asked faculty and staff to consider and provide further feedback on the QEP focus on “service-learning” – that is, activities connected to specific courses in which students serve with community organizations and deepen their learning at the same time – in an effort to further refine the selected topic, Learning through Engagement: Service-Learning.

An online faculty and staff survey was created and disseminated during Fall Semester 2010 (with a 78% response rate) that sought feedback on the following questions related to service-learning:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Very Clear</th>
<th>Somewhat Clear</th>
<th>Not Clear</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“Service-learning is a credit-bearing experience in which students participate in organized service experiences that respond to a wide spectrum of community needs. Through structured reflection on their service activities, students gain a deeper understanding of course content, develop skills in community leadership, and advance their appreciation of social responsibility, global awareness, and diversity. Service-learning allows students to practically apply and test their academic learning through hands-on career and professional development opportunities that also promote community interests.”</td>
<td>74.9%</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Faculty and staff support in this area was relatively strong, without any real patterns of critique.

### How would you rate these intended QEP student learning outcomes?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Strong</th>
<th>Adequate</th>
<th>Weak</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Develop critical and creative thinking, and reflection skills to address relevant community issues and needs</td>
<td>64.1%</td>
<td>33.5%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrate communication and community engagement of skills through collaboration with diverse groups in the community</td>
<td>61.5%</td>
<td>30.4%</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehend the relationship between civic responsibility and career development through application in real life organizational and community environments</td>
<td>65.4%</td>
<td>29.6%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Become educated for a life of engaged citizenship that connects academic theory to social practice</td>
<td>61.4%</td>
<td>29.1%</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A recurring critique of the initially-proposed student learning outcomes related to concerns about relative assessibility, with several faculty respondents claiming that the outcomes would be “difficult to measure.” The development subcommittee took on the task of redefining the student learning outcomes keeping this feedback from faculty and staff in mind.

### How would you rate the following proposed initiatives to help achieve the intended student learning outcomes?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Strong</th>
<th>Adequate</th>
<th>Weak</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Create a strong campus and community collaboration</td>
<td>77.8%</td>
<td>19.8%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop a Center for Service-Learning</td>
<td>66.9%</td>
<td>29.4%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hire a Director of Service-Learning</td>
<td>71.6%</td>
<td>22.8%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support faculty development to help students achieve their service-learning goals</td>
<td>69.0%</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Faculty and staff support in this area was relatively strong, without any real patterns of critique.

### How would you rate the following QEP assessment tools in service-learning based courses?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Strong</th>
<th>Adequate</th>
<th>Weak</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evaluate service-learning performance through paper, presentation, and discussion grades</td>
<td>64.5%</td>
<td>33.1%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apply a rubric to each learning objective in the course syllabus</td>
<td>51.2%</td>
<td>39.5%</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administer a traditional test to assess the skills students were to have acquired</td>
<td>23.9%</td>
<td>50.9%</td>
<td>25.2%</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop pre-course and post-course surveys to assess effectiveness of service-learning based courses</td>
<td>61.7%</td>
<td>31.5%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There were a number of constructive comments offered by faculty with regard to assessment strategies. One recurring suggestion was to change the language from “assessment tools” to “assessment strategies,” since the latter acknowledges that assessment is more a process than a “thing” or tool. There was rather significant resistance to the statement “Administer a traditional test to assess the skills students were to have acquired,” given that traditional tests (e.g., rote learning) will probably not do much to draw out the enhanced quality of academic learning that results from well-designed service-learning courses; e.g., critical thinking, problem-solving, applying theory to experience, complexity of issues, etc.

Several respondents mentioned the need to solicit feedback from community collaborators on student performances and applications of theory in the field. Some questioned how a series of standardized rubrics across various course offerings would work. Other suggestions for assessments of the service-learning experiences were mentioned, including portfolios, presentations, and reflective journaling. Faculty feedback on assessment strategies helped inform the assessment subcommittee’s process of refining these processes laid out in Section XI – Assessment.

The development subcommittee, working in conjunction with the Director of Service-Learning, organized a professional development activity in January 2011 that was attended by 65 faculty members. The full-day workshop entitled, “Service-Learning: Bridging the Classroom and the Community” offered faculty an opportunity to learn more about service-learning. In a post-workshop survey, participants were asked to assess the workshop – feedback follows.

Faculty responses to the survey statements noted below suggested a lack of clarity among some about what constitutes best practices in service-learning and how one might go about identifying potential community partners. These were identified as key issues around which the QEP development and implementation subcommittees could focus their efforts in the process of developing and implementing a robust service-learning program.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Please respond to the following statements:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Answer Options</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have a clear definition of service-learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have become familiar with service-learning best practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I understand a variety of service-learning models and examples</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have a good sense of how I might begin to identify possible community partnerships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel more inclined to integrate service-learning into a course(s)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What would motivate you to include service-learning in your course(s)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional development</td>
<td>59.4</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course release time</td>
<td>53.1</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extra compensation</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal development</td>
<td>43.8</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic responsibility</td>
<td>40.6</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Faculty support in this area was relatively strong, without any real patterns of critique.

Do you feel more or less encouraged to integrate service-learning into your class(es)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More encouraged</td>
<td>62.2</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less encouraged</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>35.1</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is clear that the vast majority of faculty members are open to, and interested in, continuing professional development opportunities related to service-learning.

Do you expect to attend future presentations and/or workshops on service-learning?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>73.0</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maybe</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Given the high percentage of faculty with limited or no experience with service-learning, the development subcommittee focused a good deal of attention on building faculty awareness of service-learning (working with the marketing subcommittee), providing a series of relevant workshops and other professional development opportunities.

What experience with service-learning have you had?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I currently teach one or more courses that involve service-learning</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have taught a service-learning course in the past</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have participated as a student in a service-learning class</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have no experience with service-learning</td>
<td>58.3</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Marketing Subcommittee
The marketing subcommittee worked with faculty, students, and staff to: generate ideas to educate the College community on QEP requirements; publicize and promote various components of the QEP; and raise general interest in the QEP among faculty, staff and students. The major planning benchmark for the subcommittee was the August 2011 institution-wide rollout of the QEP during a full campus event called “Fall Launch.” This event included a keynote speaker, Dr. R. Kirby Godsey, Chancellor and former president of Mercer University, who spoke about “The Engaged Campus,” SACSCOC and the QEP, and the important role of the university in serving as a teaching laboratory for civility, respect of diversity, shared learning, and civic engagement.

During Fall Launch, community organizations such as Ferst Foundation, American Red Cross, New Harmonies, CMAP, Hospice of the Golden Isles, and Boys and Girls Clubs staffed booths and provided information about their missions, services, and needs for assistance. Additionally, a panel discussion moderated by Dr. Clayton Hurd, Director of the College’s Center for Service-Learning, included Dr. Godsey and four faculty members who piloted service-learning course instruction during Spring Semester 2010: Dr. Leo Mundy in sociology, Dr. Craig Gentzle in business, Dr. Kim Pause-Tucker in biology, and Dr. Elizabeth Wurz in English. Concluding Fall Launch was a student community organizations fair that was replicated in late August at the Camden Center to educate students about the value of academic service-learning.

Prior to the “Fall Launch” rollout, a number of promotional activities were conducted, including a search for a QEP slogan and logo. Lists of suggested slogans for the QEP were gathered from various sources, including Faculty Senate, Staff Assembly, and Student Government Association. Eventually, students, staff, and faculty were surveyed to determine an appropriate title for the QEP. Five possible slogan choices were offered.

The survey results, shown in Tables 2 and 3, revealed that the majority of faculty, staff and students’ top choice for the QEP slogan was Serve. Learn. Succeed.
In Spring Semester 2011, faculty, staff and students also participated in branding the QEP. John Cornell, Director of College Marketing, and three art pre-major students, designed several different logos. Three of them were presented initially to the QEP Steering Committee, and then to the campus community. Holly Christensen, QEP Steering Committee Chair, volunteered to show the logos to various groups of faculty, staff and students to gauge their reaction, helping create a graphic depiction of the selected QEP slogan. After considerable discussion and constructive feedback, the group selected the QEP logo.

The marketing subcommittee also used other marketing strategies to promote the project and inform stakeholders of the QEP’s progress and status, including:

- President’s Cabinet, Faculty Senate, Staff Assembly, Student Government Association, and Community Advisory Group meetings;
- Meetings with student groups on Brunswick campus and Camden Center;
- Service-learning news stories in the News & Events section of the CCGA website\(^\text{11}\);
- QEP-related articles published in The Mariners’ Log\(^\text{12}\);
- Service-learning articles published in regional newspapers\(^\text{13}\)

\(^{11}\) CCGA news stories (http://www.ccg.edu/News/news_page.asp?ID=596)

\(^{12}\) Service-learning brochure (http://www.ccg.edu/SACSCOC/files/ServiceLearningBrochure.pdf)

The marketing subcommittee developed a marketing plan to raise awareness regarding the QEP, promoting it to both internal and external audiences. What follows is a detailed plan (Tables 4 and 5) that captures both current (academic year 2011-12) and future (Spring Semester 2012 – Spring Semester 2016) QEP promotional activities.

**QEP Promotional Tactics**

*Table 4: Current Promotions (Academic year 2011-2012)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Medium/Venue</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Semester(s)</th>
<th>Target Audience</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Newspaper Article – Student Community Organization Fairs</td>
<td>Brunswick News &amp; Tribune &amp; Georgian</td>
<td>Fall 2011</td>
<td>Community and Students</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>Peggy Golden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mariners’ Log</td>
<td>Article on Community Service Fairs</td>
<td>Fall 2011</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>Holly Christensen/Sharon Bartkovich</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table at Welcome Back events</td>
<td>Center for Service-Learning T-shirt handout to students</td>
<td>Fall 2011</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>$1,785</td>
<td>Center for Service-Learning, Andrew Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buildings</td>
<td>QEP posters</td>
<td>Fall 2011</td>
<td>Faculty and Students</td>
<td>$200</td>
<td>Andrew Smith, John Cornell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall Launch</td>
<td>Give out 250 coffee mugs to faculty; service-learning brochure</td>
<td>Fall 2011</td>
<td>Faculty and Staff</td>
<td>$413</td>
<td>Andrew Smith, John Cornell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall Launch Community Organizations Showcase</td>
<td>Booths for faculty to meet organizations for potential service-learning partnering</td>
<td>Fall 2011</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>Center for Service-Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Community Organizations Fairs</td>
<td>Booths for students to interact with service organizations</td>
<td>Fall 2011</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>Andrew Smith, Heidi Lemming, Center for Service-Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Lighthouse – Bookstore</td>
<td>Bookmarks with service-learning logo</td>
<td>Fall 2011</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>$200</td>
<td>Holly Christensen/John Cornell/Jennifer Strickland</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

14 Service-learning brochure (http://www.ccga.edu/SACSCOC/files/ServiceLearningBrochure.pdf)

15 QEP website (http://www.ccga.edu/SACSCOC/QEPOverview.asp)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Residence Hall Service-Learning Community</th>
<th>Regular floor meetings</th>
<th>Fall 2011</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th>$0</th>
<th>Michael Butcher</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Campus Computers</td>
<td>QEP screensavers</td>
<td>Fall 2011 &amp; Spring 2012</td>
<td>Faculty, Staff and Students</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>Holly Christensen/Geri Culbreath</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service-Learning Speakers</td>
<td>Service-learning speakers</td>
<td>Fall 2011</td>
<td>Faculty and Students</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>Center for Service-Learning, Andrew Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Buildings</td>
<td>QEP pop-up banners</td>
<td>Fall 2011 &amp; Spring 2012</td>
<td>Faculty, Students &amp; Staff</td>
<td>$750</td>
<td>Andrew Smith, John Cornell, Center for Service-Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting with Student Government Association</td>
<td>Update SGA on QEP</td>
<td>Fall 2011</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>Heidi Lemming, Holly Christensen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service-Learning Fairs</td>
<td>Community partners receive 250 coffee mugs</td>
<td>Fall 2011</td>
<td>Community Partners</td>
<td>$411</td>
<td>Center for Service-Learning, Andrew Smith</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 5: Future Promotions (Spring Semester 2012 – Spring Semester 2016)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Medium/Venue</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Semester(s)</th>
<th>Target Audience</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Service-Learning Speakers</td>
<td>Presentation series</td>
<td>Spring 2012-16</td>
<td>Faculty and Students</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>Center for Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service-Learning Scholars</td>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>Fall 2012-15; Spring 2012-16</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>Center for Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poster Sessions</td>
<td>Event</td>
<td>Spring 2012-16</td>
<td>Faculty, Students and Community</td>
<td>$200</td>
<td>Center for Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service-Learning Newsletter</td>
<td>Newsletter</td>
<td>Fall 2012-15</td>
<td>Faculty, Students and Community</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>Center for Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellence Awards</td>
<td>Awards for Service-Learning Excellence</td>
<td>Spring 2013-16</td>
<td>Faculty, Students and Community</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>Center for Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Press Releases on Service-Learning</td>
<td>Articles featuring service-learning</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Faculty, Students and Community</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>Advancement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Forums</td>
<td>Forums for community partners and faculty</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Faculty and Community</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>Center for Service-Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mariners’ Log</td>
<td>Articles featuring service-learning</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>Center for Service-Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL Booth at Student Events</td>
<td>Information on service-learning at student events</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>Center for Service-Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service-Learning Community in Residence Hall</td>
<td>Bring service-learning to students residing on campus</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>Michael Butcher, Center for Service-Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service-Learning Presentation at New Student Orientation</td>
<td>Presentation on service-learning</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>Admissions &amp; Center for Service-Learning</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Implementation Subcommittee

The implementation subcommittee collaborated with other QEP subcommittees to brainstorm and develop ideas for implementation. To this end, the subcommittee suggested a service-learning pilot program for Spring Semester 2011 and developed a plan to commit institutional resources to support the plan (see Section X – Resources for more details). Additionally, input from other subcommittees was sought to determine if the implementation ideas generated might be consistent with the purpose of the QEP and viable strategies were considered for further development. The implementation subcommittee also worked closely with the marketing subcommittee to ensure all items and activities were integrated into the budget and to identify funding sources for the five-year project discussed in more detail in Section IX – Resources.

A more detailed overview of the implementation plan appears in Section VIII – Implementation.

Assessment Subcommittee

The assessment subcommittee determined the appropriate data collection and analysis processes – based on extensive best practices research in the service-learning field – to be implemented at both institutional and course levels. Working closely with the implementation subcommittee, the assessment group determined which strategies to implement and the appropriate assessment tools to measure the institutional effectiveness and expected student learning outcomes.

The subcommittee determined that assessment would be pursued through two complementary strategies (see Section XI – Assessment for a more detailed overview).

1. Use of a Self-Assessment Rubric for Service-Learning Institutionalization:

   a. The subcommittee chose to adapt Andrew Furco’s Self-Assessment Rubric for the Institutionalization of Service-Learning in Higher Education (Furco, 2002) 16 to create a rubric that will assist the campus community in gauging the progress of its service-learning institutionalization efforts. The adapted rubric is structured by five dimensions:

      i. Institutional support for service-learning
      ii. Integration of service-learning into course development
      iii. Faculty support for and involvement in service-learning
      iv. Student support for and involvement in service-learning
      v. Community support, participation, and partnerships.

2. On-going assessment of established Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) for service-learning will be accomplished through:

   a. Course-level assessment of SLOs:

      i. Integration of SLOs into course syllabi
      ii. Student self-assessment survey [Exhibit 5]

---

16 An overview of Furco’s self-assessment rubric is available at http://www.servicelearning.org/filemanager/download/Furco_rubric.pdf
iii. Faculty course assessment [Exhibit 6].

b. Institutional-level assessment of SLOs:
   i. Faculty focus groups and presentations
   ii. Student focus groups, interviews and surveys.

QEP Information Gathering
In Fall Semester 2010, as part of Fall Launch, the QEP Steering Committee had an opportunity to engage in conversation with Dr. John Gardner, Executive Director and founder of the Policy Center on the First Year of College, in an effort to orient the Committee on best practices in service-learning. As a prerequisite to this conversation, each Committee member was given a copy of the monograph *Service Learning and the First Year Experience*. Also in Fall Semester 2010, efforts were undertaken to keep the faculty and staff informed of QEP work underway and to elicit their feedback. The President’s Cabinet was fully engaged in this process. The Reaffirmation Chair, Dr. George Dupuy, and QEP Steering Committee Chair, Holly Christensen, both made several presentations at monthly faculty meetings, as well as with the Student Government Association, and Faculty Senate. Several QEP Steering Committee faculty members made presentations to academic departments. Additionally, the College’s President and Director of Service-Learning made presentations to students on both the Brunswick campus and at the Camden Center. A presentation was also made to the College’s Staff Assembly. At all these meetings, a general overview of the reaffirmation of accreditation was offered with focused discussion on the way in which assessment would occur for (1) core requirements, (2) comprehensive standards, (3) federal mandates, and (4) the quality enhancement plan.

Community Advisory Board for Service-Learning
In January 2011, a Community Advisory Board for Service-Learning, made up of local non-profit, government, and small business leaders, was formed and charged to:

- Set current and future priorities in service-learning as they relate to community-based service opportunities;
- Provide insight into the nature and shifting needs in Glynn, Camden and McIntosh counties (Georgia) and strategies for addressing those needs; and
- Help create awareness of service-learning as a pedagogy and community capacity-building strategy to the organizations they represent and to the community as a whole.

Board members were asked to represent, as much as possible, the best interests of their constituents as well as the best interests of the region. The Advisory Board plays an essential role in not only supporting the QEP, but also the Center for Service-Learning, as it seeks to create and expand opportunities to engage students, faculty, and staff in service-learning partnerships of mutual benefit with community groups.

Faculty Involvement
A service-learning faculty panel discussion was offered in February 2011, led by several invited service-learning practitioners from the University of Georgia. The discussion provided an opportunity to hear more about service-learning and the diverse forms it could take across the

---

curriculum. Later in February, the Center for Service-Learning hosted a presentation on Sustainable Innovations through Service-Learning: A Project Based Approach for Community Development, presented by invited speaker Dr. Stuart Cottrell, Associate Professor & Global Tourism Coordinator, Department of Human Dimensions of Natural Resources, Colorado State University.

In March 2011, Dr. Leo Mundy, Assistant Professor of Sociology, made a presentation to faculty as part of a Coastal Scholars series entitled, “Service Learning in Social Problems: The Mid-Term Report” that included several of his former students who participated in a service-learning program.

A faculty-community agency partnership forum, attended by 25 College faculty/staff and 31 community organization representatives, was held on the College campus in late March. The event, facilitated by the Center for Service-Learning, allowed participants to engage in informal conversation about potential future partnerships in service-learning.

Service-Learning Professional Development
To provide focus and to facilitate further understanding of the level of commitment needed to successfully develop and implement a Quality Enhancement Plan, QEP Steering Committee members met with an international expert on the practice of service-learning during the critical first year of a student’s college experience. Committee members also attended several conferences focused on service-learning and engaged in institutional professional development activities.

To augment their respective service-learning knowledge, several Committee members participated in professional development conferences, including:

- 2010 SACSCOC QEP Summer Institute
- 2010 SACSCOC Annual Conference
- 2010 Greenleaf Servant Leadership Conference
- 2011 Gulf-South Summit for Service-Learning and Civic Engagement through Higher Education
- 2011 SofTL (Scholarship of Teaching and Learning) Commons Conference
- 2011 Emory University, Oxford College, The Institute for Pedagogy in the Liberal Arts, Technology and Service-Learning

Service-Learning Scholars Program
One key institutional professional development initiative was provided by a newly-designed Service-Learning Scholars Program that allows the opportunity for a select cohort of College faculty to engage in dialogue about student-centered, experiential education that promotes academic learning while serving genuine community needs. The six-week seminar series, convened for the first time during Spring Semester 2011, is designed to deepen faculty participants' understanding of service-learning and guide them as they integrate it into their curriculum and pedagogy. During this inaugural set of workshops, foundational information on service-learning and community partnership building was covered through discussion, readings,

---

18 Full announcement and application for the Spring Semester 2011 Service-Learning Scholar Program can be found on the Center for Service-Learning webpage at http://www.ccga.edu/ServiceLearning/Scholars.asp
and guest speaker presentations (Service-Learning Scholar workshop agenda [Exhibit 7]). Fourteen faculty members participated in the Scholars program, and each committed to incorporate service-learning into at least one new or existing course within the academic year. For their involvement, participants received a course re-assignment and were given priority access to the Service-Learning Mini-Grant pool (typically ranging from $500-$1000) for additional resource development.

Four faculty members involved in the Service-Learning Scholars Program also taught distinct “pilot” service-learning courses\(^{19}\) during Spring Semester 2011. These included:

- BIOL 3250: Marine Biology (biology)
- BUSA 2106: Environment of Business (business)
- ENGL 1101: Composition I (English)
- SOCI 1160: Introduction to Social Problems (sociology).

A service-learning requirement existed in each class. Approximately 110 students participated across the four courses with 15 distinct community partners, averaging just over 15 hours of service per student. Table 6 provides an extract from the Student Evaluations of Service-Learning survey (N=84) conducted in Spring Semester 2011 based on student feedback from four service-learning courses (BIOL 3250, BUSA 2106, ENGL 1101, SOCI 1160).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extent to which the service component of course enabled you to do each of the following:</th>
<th>Very Much</th>
<th>Quite a Bit</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>Very Little</th>
<th>Not at All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Access the larger community as a resource for skill building and learning</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apply theories and concepts to practical problems or in new situations</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve problem-solving skills</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Think critically and creatively</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use new information to make decisions and solve problems</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborate and build relationships with community organizations</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practice and build leadership skills, including skills of interpersonal communication and collective action</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflect on your own and others’ beliefs and assumptions about a social issue(s) or an area of service</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{19}\) Syllabi for each course can be found at [http://www.ccura.edu/SACSCOC/QEPoverview.asp](http://www.ccura.edu/SACSCOC/QEPoverview.asp)
Overall, student satisfaction with the service-learning experiences was overwhelmingly positive. One interesting result from the larger survey was that only 56% of students agreed that they received a thorough orientation at the agency where they served. It is important, therefore, that the Center does more to assure that students receive a proper orientation to the community site and that site supervisors understand the importance of providing a thorough orientation in the context of an academic service-learning experience.

Students’ qualitative assessments of their experience in the courses were quite favorable as well and included the following comments:

- *Experience showed me how important reading is to children especially from low SES.*
- *It was a great opportunity to learn in a non-traditional setting.*
- *Good for understanding the material by actually performing the work instead of reading from a book.*
- *It is an important part of understanding the connections between businesses and the stakeholders of the community.*
- *It was a great learning experience & useful for me to use in the future for classes and my career.*
VI. Student Learning Outcomes

Specific, well-defined goals related to an issue of substance and depth, expected to lead to observable results (providing support for compliance with CS 3.3.2 “identifies goals”)

The essential components of the College’s QEP are displayed in Figure 1.

Figure 1: QEP Model

The diagram portrays the relationship of the central QEP goal and objectives to student learning outcomes. Program objectives will be achieved through targeted strategies discussed in more detail in Section XI – Assessment. Student learning outcomes will be tracked and assessed through standardized instruments and learning activities embedded in the curriculum.
Service-Learning Definition

Before establishing goals, objectives, and student learning outcomes, given variations in the definition of service-learning in the literature, the QEP Steering Committee recognized that agreement on a working definition was imperative, and the following definition of service-learning was adopted:

Service-learning is a credit-bearing experience in which students participate in organized service experiences that respond to a wide spectrum of community needs.

Through structured reflection on their service activities, students gain a deeper understanding of course content, develop skills in community leadership, and advance their appreciation of social responsibility, global awareness, and diversity.

Service-learning allows students to practically apply and test their academic learning through hands-on career and professional development opportunities that also promote community interests.

The following is an overview of each QEP objective and the associated student learning outcomes portrayed in the QEP model.

QEP Goal
To integrate and enhance student learning and development through service-learning activities and experiences that also meet community needs.

QEP Objectives
From the QEP goal, four major objectives evolved:

1. Enable community engagement and promote leadership;
2. Enable enhanced understanding of course content;
3. Develop critical and creative thinking and reflection skills; and
4. Promote social responsibility, global awareness, and openness to diverse perspectives.

QEP Student Learning Outcomes

Objective 1 – Enable community engagement and promote leadership:

- 1.1 – Students will collaborate and build relationships with community organizations.
- 1.2 – Students will demonstrate an understanding of how communities function.
- 1.3 – Students will demonstrate effective leadership in community activities, including skills of interpersonal communication, collaboration, and collective action.
- 1.4 – Students will demonstrate the ability to access the larger community as a resource for course-specific skill building and learning.

Objective 2 – Enable enhanced understanding of course content:

- 2.1 – Students will demonstrate ability to effectively apply theories, concepts and methods to practical problems.
• 2.2 – Students will demonstrate effective use of problem-solving skills and strategies in service-learning assignments.

• 2.3 – Students will demonstrate the ability to effectively transfer course theories, concepts and knowledge to novel situations.

Objective 3 – Develop critical and creative thinking and reflection skills:

• 3.1 – Students will demonstrate higher levels of critical and creative thinking by recognizing and analyzing problems, identifying viable solutions when possible, and defending choices of solutions.

• 3.2 – Students will demonstrate an ability to analyze and reflect upon their own and others' beliefs and assumptions about an area of service.

Objective 4 – Promote social responsibility, global awareness, and openness to diverse perspectives:

• 4.1 – Students will demonstrate comprehension of the community issues that are relevant to their service-learning course content.

• 4.2 – Students will demonstrate awareness of global issues, processes, trends and systems in relation to their service-learning experiences.

• 4.3 – Students will demonstrate the ability to understand, make reasoned judgments, and respond to differences in perspectives and viewpoints.

• 4.4 – Students will gain practical experience and make community contacts that will help them start and/or advance their careers.
VII. Literature Review

Evidence of consideration of best practices related to the topic (providing support for compliance with CS 3.3.2 “institutional capability for the initiation, implementation, and completion of the QEP”)

The intention of this literature review is to offer a brief history of the growth of service-learning in higher education, describe service-learning as a pedagogical practice, establish what researchers and practitioners say about the relative effectiveness of service-learning, and delineate the challenges and strategies for creating well-designed, effective service-learning experiences for students.

Overall, the review is designed to present a foundation and justification for focusing the College’s QEP on the practice of service-learning.

Defining Service-Learning

Service-learning is a pedagogical practice that integrates service and academic learning to promote increased understanding of course content while helping students develop knowledge, skills, and cognitive capacities to deal effectively with complex social issues and problems. It is an approach that emphasizes reflection and field-based learning as a way to engage the learner personally with the curriculum. As pedagogy, service-learning emphasizes meaningful student learning through applied, active, project-based learning that draws on multiple knowledge sources (academic, student knowledge and experience, and community knowledge) and provides students with ample opportunities for ethical and critical reflection and practice.

By confronting issues and problems in complex natural contexts, service-learning courses help students develop a deeper understanding of subject matter, a practical knowledge of community decision making processes, and strategies for transferring knowledge and problem-solving skills to new situations. Effective service-learning classes are those that use service and civic engagement to integrate and enhance academic learning, not to take the place of it. Service-learning courses, when thoughtfully designed, combine content-driven, outcomes-based commitments with ample opportunity for learning and knowledge to grow from students’ service experiences.

The growth of service-learning in higher education is related to the way it helps students achieve personal and academic goals, as well as broader institutional goals of civic engagement for students and outreach to communities (Campus Compact 2000). The increasing status of service-learning as a legitimate and valued pedagogy is related, in large part, to shifting understandings about the nature of learning as a social and dialogical process. A growing body of scholarship from disciplines and traditions of thought as diverse as social psychology (Vygotsky 1978), cultural anthropology (Lave 1988; Lave and Wenger 1991), sociolinguistic theory (Volosinov 1986; Wells 2001), and the cognitive sciences (Steinke and Buresh 1999; Eyler 2002) have demonstrated that “learning” is not a simple process of knowledge transmission from teacher to students, but rather a multidimensional social practice where learning is supported by forms of apprenticeship (that is, relationships with others who have various kinds of expertise) and participation in specific, on-going social activities.

In other words, students achieve academic mastery not simply by acquiring a particular body of knowledge they can recall on demand, but by developing a personal understanding of information through a process of interpersonal co-construction and problem-solving that
depends on relations between themselves, college/university faculty and staff, their peers, and other educational partners.

It can be said that service-learning helps students develop not only as “traditional experts” but also as “expert learners”. Higher education has long been concerned with producing “traditional experts” – that is, people who have mastery of a body of knowledge and know answers to important questions in their disciplinary field. The contribution of service-learning pedagogy and practice is to also develop students as “expert learners,” that is, as people who are able to approach new situations flexibly, are skilled at acquiring new knowledge quickly and efficiently, and are able to learn throughout their lifetimes (Singham 2005). It is clear that helping students develop these kinds of “socially-responsive” intellectual skills is essential in a 21st-century context that requires adaptability, sophisticated knowledge, problem-solving capacities, and lifelong learning skills.

Unfortunately, though, most college students enter and leave postsecondary education without the capacity and critical thinking abilities to be effective problem-solvers (King 1992). Problem-solving draws on the capacity to recognize, frame, and address a problem and involves a wide range of skills and knowledge. For example, the ability to analyze what are called “ill-structured” problems (that is, problems that are complex and open-ended with no easy solutions) and to make warranted judgments about often-conflicting information in the context of uncertainty takes a fairly advanced level of cognitive development that most college students do not possess. Yet the processes that lead to cognitive development of this kind are very similar to those associated with well-designed service-learning experiences. Service-learning activities help students to reflect on complex problems and bring their experiences to bear on these puzzles, helping them move toward the ability to make well-reasoned decisions in the face of doubt.

Service-learning, by engaging students in rich problem-solving and experiential settings, allows students to construct and refine complex knowledge structures from which they are better equipped to understand complex social problems, to apply what they have learned to new situations, and to develop the critical thinking abilities to make adequate judgments about the information they receive. At the same time, service-learning experiences often challenge students’ assumptions about particular problems and community issues they face, and reflection on such “cognitive dissonance” is a way in which individuals develop the capacity to understand and resolve complexity. Structured and continuous reflection – the cornerstone of effective service-learning pedagogy – is the key mechanism for stimulating this kind of cognitive growth.

**Impact of Service-Learning on Enhanced Understanding of Course Content and Critical/Creative Thinking**

Research has demonstrated that courses incorporating service-learning components generally provide greater learning benefits than those that do not, including a deeper understanding of course material (McKenna and Rizzo 1999; Eyler and Giles 1999; Balazadeh 1996; Markus et al. 1993), a better understanding of the complex problems people face (Batchelder and Root 1994; Boss 1994; Eyler and Halteeman 1981; Barron et al. 1998; Bransford and Vye 1989; Bransford and Schwartz 2000; Mabry 1998), and an ability to apply course material to new situations and real world problems (Rasmussen and Skinner 1997; Williams, Youngflesh and Bagg 1997; Eyler and Giles 1999; Markus, Howard and King 1993).

Service-learning experiences have also been shown to enhance students’ creativity and critical thinking, as they often require students to apply knowledge to novel situations in settings that have few resources (Conrad and Hedin 1991; Osborne, Hammerich and Hensley 1998; Bhaerman et al. 1998).
When grades on standardized tests have been used to measure student learning, the relative benefits of service-learning courses are mixed. Some studies claim no significant difference in grades while others show that students earn higher grades from their service-learning courses. However, it should be noted that even if grades on standardized tests are minimally affected, service-learning makes significant contributions to qualitative differences in the understanding of academic material, including a greater depth of understanding, increased analytical skills, and a greater ability to apply what is learned. This makes some sense of the evidence that service-learning students do better on essay tests but not necessarily on multiple choice questions (Kendrick 1996; Strange 2000).

Impact of Service-Learning on Social Responsibility and Openness to Diverse Perspectives
Service-learning has long been associated with important civic learning outcomes such as enhancing students’ engagement with the community and developing their sense of civic responsibility. In addition, students participating in service-learning courses report a greater understanding of social problems (Sax and Astin 1997; Blyth, Saito, and Berkas 1997), greater knowledge and acceptance of diverse cultures and races (Sax and Austin; McKenna and Rizzo 1999), a greater ability to get along with people of different backgrounds (Sax and Astin; McKenna and Rizzo), and increased awareness of their own biases (Rice and Brown 1998; Vadeboncoeur, Rahm Aquilera, and LeCompte 1996). While acquiring this important civic learning, students also provide meaningful outreach to people and organizations in need, a service generally valued by community partners (Driscoll, Holland, Gelmon, and Kerrigan 1996; Gray et al. 1999).

Service-learning experiences often provide students with an opportunity to gain knowledge about the larger community, especially across lines of class, racial, ethnic, religious, and generational difference, and to learn about social issues that are often not adequately covered by the national media. By moving outside of themselves and encountering others in the community, students can come to a greater appreciation of the strengths and great capacities (assets) contained in the diverse groups and people that make up their community, their state, and their nation. In their community service work, students often experience “encounters with strangers” (Radest 1993) in which they face “alien” situations and “shocks of awareness” that lead to increased self-awareness. These “shocks of awareness” can also increase students’ need to confront their notions of otherness and construct more complex and multitudinous notions of cultural diversity (Rhoads 2003; 1997). Students who are allowed to explore different social worlds come to see the sophisticated ways in which identities intersect and diverge and, at the same time, recognize common connections that many of them share with their peers and those they meet in the community. Social and cognitive development is facilitated as students move from comfort zones to contact zones and become “more comfortable with that which is different and more sophisticated in locating that which is similar” (Rhodes 2002). In this way, service-learning has an important role to play in helping students to develop complex selves capable of negotiating diverse cultural differences and enhancing their capacity to work with others, who often face vastly different circumstances, in efforts to achieve common purposes.

In a global democracy, higher education must give serious thought to structuring student learning and development in such a way to promote cross-cultural understanding and civic-mindedness. In strong democracies, people have to be able to listen to each other, to understand the places and interests of others in the community, and to achieve compromises and solve problems when conflicts occur. These are the kinds of skills students can successfully develop and enhance through their service work and through the critical classroom reflection activities that are central to effective service-learning experiences.
Impact of Service-Learning on Student Retention
Proponents of service-learning and student retention share a common concern for addressing the lack of “connectedness” in education and the failure to prepare students for life-long learning and participation. In fact, as Mundy and Eyler (2001) note, service-learning seems a logical and necessary response to Tinto’s (1993) interactionalist model of student departure, which highlights the need to promote both students’ academic (cognitive) and social (affective) integration and to facilitate the development of meaningful connections between students, faculty, and community members that encourage retention.

Emerging studies on the relationship to retention demonstrate that service-learning has a positive influence on persistence in college (Bringle, Hatch and Muthiah 2002; Gallini and Moely 2003), enhances student engagement with and commitment to school (Sax and Austin 1997), has significant impact on students’ social and emotional health (Kendrick 1996; Ostrow 1995; Rhoads 1997), and facilitates meaningful connections between students, faculty, and community in ways that support retention (Braxton, Sullivan and Johnson 1997; Gallini and Moely 2003; Astin, Vogeles, Ikeda, and Yee 2000; Eyler 2002).

In service-learning classes, students receive coaching support from faculty, community partners, and peers as they navigate their service-learning experiences, undertake worthwhile projects, and problem-solve in a variety of settings. Service-learning is a particularly good fit because it provides these meaningful connections in ways that allow for diversity, which is also linked to retention (Eyler and Giles 1999).

Another strong link between the two is the centrality of active learning – a hallmark of both service-learning and student retention theory. A number of active learning techniques such as class discussions and higher order thinking activities have been positively-related to student retention (Braxton, Milem and Sullivan 2000). Good practice in service-learning promotes active learning, collaborative learning, and student involvement – all key strategies to assist students with both academic and social integration.

Importance of Instructional Support for Service-Learning
Service-learning, as pedagogy, is distinct from traditional teaching in many ways, including the role of the student, the role of the instructor, and the kind of learning that is valued. Service-learning integration often asks faculty to rethink traditional pedagogical approaches, shifting from teacher-centered, lecture-based formats focused on information dissemination to synergistic classroom where responsibility for teaching and learning is shared by students and instructors (Howard 1998). Effective service-learning courses tend to pursue models of active learning that promote inclusive student involvement and participation and place a strong emphasis on dialogue and deliberation as primary modes of teaching and learning. In curricular terms, service-learning courses include activities and resources that draw from and build upon students’ own experiences, creative ideas, and “funds of knowledge” to increase and diversify the intellectual resources available to all students. This pedagogy brings to the surface assumptions, values, beliefs, and feelings that shape (and sometimes limit) students’ responses to new learning. Instructional approaches typically focus on active learning and include participatory lectures, full class and small group discussions, student-led panels and debates, and on-going opportunities for structured reflection that link students’ service experiences to central themes, concepts, and objectives of the course.

Given the methods mentioned above, it is clear that the effective integration of service-learning into academic courses involves much greater time and effort in coordinating and structuring activities and class discussions, and much more attention to process than does a traditional
classroom. Yet research demonstrates the benefits of such integration are significant, particularly in enhancing the achievement of the curricular goals of the course (Sax and Astin 1997; Cohen and Kinsey 1994, Eyler and Giles 1999; Kendricks 1996; Markus et al. 1993; Strange 2000). In addition, research suggests that service-learning integration can lead to faculty members’ enhanced understanding of students, deeper faculty-student connections, a better sense of students’ learning styles, and insight into how students construct knowledge and experience the course (Pribbenow 2005). This is important because research on student learning outcomes has consistently shown that increased student-faculty interaction positively affects student learning (Astin 1993; Kuh et al. 1991; Pascarella 1980; Pascarella and Terenzini 1991).

Faculty integration of service-learning pedagogy and practice, as well as faculty association with a service-learning program, have also been shown to promote more meaningful engagement with and commitment to teaching and a greater sense of connection to other faculty and the institution (Pribbenow 2005). For some faculty, new knowledge of students and community-based experiences leads to changes in pedagogical practices, including more use of constructivist teaching and learning approaches and improved communication of theoretical concepts through the availability of community-based experiences (Pribbenow 2005).

Many faculty members who chose to integrate service into their courses are cognizant of the positive impact that well-designed service-learning experiences can have on student learning outcomes. In fact, research suggests that faculty’s efforts to incorporate service-learning are most often motivated by a desire to improve their teaching (Hammond 1994; Pribbenow 2005). Alternatively, it is not surprising to find that faculty members with little awareness of service-learning, or with negative perceptions of it, are less likely to integrate it than faculty with awareness and positive perceptions (Mundy 2003). Therefore, it is important to develop strategies for increasing faculty knowledge and awareness of service-learning as a valuable educational philosophy, instructional pedagogy, and institutional program.

It is clear that service-learning means quite different things to different people. For example, some courses will require a service component but make less of a tangible or explicit connection to course objectives and learning outcomes, whereas others will intentionally and elaborately integrate learning from the community with learning in the classroom. The former is often a compromised interpretation of academic service-learning and will not yield the equivalent academic outcomes of quality service-learning.

While service-learning courses may offer students the opportunity to experience communities first-hand, they may provide too little guidance to help students understand the lessons to be learned from that experience. In fact, if done inadequately, service-learning may not only fail to connect students to public life, it may actually reinforce student stereotypes about people who are “different” and harden previously held beliefs. For example, badly-mediated community engagement in culturally and socio-economically diverse settings may lead students to individualize social issues and problems, de-emphasize structural components and causes, and reinforce views of community members as deficient (Eby 1998). It is in this sense, as John Dewey (1938) noted, that the discipline of experience may be “miseducative.”

It is therefore important that students’ community involvement be subject to clear direction and development. Research highlights the importance of careful planning, preparation, and partnership in assuring successful outcomes of service-learning. Effective, well-designed programs are those that include strategies for real partnerships with communities (Eyler and Giles 1999; Howard 2001; Mabry 1998), are academically integrated and include deep and
substantive reflection (Niemi, Hepburn and Chapman 2000; Schank et al. 1999), and have a plan for how to deepen students’ civic learning.

**Importance of Quality Reflection**

Reflection, as applied to service-learning, is perhaps best defined as “the intentional consideration of experience in light of particular learning objectives” (Hatcher and Bringle 1997: 153). Studies measuring quality of the service-learning experience suggest that quality matters and that the quality that seems to matter most is the amount and type of reflection. Structured, intentional reflection activities build a bridge between concrete and abstract – connecting practice and theory – and can facilitate recognition of lessons in service experience that might not otherwise be acknowledged. Quality reflection activities help students integrate what they are bringing into the situation, what they are learning from the class portion of the course, and what they are gaining from their service experiences.

Research has demonstrated that reflective – compared to non-reflective – service-learning has a significant impact on development of intellectual components like knowledge, skills, and cognition. A study by Eyler and Giles (2002) shows that when students’ capacity for problem analysis was compared, only students in highly reflective courses showed significant progress in tackling complexity of analysis. Those surveyed had the tendency to frame the problem and solution in systematic ways rather than focusing on individual analyses, in coherence of a practical action strategy, and in cognitive development (see also Eyler and Giles 1999).

**Conclusion**

As an educational practice, service-learning fulfills the dual purpose of promoting outreach to communities and providing the means for distinctive undergraduate experiences. Through this QEP, the College will provide students access to diverse cultural experiences through community involvement in a broad array of activities that extend learning, foster leadership skills, and promote civic responsibility.
VIII. Implementation and Timeline

**Implementation:** Evidence of careful analysis of institutional context in designing actions capable of generating the desired student learning outcomes (providing support for compliance with CS 3.3.2 “institutional capability for the initiation, implementation, and completion of the QEP”)

**Timeline:** A logical calendaring of all actions to be implemented (providing support for compliance with CS 3.3.2 “institutional capability for the initiation, implementation, and completion of the QEP”)

During academic year 2010-2011, the QEP Steering Committee was given the central charge of developing an implementation plan to structure and guide the QEP. Knowing that service-learning activities would extend well beyond the campus and into the larger community, the Committee carefully considered the needs and opinions of the various stakeholders during the implementation planning phase.

The QEP implementation plan requires concurrent activity in a variety of arenas in order to successfully achieve student learning outcomes and reach the primary goal – to integrate and enhance student learning and development through service-learning activities and experiences that also meet community needs.

To measure and monitor service-learning program implementation at the institutional level, the College decided to break its implementation plan into six major categories of activity adapted from Andrew Furco’s (2002) well-known rubric for service-learning institutionalization. Using the Furco rubric as a guide, the QEP assessment subcommittee identified six key content dimensions on which the success of the College’s service-learning institutionalization efforts will depend:

1. Faculty Support and Involvement
2. Community Support, Participation, and Partnership
3. Student Support and Involvement
4. Program Development
5. Institutional Support
6. Assessment Development and Implementation

The actions that will be implemented during the next five years (2011-2016) include:

1. Supporting faculty development activities and the efforts of faculty to incorporate service-learning into their courses through instructional training, resources, incentives, recognition and rewards;
2. Identifying, educating, and supporting community partners;
3. Providing opportunities for student leadership in service-learning;
4. Continuing to build the service-learning programming infrastructure;
5. Broadly institutionalizing service-learning at the College; and

6. Implementing an assessment plan that includes development of an evaluation system to gather data that will be used to grow and support service-learning.

The following narrative description of the College’s QEP implementation process begins by considering actions in the first year (2011 – 2012) and continues by outlining those that will be advanced in the following four years (2012 – 2016). Activities are organized according to the six broad categories listed above.

**ACTION PLAN: Year 1**

Table 6 shows the timeline to be used in the initial year of implementation, broadly summarizing the key initiatives.

*Table 6: Initial Year of Implementation (2011-2012)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Fall Semester 2011</th>
<th>Spring Semester 2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Faculty Development and Support | • Provide professional development to faculty  
• Establish campus Service-Learning Advisory Committee  
• Provide incentives to faculty teaching pilot courses | • Continued professional development to faculty  
• Continue incentives for faculty preparing or implementing courses  
• Share pilot course assessment results with faculty |
| Student Involvement and Leadership | • Establish service-learning Living/Learning Community (LLC) in residence halls  
• Continue pilot service-learning courses | • Integrate “Introduction to Service-Learning” unit into select CCGA 1101 seminars  
• Organize student poster session to showcase work |
| Community Partnership Development | • Continue meetings of Community Advisory Board  
• Expand community partnerships  
• Create online database of potential community partner organizations | • Host faculty/community partner forum  
• Include community partners in professional development activities with students and faculty |
| Program Development            | • Market service-learning program to students, faculty, and community | • Add part-time assistant director to Center |
| Institutionalization            | • Develop guidelines and procedures for service-learning course designation  
• Discuss of how to integrate service-learning into faculty reward system (annual evaluations, tenure and promotion) | • Create service-learning course designation |
Assessment

- Develop course assessment tools for students and faculty
- Initiate institutional assessment plan
- Evaluate service-learning course assessment results; refine instruments
- Survey community partners; analyze feedback

Faculty Development and Support
During academic year 2011-2012, a central focus of implementation activities will be on the continued development and preparation of the College’s faculty to teach effective, well-designed service-learning courses. Faculty development activities will include two Service-Learning Scholars Workshop series—one in the Fall Semester and another in the Spring Semester—for those faculty who are committed to integrating service-learning into their coursework. At least three additional informational workshops will be offered to faculty members who may be considering or interested in integrating service-learning into one or more courses in the future. Workshops will be co-facilitated by the Director of Service-Learning and more experienced faculty members who will serve as knowledgeable presenters and mentors. National service-learning expert practitioners may also be invited to facilitate workshops for the College’s faculty, students, and community partners. These decisions will be guided by the interest of the faculty and results of ongoing assessments.

Faculty who are teaching their first service-learning course will be provided the incentive of a course reassignment or professional development funds to ease their transition into this new, and sometimes initially time-intensive, method of teaching. Service-learning mini-grants (typically $500-$1,000) will also be made available to faculty, on a competitive basis, to support course implementation. Both of these incentive programs will continue on an annual basis.

Near the end of Fall Semester 2011, a Service-Learning Advisory Committee will be organized and convened. It will be composed of faculty with experience in service-learning as well as student and community partner representatives. This Committee will play an important steering and consulting role in relation to the ongoing development of service-learning initiatives and programs on campus. Among the Committee’s initial tasks will be to support the Director of Service-Learning in refining the selection criteria for the mini-grant allocations and to assist in the development of the criteria for courses to be designated as service-learning. On-going responsibilities of the committee members will include support for program sponsored by the Center for Service-Learning, including the review of competitive mini-grants, mentorship support for new faculty enrolled in instructional training programs, and playing the role of service-learning advocates in departmental, academic school, student, and community contexts.

In Spring Semester 2012, the Director of Service-Learning will work together with the Council of Deans to identify service-learning courses to be taught in academic year 2012-13. Instructors for these courses will be selected from those who have completed the Service-Learning Faculty Scholars training program.

Beginning in Spring Semester 2012, and continuing annually thereafter, the College will hold an end-of-the-year reception, hosted by the President, to honor and acknowledge faculty who are engaged in service-learning.

Student Involvement and Leadership
With the Fall Semester 2011 opening of the College’s new residential housing complex, a service-learning Living-Learning Community (LLC) for incoming freshmen will be developed to
incorporate community service into curricular and co-curricular activities. The Director of Service-Learning and the Residence Hall Director will co-facilitate a pilot version of the first-year seminar, CCGA 1101 that will include a low-level service-learning component. This LLC is anticipated to start small (approximately 20–30 students) with plans to grow significantly in future years.

In Spring Semester 2012, the College will integrate an “Introduction to Service-Learning” thematic unit into its first-year seminar, CCGA 1101. This unit will engage students in a discussion about the meaning and benefits of service-learning, the institution’s mission and expectations regarding service-learning and emerging course offerings that will be available. Additionally, a one-time, reflective service-experience will be piloted in a limited number of CCGA 1101 sections during the same semester. The idea is to give students a taste of what service-learning is like by engaging them in a process of service and reflection through an introductory community engagement experience; it is expected that this community engagement component of CCGA 1101 will be expanded in Years 2 – 5 of the QEP.

The Center for Service-Learning will organize and host an end-of-the-year Student Poster Session and Showcase event to highlight service-learning partnerships between the College, students and faculty, and local community organizations. This event will be held annually in the month of April. Faculty teaching service-learning courses will be made aware of the date of the event in advance of the academic year so that they may include it on their fall and spring semester syllabi and encourage students to participate. Prizes will be awarded to the top student poster presentations.

The Director of Service-Learning and student staff assistants will schedule class presentations throughout the fall and spring semesters, particularly in the first-year CCGA 1101 courses, to educate students about service-learning and the benefits associated with taking service-learning courses as well as to share the mission and resources available through the Center for Service-Learning.

Community Outreach Student Committee
Late in Fall Semester 2011, the Director of Service-Learning will work with the Assistant Vice-President for Student Life to organize a Community Outreach Student Committee comprised of student leaders in service who will provide support for the planning and development of co- and extra-curricular service activities across campus. Initially, Committee members will be drawn from the Student Government Association, student clubs/organizations with a service focus, and the service-learning LLC in the new residence hall. This Committee will help brainstorm and support campus-wide “signature service events,” one-day service plunges, and ongoing reflective community service partnerships with local non-profit organizations. The Committee will also provide input on the development of alternative break experiences that will be initiated the following academic year.

Community Partnership Development
With the establishment of the Center for Service-Learning in October 2010, one of the primary responsibilities for the Director has been to educate and build relationships with potential community partners. In the Center’s first year, the Director spent much of his time visiting non-profit organizations, government agencies, and small businesses to raise their awareness of the service-learning mission, learn about their particular needs and services, and begin planning

---

20 Typically 1-2 weeks in length, immerse groups of students in direct service and experiential learning with community organizations to increase their knowledge of social issues and encourage life-long, active citizenship.
how the College might partner with the community to better educate College students while making a positive contribution to the work of those community organizations.

To better articulate the mutual responsibilities and expectations of all those involved in service-learning partnerships, the Center for Service-Learning has developed two good-faith agreement forms that faculty are expected to use in developing community partnership: a Faculty/Agency Agreement Form and a Student/Agency Agreement Form [Exhibit 8]. The Director of Service-Learning has also begun working with the College’s Assistant Vice-President for Organizational Development and Legal Affairs to draft an addendum to the institution’s existing Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) regarding “Applied Learning Experiences” with local community organizations. This new addendum will address the mutual responsibilities and risk management issues that are at play in service-learning partnerships and will lay out a plan of communication between the College and community agency should difficult issues arise.

Earlier in Fall Semester 2011, the Center for Service-Learning partnered with Student Affairs to hold community agencies fairs at both the Brunswick and Camden campuses. These events, which will continue to be held annually, invited vetted community organizations from across the region to the campus to share their missions and service opportunities with students, faculty, and staff.

Beginning in Spring Semester 2012, select community partners will be invited to on-going workshops with College faculty and students to present their needs for and/or experiences in service-learning partnerships. The Center for Service-Learning will also host on-going community partner trainings that highlight the trademark characteristics of effective, mutually-beneficial service-learning experiences; e.g., a campus/community forum, various site visits and staff trainings, and inclusion of community representatives in faculty workshops and service-learning development activities.

The Center for Service-Learning’s Community Advisory Board, first established in Spring Semester 2011, will continue to meet regularly to engage it in a broad assessment of community needs that will inform service-learning program development. Among the Board’s first tasks will be to work with the Director of Service-Learning to (1) refine a Community Partner Impact Survey that will help assess the nature and effectiveness of service-learning partnership from the perspective of community organizations and (2) create a Community Partner Manual that will serve as an essential resource for community organizations who may wish to recruit, orient, train and supervise student service-learners. The Community Partner Impact Survey [Exhibit 9] will be distributed to all partnership sites, allowing them to comment on their experience working with the College’s students, faculty and Center for Service-Learning staff and to comment on the benefits and challenges of the partnerships, lessons learned, and future needs and desires.

Working in conjunction with the United Way of Coastal Georgia and the national Hands-On Network, the Center for Service-Learning will produce a comprehensive, customized online database system that will allow local non-profit agencies to list their organization’s purpose and contact information as well as the volunteer opportunities and service-learning projects they have available. This database will allow the College’s faculty and students to do advanced searches to find community organizations that best match their needs and interests. The database system (utilizing a Salesforce™ assessment platform) will also accommodate the creation and storage of personal profile information including service-learners names, the class in which they are enrolled, and the number of hours they have successfully completed. The system will also allow faculty, Center staff, and community organizations to pull corporate,
institution-level, and course-specific data for the purposes of assessment and accountability. The development of this database is scheduled to begin in late August 2011 and is expected to become operational no later than the beginning of Spring Semester 2012.

Program Development
The Center for Service-Learning will promote service-learning and share information about its programs to students through venues that include student orientations, Welcome Back events, class presentations, and scheduled meetings with the Student Government Association (SGA) and student clubs/organizations. The Center will continue to communicate with local community organizations through a database that currently includes over 70 (vetted) local non-profit groups. The Center will also maintain on-going communications with community partners by sharing information about campus service-learning events and partnership opportunities as well as by soliciting feedback on their service-learning experiences.

In Spring Semester 2012, the Center will add a part-time assistant director to support the expansion of programming and assessment responsibilities.

Institutionalization
The primary institutional goal in academic year 2011-2012 is to develop guidelines and procedures for the official designation of courses as service-learning. Once this designation is established, a service-learning notation and description can be added to the course catalogue and to student transcripts.

Beginning in Fall Semester 2011, the Vice-President for Academic Affairs will meet with the Director of Service-Learning and the Service-Learning Advisory Committee to consider how faculty engagement in service-learning can be integrated as a valued criterion in yearly assessments of faculty performance and in the tenure and promotion process. It is expected that a policy in this area will be approved and implemented in Year 2 of the QEP.

Assessment
A central goal in Year 1 of QEP implementation is to develop and refine a broad range of assessment tools that will guide and monitor the College’s progress in fostering service-learning. These assessment tools include: a course-based student self-assessment survey (pre- and post-), a faculty course survey, faculty development workshop surveys, a community partner impact survey, assessment rubrics that align with service-learning outcomes, and faculty and student focus group and interview questions.

Beginning with the pilot service-learning courses in Fall Semester 2011, and continuing every semester thereafter, the Center for Service-Learning will conduct post-course assessments of students’ and faculty members’ experiences with service-learning. At the end of Spring Semester 2012, and continuing on an annual basis, the Center for Service-Learning will organize focus groups and interviews with faculty and students in order to collect more qualitative data about their respective experiences with service-learning. In addition, the Center will distribute a Community Partner Impact Survey, on a semester-by-semester basis, to all local organizations partnering with the College.

Information from these surveys, focus groups, and interviews will be analyzed each semester, and the results will be distributed and used to guide future development and programming strategies.
ACTION PLAN: Years 2–5

Whereas the initial year of the QEP will involve establishing the infrastructure on which to build the service-learning program and create the framework with which to carry it out, Years Two through Five will involve a tiered approach to implementation and assessment. Table 7 shows a brief summary of the plan for the subsequent four years of the QEP.

Table 7: Implementation in Years 2–5 (2012-2016)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Years 2-5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Development and Support</td>
<td>• Continue professional development opportunities for faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Provide on-going incentives for service-learning faculty practitioners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Increase number of faculty teaching service-learning courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Recruit service-learning faculty practitioners to help facilitate professional development workshops and mentor colleagues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Host faculty receptions honoring faculty commitment to service-learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Provide Excellence in Service-Learning Awards for outstanding faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Establish service-learning activity as a valued criteria in tenure and promotion process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Involvement and Leadership</td>
<td>• Increase number of students enrolled in service-learning courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Continue to expand and improve service-learning integration in residence hall living-learning communities (LLCs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Expand “Introduction to Service-Learning” experience in CCGA 1101 seminars, including connection to days of service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Organize student-led Alternative Break experiences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Engage students as service-learning assistants in service-learning courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Continue annual student service-learning poster session and showcase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Partner Development</td>
<td>• Continue to expand new community partnerships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Assure quality and diversity of community partnerships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Provide ongoing community forums and partnership development opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Development</td>
<td>• Provide Excellence in Service-Learning awards to faculty, students and community partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Publish service-learning newsletter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Make Assistant Director of Center a full-time position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Create comprehensive website as information portal for all students, faculty and community partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Apply for President’s Higher Education Community Service Honor Role</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutionalization</td>
<td>• Include service-learning as valued component in yearly assessment of faculty performance and faculty promotion and tenure decisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Integrate service-learning into all academic school/departmental strategic plans and class offerings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Establish lower-level service-learning requirement for all degree programs; established upper-level requirement for baccalaureate programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Create community engaged certificate/minor for students in service-learning</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Faculty Development and Support
Each year of the QEP, the Director of Service-Learning will facilitate at least one Service-Learning Scholars Workshop Series to a cohort of faculty committed to integrating service-learning into their coursework. While the current workshop covers the theme of service-learning quite broadly, future workshop series could be designed with particular themes in mind; e.g., community-based research, interdisciplinary service-learning, capstone experiences, etc. These thematic programs will be designed to meet the College’s institutionalized goals.

In addition to the Scholars Program – which is essentially a course-revision training program – the Center will sponsor a variety of on-going workshops, on a semester-by-semester basis, aimed at both introductory audiences and advanced practitioners. As the community of service-learning faculty scholars and practitioners grows at the College, a more diverse menu of service-learning development opportunities will be necessary. It is expected that faculty interest, along with community- and institutionally-identified needs, will drive the content of training. It is also expected that faculty will act as both conveners and attendees of these programs. The Service-Learning Advisory Committee will play a central role in advancing and developing programming ideas and strategies. A rather substantial QEP budget allocation for faculty development will facilitate inviting distinguished guest speakers and organizing regional mini-conferences on campus.

The incentives offered to faculty for developing and implementing service-learning classes – course reassignments and mini-grants allocations – will be offered on an on-going basis throughout the QEP. While reassignments are currently offered only to faculty teaching their first service-learning course, it may be that an individual faculty member will teach multiple courses, or multiple sections of a single course, that include a service-learning component. If this is the case, providing that faculty member with additional course reassignments may be desirable.

In order to provide recognition and rewards to faculty members engaged in service-learning teaching and mentorship, a number of support mechanisms will be implemented. Beginning in Year 2 and recurring annually, the College will offer an Excellence in Service-Learning Award to an outstanding faculty practitioner. Beginning in Year 3, an additional faculty award for service-learning leadership will be established. Faculty will be honored with a plaque and modest cash prize to be presented by the President at a year-end faculty reception.

Faculty will be further rewarded through the intentional incorporation of service-learning as a valued criterion in faculty evaluations, tenure and promotion (see “Institutionalization” section.)

The Center for Service-Learning will continue to support faculty in many ways. Center staff will be available to consult on curriculum development, help match students with relevant community partnerships/placement sites, and assist faculty who are seeking resources to support their service-learning teaching and scholarship.
Student Leadership and Involvement
As service-learning course offerings expand, so will student participation. The Center for Service-Learning will track all students who complete service-learning courses. In Year 2, the Service-Learning Advisory Committee will begin a discussion about the development of a community-engaged certificate program/minor for students. This certificate will take some time to develop, requiring that a broad array of service-learning courses are in place and available to students. Eventually, however, this program will allow students to develop and demonstrate significant skills in community-based service-learning and to receive recognition for their efforts. The Center for Service-Learning expects to pilot this certificate program in at least one academic school by the end of Year 4.

The integration of a one-time reflective service experience into the first-year seminar, CCGA 1101, piloted in a small number of sections in Year 1, will be expanded and potentially tied to a campus-wide day of service. In this “Introduction to Service-Learning” experience, students will engage in background research on a community organization and the important work it does, engage in service with the organization, and then reflect on what was learned during their experience in light of the specific seminar learning goals. By Year 4, it is expected that over 70% of students enrolled in CCGA 1101 will also be engaged in an associated reflective service experience.

Beginning in Year 2, and expanding annually, the Center for Service-Learning will facilitate the development of student-led Alternative Break (AB) experiences – typically 1-2 weeks in length, immerse groups of students in direct service and experiential learning with community organizations to increase their knowledge of social issues and encourage life-long, active citizenship. It is expected that some of these experiences will be tied to credit-bearing coursework. These experiences may be planned during spring break, winter break or the summer intersession.

Also beginning in Year 2, the Center for Service-Learning will establish a service-learning student assistant program that will engage students, as leaders and co-facilitators, in the College’s service-learning program. Students will be trained to provide support to faculty teaching service-learning courses, as well as co-lead co-curricular AB experiences. Students will be trained to assist with community partnerships processes as well as to effectively facilitate critical reflection on their peers’ community learning experiences. Using the student-as-colleague leadership development model (Zlotkowski, Longo & Williams 2006), individual students will be partnered as co-educators with faculty and community partner mentors. The details of this service-learning leadership program will be worked out in late Year 1/early Year 2 by the Director of Service-Learning, in consultation with the Service-Learning Advisory Committee.

Community Partner Development
The Center for Service-Learning will maintain a strong facilitating role in brokering partnership between local community agencies and the College’s faculty and students. This will include ongoing training of partners regarding how to best engage in effective, mutually-beneficial service-learning experiences; provision of various opportunities for organizations to connect with staff and students (e.g., service fairs, campus/community forums, community tours, inclusion in faculty workshops, presentations to classes and student clubs); and maintenance of an online database of service organizations and a calendar of events. Community partners will also be treated as members of the College community and receive invitations to campus events and programs.
Overall, programs and resources dedicated to community-partner development will respond to the ongoing feedback of student, faculty, and community organizations that are involved in service-learning partnerships, drawing from the continuous assessment of local/regional community needs and social service initiatives. Programming offered will both build on the identified strengths of collective partnerships and aggressively address areas in need of improvement.

Program Development
The Center for Service-Learning will act as the hub of campus programming for service-learning. The Center will organize partner recognition events like the year-end faculty reception and the student poster session and showcase that will illustrate the learning benefits of service-learning and the College’s contribution to the community. Additionally, the Center will also distribute recognition awards for Excellence in Service-Learning to distinguished faculty, students, and community partners.

The Center will take a leadership role in overseeing the promotion and marketing of service-learning on- and off-campus by producing a regular calendar of events and a bi-annual online newsletter; maintaining a dynamic website that will serve as a portal to faculty, staff, and community partners; and maintaining a presence at service events on campus and in the community. In addition, Center staff will apply for national recognition awards like the President’s Higher Education Community Service Honor Roll and present updates regarding the service-learning program’s development at regional and national service-learning conferences.

In Year 3, the Assistant Director of Service-Learning will become a full-time position to cover expansion of the Center’s activities, including growth in curricular and co-curricular programming (e.g., alternative breaks, student-led signature service events, student service-learning assistants program) and to help manage and analyze ongoing assessment (e.g., course-based assessments, student and faculty focus groups and interviews, community partner impact surveys, etc.)

Institutionalization
A key part of the implementation process is to assure that a wide range of faculty are prepared to teach service-learning courses, and that service-learning course offerings are available to students in a variety of degree programs at both the lower/introductory and upper-course levels. As faculty continue to be trained in service-learning, the Director of Service-Learning will track and compare the service-learning sections offered each year to confirm increased capacity and breadth of coverage across academic schools and at various curricular levels. Working together with the Council of Deans, the Vice-President for Academic Affairs, individual faculty members, and the Director of Service-Learning will identify, on an annual basis, what service-learning courses will be taught and in what academic terms they will be offered. To assure consistent quality in course development, all faculty members who teach service-learning courses will be expected to complete the Service-Learning Scholars faculty workshop series.

Beginning in 2013, the Director of Service-Learning will work with the Vice-President for Academic Affairs, the Council of Deans, and the QEP Implementation Committee to develop a plan for service-learning experiences in upper level courses, internships, and capstone experiences. Faculty workshops will be offered by the Center for Service-Learning regarding how to integrate service-learning into these kinds of academic experiences.

By the Fall Semester 2015, the College plans to have a service-learning program in which 75% of all students enrolled in a degree program will have access to taking at least one service-
learning course. This means that at least 30 service-learning sections will be offered to students on a yearly basis, with a cadre of 20-25 faculty members consistently teaching at least one service-learning course per year.

In Year 2, the Vice-President for Academic Affairs, after reviewing recommendations from the Director of Service-Learning and Service-Learning Advisory Committee, will forward a proposal for Faculty Senate approval regarding the incorporation of service-learning teaching and scholarship as valued criteria in annual faculty performance evaluations, promotion and tenure. It is expected that the policy will be in effect by the end of Year 2.

Beginning in Year 2, the College will seek external acknowledgment for its service efforts by submitting an application for the President’s Higher Education Community Service Honor Roll. Also in Year 2, and continuing annually, the College will offer “excellence in service-learning” recognition awards to an outstanding faculty member, student or student group, and community partner. During the same year, the Director of Service-Learning, in conjunction with the Service-Learning Advisory Committee and QEP Implementation Committee, will begin discussion about the development of the service-learning certificate/minor program. It is expected that the College will pilot this certificate program in at least one academic school by Year 4.

A necessary precondition to the success of the certificate program is the existence of an adequate infrastructure. This will allow students a “pathway” to participate in and progress through a range of community-based service and experiential learning opportunities designed to enhance their academic learning, deepen their civic skills, and/or extend their professional experience and preparation. These opportunities might range from involvement in one-time service activities to more academically-integrated coursework, including a required capstone project, internship, and/or field experiences.

Beginning in Year 3, an additional faculty award will be offered for service-learning leadership. Formal recognition of faculty members’ service-learning commitments – through both awards and the tenure and promotion process – will assure that faculty members are able to maintain commitments to service-learning at any point in their academic careers. Also in Year 3, the Vice-President for Academic Affairs will convene a group to consider collecting data and applying for the Carnegie Foundation’s elective classification for Community Engagement.

The Director of Service-Learning, working with the Council of Deans and the QEP Implementation Committee, will review curriculum and student programming on an ongoing basis to assure that an adequate range of service-learning experiences are developed and available to students at the co-curricular, introductory- and upper-course levels, and that there are opportunities for service-learning integration at the capstone, internship, and thesis levels. The development of this community-engaged certificate/minor program will require a thorough consideration of a range of models and strategies existing at colleges and universities nationally. The goal will be to institute a program that best fits the needs and unique circumstances of the College, its students, and its community partners.

Additional institutionalization mechanisms will include course reassignments for faculty who commit to developing and teaching a service-learning course and competitive faculty mini-grants to support course implementation and scholarly dissemination.
Assessment
Conferring with the Office of Institutional Effectiveness, the Director of Service-Learning and the QEP Implementation Committee will review and assess implementation activities on an annual basis to assure an effective movement toward service-learning institutionalization. Assessment activities will include:

- Tracking and comparing numbers of service-learning sections offered each year to confirm increased capacity and breadth of coverage across the academic schools;
- Evaluating data from Fall and Spring Semester service-learning courses, with a subsequent distribution of results to internal and external advisory boards, to be used for future trainings and plans for improvement;
- Refining tools to collect assessment data from service-learning courses, faculty, and community partners; and
- Evaluating data from community partner surveys, including distribution of results to faculty, community partners, and advisory boards.

Course-based assessments of student and faculty experiences will be collected and analyzed on a semester-by-semester basis beginning in Year 1. Starting in Year 3, graduating students will also be surveyed to share their service-learning experiences and achievement of desired student learning outcomes.

After Year 2, the Director of Service-Learning, working in conjunction with the Office of Institutional Effectiveness, QEP Implementation Committee, and Service-Learning Advisory Board, will prepare an interim program review and assessment, documenting outcomes and findings from the first two years of QEP implementation. The Office of Institutional Effectiveness staff will assist with interpreting the data and will recommend modifications to the QEP as it continues to evolve.

In Year 5, the Office of Institutional Effectiveness will gather data for the writing and submission of the QEP impact report and determine if it is appropriate to apply for Carnegie Foundation Community Engagement Classification.

Ultimately, for the QEP to be successful, the College must be capable of implementing a program that does the following:

- Produces data that can be analyzed and used for responsible decision making regarding student learning;
- Complements on-going institutional effectiveness efforts;
- Can be accomplished within the human and fiscal resources of the College; and
- Is sustainable within the available resources of the College.

To reach these goals, a comprehensive management system must be in place to coordinate and maintain service-learning partnerships; to train faculty to use service-learning methodology and to develop and assess reflective writing assignments; to build a comprehensive relationship among faculty, students, and community partners; to administer assessment measures; to provide a venue for gathering, analyzing, and disseminating results; and to discern the overall impact of the service-learning program on student learning at the College. Ensuring that this structure is fully operational is the key goal in Year 5.
IX. Organizational Structure

Clear lines of responsibility for implementation and sustainability (providing support for compliance CS 3.3.2 “institutional capability for the initiation, implementation, and completion of the QEP”)

The College has identified positions that will be responsible for service-learning’s administration and implementation. The organizational diagram below (Figure 2) illustrates the proposed relationships among the key stakeholders responsible for effectively and efficiently implementing the QEP.

Figure 2: Service-Learning Organizational Chart

Roles and Responsibilities
The following summary explains the proposed roles and responsibilities of key individuals and groups responsible for the various tasks associated with the successful implementation of the QEP. Operationally, the oversight of the QEP resides with the President’s Cabinet with the Vice-President for Academic Affairs serving as its liaison.

Vice-President for Academic Affairs
Reporting directly to the President, the Vice-President for Academic Affairs will provide oversight for the implementation and evaluation of the Quality Enhancement Plan by working closely with the Director of Institutional Effectiveness and the Director of Service-Learning, and by chairing the QEP Implementation Committee.

QEP Director
Reporting to the Vice-President for Academic Affairs, the Director of Service-Learning will serve as the QEP director – responsible for the management and execution of the QEP, including the allocation of project resources. The Director will lead the QEP Service-Learning Advisory Committee, direct all activities associated with the QEP, monitor the project budget, and facilitate the annual evaluation of the QEP.
Assistant Director of Service-Learning
Reporting to the Director of Service-Learning, the Assistant Director will provide leadership in the development and implementation of academic service-learning/community-based opportunities, services, advocacy, and research, including

- Overall administrative support for academic service-learning;
- Supporting faculty development workshops;
- Developing student leadership in service-learning and meta-curricular engagement initiatives;
- Coordinating risk management and evaluation activities related to service-learning; and
- Furthering institutionalization of processes and infrastructure for service-learning and community engagement.

Implementation Committee
The Implementation Committee will consist of the Vice-President for Academic Affairs, QEP Director, Director of Institutional Effectiveness, faculty representatives from each academic school, and representatives from Business Affairs, Student Affairs, and the Student Government Association. The Implementation Committee will oversee the implementation activities of the QEP, providing recommendations as needed.

Community Advisory Board for Service-Learning
Community Advisory Board for Service-Learning, made up of local non-profit, government and small business leaders, has been charged with (1) setting current and future priorities in service-learning as they relate to community-based service opportunities, (2) providing insight into the nature and shifting needs in Glynn, Camden and McIntosh counties and strategies for addressing those needs, and (3) creating awareness of service-learning as a pedagogy and community capacity-building strategy for the organizations they represent and to the community as a whole. Board members are asked to represent, as much as possible, the best interests of the constituents they represent as well as the best interests of all.

Service-Learning Advisory Committee
The Service-Learning Advisory Committee will serve as a central steering and consulting body for the advancement of service-learning on the campus. The Committee will include faculty service-learning practitioners from diverse disciplines as well as student and community partner representatives.

Working with the Director of Service-Learning, Committee members will provide significant leadership in the planning and development of service-learning activities and initiatives including support for ongoing programs (e.g., review of faculty mini-grant submissions; playing role of resident experts or mentors in instructional development programs; serving as advocates of service-learning activities in departments, student organizations, and community centers) and consultation on the development of new programming and research initiatives.

Director of Institutional Effectiveness
The Director of Institutional Effectiveness will provide statistical analyses of all QEP-related data; provide annual QEP evaluation updates; and communicate assessment issues with the Director of Service-Learning, the Advisory Committee, and other institutional audiences. The Director will provide assessment oversight of the QEP and will ensure its coordination with the
overarching College planning and institutional effectiveness processes. The Director reports
directly to the President and serves as the College’s accreditation liaison.

Meetings
It is expected that all Committee, advisory board, and other QEP support staff will meet at least
twice per semester, provide meeting minutes to the President’s Cabinet, and offering a
summary of their activities and decisions.

College, Faculty, Staff and Agencies
Beyond the key organizational roles the aforementioned stakeholders will play the ultimate
success for service-learning lies in the collective work of all partners – the College, faculty,
students, and community organizations.

College Role
While the Center for Service-Learning will play a leadership role in facilitating the development
of service-learning on the campus, the Center is only as effective as the active support it
receives from the rest of the campus community. The success of service-learning requires the
support of the Council of Deans and other administrators to promote program goals; of faculty to
share with students the benefit of service-learning as an effective, albeit non-traditional, learning
strategy; of staff and advisors to counsel students on course offerings and community
placements; and on the President and vice-presidents to manage priorities and mobilize
resources for the program. The entire College is responsible for the development and success
of service-learning; it will not be successful if simply envisioned as the Center’s responsibility.

Faculty Role
The role of faculty in the practice of service-learning is critical as they will be introducing the
concept of service-learning to students as well as giving them the opportunity to participate in
the service-learning program. The faculty member who will be teaching service-learning
courses will need to offer service-learning opportunities for students; determine appropriate
assignments and learning objectives based on course content; and evaluate students’ reflective
journals and other service-learning assignments.

Student Role
Students are the most important variable in the service-learning equation. Students will be
provided with a service-learning orientation, including practical guidelines, as well as sign a
contract indicating that they have read, understood, and will abide by the established service-
learning guidelines. Students will also be responsible for completing all necessary forms and
agreements; fulfilling requirements for the service-learning project; and attending reflection
group sessions at the end of the semester in which the service-learning project was undertaken.

Community Organization Role
Community agencies are both the beneficiaries and providers of service-learning opportunities.
It is expected that the agency will provide position descriptions to the Director of Service-
Learning; formalize insurance and other agency requirements; complete an agency service-
learning agreement form; work with the Director of Service-Learning should an issue arise
between the agency and student(s); evaluate and supervise the student(s); and sign student
time sheets.

Agencies will work very closely with faculty members engaged in service-learning and will
provide input on best matches between student and agency. They will also engage, as needed,
in the interview and selection of student candidates for service-learning placements, as well as provide written materials to supplement training.

Mission Connection
The interconnectiveness between students-faculty-community is very apparent when aligning the QEP with the College’s mission:

- **For Students**, the QEP will improve decision-making, problem-solving and analytical skills; develops leadership, social interaction and civic responsibility through active community involvement; provide understanding of how to access the larger community as a resource; enhance understanding of classroom concepts by putting them into practice; allow for an stronger understanding, appreciation and an ability to relate to people from a wide range of backgrounds; allow for opportunities to engage in cross-cultural situations; and encourage a willingness to develop and implement new ideas and processes.

- **For Faculty/Staff**, it increases awareness of community issues, encouraging them to shift from the "expert on top" to the "expert on tap"; inspires innovative teaching methods and broadens areas for research and publication related to current societal demands; demonstrates how academic theories and information become relevant as they are applied to actual situations; contributes to student retention by helping students develop a sense of community within the class, which makes the sharing of information more meaningful; and encourages a better understanding of the social and moral implications of education and of civic and social responsibility.

- **For Community/Service Organization Sites**, it helps build positive relationships for and with students who bring enthusiasm and creative ideas, as well as specialized skills to the needs of local community organizations; cultivates a new generation of caring and experienced citizens and volunteers; creates potential for additional partnerships and collaboration with the College; fosters an ethic of servitude leadership in students who will be tomorrow’s volunteers and community leaders, as well as increasing overall community volunteerism; and provides awareness of community needs and the agencies which provide for them.
X. Resources

A realistic allocation of sufficient human, financial, and physical resources (providing support for compliance CS 3.3.2 “institutional capability for the initiation, implementation, and completion of the QEP”)

The College of Coastal Georgia recognizes that implementing Learning through Engagement: Service-Learning requires a resolute commitment of human, financial, and physical resources.

Institutional staffing, financial, and space planning will incorporate the needs of service-learning to enhance program effectiveness.

Human Resources
Staffing
The inaugural Director of Service-Learning began employment at the College in October 2010. Dr. Clayton Hurd holds a Ph.D. in Cultural Anthropology from the University of California at Santa Cruz and spent the past five years working at Colorado State University as Director of the Office of Service-Learning in the Institute for Learning and Teaching. He has served as faculty mentor, instructor and project coordinator of various student engagement and service-learning projects.

In August 2011, Dr. Hurd resigned to assume the role of Director of Public Service Research in the Haas Center for Public Service at Stanford University. Currently, a search is underway to find a qualified replacement. Kay Hampton, Associate Vice-President for Academic Affairs, has been named interim Director of Service-Learning to ensure the College remains on track with its first-year QEP implementation initiatives.

A part-time Assistant Director of Service-Learning will begin work in the Center for Service-Learning in Spring Semester 2012. The proposed budget also includes making the new assistant director position full-time in the third year. Funds are included in the budget to provide undergraduate student workers through institutional funds or Federal Work Study.

Financial Resources
The overall General Operating budget for the College has increased from $16,394,439 in Fiscal Year (FY) 2009 to $23,019,995 in FY 2012. Although state appropriations have only increased modestly, internal revenue growth has been extremely strong. The combination of solid enrollment growth coupled with tuition and fee increases has provided the institution with the largest budget in the history of the institution.

The College of Coastal Georgia Foundation, which is a non-profit corporation governed by a volunteer Board of Trustees, develops resources to support the College in providing quality education. The Foundation recently reached a milestone by surpassing $10 million in assets and the FY 2012 budget stands at $995,000 – also an all time high.

In addition to institutional and Foundation resources available to support the QEP, external grants have been sought. The institution was selected as one of the recipients of funding from the St. Marys United Methodist Church Foundation. A total of $150,000 has been provided over a two-year period (2010-2012) to help launch the comprehensive service-learning initiative.

Each year, the College will be required to increase the QEP budget due to the growth of student involvement in the service-learning program and the costs associated with this growth. The
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College will also seek opportunities to apply for external grants that are related to the establishment of a synergistic service-learning program.

Noted below are the major QEP budgetary categories with a brief description.

Marketing
The marketing budget will be used for a broad range of activities intended to promote the QEP topic and programs among all constituents, including the College’s students, faculty, and staff, as well as community partners and the larger Coastal Georgia region.

Programming
The annual student poster sessions will showcase – to internal and external audiences – the high quality service-learning projects in which students and faculty participate. Funds will be used to organize and cater the event. The faculty reception and excellence awards will serve the purpose of acknowledging and rewarding participants and partners who demonstrate leadership and innovation in advancing the College’s service-learning program. An award for excellence will be offered annually to an outstanding faculty member, student and community partner organization. Recipients will receive a plaque, modest monetary award ($200), and acknowledgement at the annual student poster session.

Office Expenses
Office expenses will include the purchase and upgrade of essential equipment, including computers, printers, telephones, and hand-held video cameras. Funds will also be used to purchase scantron forms for the on-going, course-based assessments of student and faculty participants.

Partnership Cultivation
These funds will be used to organize, implement and host reflective learning sessions for campus-wide signature service events that may include, for example, a hunger day event or a number of Fall and Spring Semester one-day community service immersion experiences for students. The College will begin to engage the first-year seminar students in short-term service experiences in Spring Semester 2012. Costs for these activities will include transportation to service sites, project materials, and potential stipends for student organizers. Alternative Break experiences, which will be organized in Fall Semester 2012, and which will expand in number over the course of the five-year plan, will require funds to set up service sites, to facilitate student leadership retreats and training, and to provide basic travel support for faculty, staff, and students who serve as co-leaders on the trips.

Faculty Development
These funds will be used to support programming for on-going, campus-wide faculty training in service-learning. Activities will include workshops or seminars hosted by inter/national experts in such areas as service-learning pedagogy and assessment, outreach scholarship, and community partnership building. Costs will also include those associated with the locally-organized workshops and community immersion experiences.

Professional Staff Development/Support
These funds will be utilized to support activities that enhance the professional competencies of the Center for Service-Learning staff. This may include support for attendance at regional/national conferences and other relevant trainings/workshops.
Course Development and Support
College faculty members who commit to participating in an intensive, six-week training program and teaching a service-learning course will be offered a one-course reassignment. The course reassignment will be offered only during the first semester the instructor offers the course. Faculty can apply for ongoing support for course implementation, on a competitive basis, through the faculty mini-grant program. Mini-grants will support faculty members in the implementation or improvement of courses, the assessment of existing courses, or the dissemination of findings at relevant conferences and public events.

Assessment/Data Management Software
These funds will be necessary to purchase new or upgraded assessment software, to support maintenance costs and contracts with external providers (e.g., Hands-On Network, Pearson-Scantron), and to purchase relevant assessment equipment and supplies. Table 8 provides an itemized breakdown of resources required to support the QEP over Fiscal Years (FY) 2012-2016. The total projected five-year cost is $995,625.

Table 8: Detailed Five-Year Budget Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salaries &amp; Benefits</td>
<td>$113,208</td>
<td>$133,291</td>
<td>$147,606</td>
<td>$151,899</td>
<td>$156,321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director</td>
<td>84,995</td>
<td>87,544</td>
<td>90,170</td>
<td>92,875</td>
<td>95,661</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asst. Director (starting part-time Spring 2012)</td>
<td>23,713</td>
<td>41,247</td>
<td>52,936</td>
<td>54,524</td>
<td>56,160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Assistants (College Work-Study - 15 hrs/wk for 40 wks)</td>
<td>$4,500</td>
<td>$4,500</td>
<td>$4,500</td>
<td>$4,500</td>
<td>$4,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing</td>
<td>$4,500</td>
<td>$6,100</td>
<td>$6,100</td>
<td>$6,200</td>
<td>$6,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programming</td>
<td>$1,200</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
<td>$2,800</td>
<td>$2,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Posters Session/Showcase</td>
<td>$600</td>
<td>$750</td>
<td>$750</td>
<td>$750</td>
<td>$750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL Faculty reception</td>
<td>$600</td>
<td>$750</td>
<td>$750</td>
<td>$750</td>
<td>$750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL Excellence Awards</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$1,300</td>
<td>$1,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Expenses</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnership Cultivation</td>
<td>$3,500</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
<td>$4,500</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$5,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signature Campus Service Events</td>
<td>$1,250</td>
<td>$1,250</td>
<td>$1,250</td>
<td>$1,250</td>
<td>$1,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCGA 1101 Immersion Experience</td>
<td>$1,250</td>
<td>$1,250</td>
<td>$1,250</td>
<td>$1,250</td>
<td>$1,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-curricular/Alt Break Experiences</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Development</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshops/Seminars/Invited Speakers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Staff Development /Support</td>
<td>$3,500</td>
<td>$3,500</td>
<td>$3,500</td>
<td>$3,700</td>
<td>$3,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference travel for Center staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Development/ Support</td>
<td>$30,600</td>
<td>$30,600</td>
<td>$30,600</td>
<td>$33,000</td>
<td>$35,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty course reassignments/overloads</td>
<td>$21,600</td>
<td>$21,600</td>
<td>$21,600</td>
<td>$24,000</td>
<td>$26,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty mini-grants</td>
<td>$9,000</td>
<td>$9,000</td>
<td>$9,000</td>
<td>$9,000</td>
<td>$9,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment/Data Management Software</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$168,008</td>
<td>$189,491</td>
<td>$204,806</td>
<td>$213,099</td>
<td>$220,221</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 9 provides a funding source overview that captures the major financial streams that will support the effective and efficient completion of the QEP. The St. Marys United Methodist Church Foundation (SMUMC) grant was provided as a one-time, start-up resource for the development of a Center for Service-Learning.

Table 9: Funding Source Overview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fund Sources</th>
<th>FY 2012</th>
<th>FY 2013</th>
<th>FY 2014</th>
<th>FY 2015</th>
<th>FY 2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Funds</td>
<td>$83,408</td>
<td>$179,741</td>
<td>$195,056</td>
<td>$203,349</td>
<td>$210,471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMUMC Foundation</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCGA Foundation</td>
<td>$9,600</td>
<td>$9,750</td>
<td>$9,750</td>
<td>$9,750</td>
<td>$9,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$168,008</td>
<td>$189,491</td>
<td>$204,806</td>
<td>$213,099</td>
<td>$220,221</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Physical Resources
The Center for Service-Learning will ultimately be housed in the planned Teacher Education and Learning Center. The USG Board of Regents and the State Legislature has approved $7.6 million for construction in Fiscal Year 2012 and an additional $1.1 million in FY 2013 for furniture, fixtures and equipment. Currently, the Center operates from an office suite in the Earl F. Hargett Administration Building.

The new Center for Service-Learning space will provide greater support and expanded resources for faculty in designing and implementing service-learning courses, including course development and syllabus preparation; service-learning project ideas; and partnerships with community-based organizations whose needs match a particular course. Meeting rooms, resource rooms, library space, and offices will be part of the architectural program to ensure adequate space is provided in the new facility to support service learning activities.

Strategic Planning and Resources Priority
In addition to an ongoing budgetary commitment, the implementation of the QEP is a standing priority item in the College’s strategic planning process through which any identified needs for additional resources would be identified and addressed through either allocation of additional resources or reprioritization of existing resources.
XI. Assessment

A comprehensive evaluation plan (providing support for compliance with CS 3.3.2 “a plan to assess their achievement”)

The assessment plan is designed to guide the effectiveness of the QEP implementation, serving as a means of measuring areas of strength and opportunities for growth. The Director of Service-Learning and designated faculty representatives on the Service-Learning Advisory Committee will work together to assure that the students meet not only the QEP’s measurable objectives, but the student learning outcomes (SLOs) as well.

To ensure that measurable student learning outcomes are translated into institutional structures, and associated evaluation measures are part of an ongoing assessment process, the College will subscribe to both:

- Student learning outcomes and
- Institution-level assessment practices

Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes
To provide an alignment between the student learning outcomes and the assessment of those outcomes, Table 10 provides an overview. The achievement target is that at least 75% of service-learners will demonstrate achievement of the following SLOs (when included in a course).

Table 10: Student Learning Outcomes & Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Learning Outcomes</th>
<th>Criterion &amp; Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objective 1 – Enable community engagement and promote leadership:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1 – Students will collaborate and build relationships with community organizations.</td>
<td>Grow to at least 30 service-learning course sections offered to students on a yearly basis by 2015.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 1.2 – Students will demonstrate an understanding of how communities function. | Students will score at least at a Proficient level on a:  
  - Common rubric,  
  - Faculty checklist of SLOs included/met in the course, and  
  - Post-course student self-assessment of learning (survey) |
| 1.3 – Students will demonstrate effective leadership in community activities, including skills of interpersonal communication, collaboration, and collective action. | Students will score at least at a Proficient level on a:  
  - Common rubric,  
  - Faculty checklist of SLOs included/met in the course, and  
  - Post-course student self-assessment of learning (survey) |
| 1.4 – Students will demonstrate the ability to access the larger community as a resource for course-specific skill building and learning. | Students will score at least at a Proficient level on a:  
  - Common rubric,  
  - Faculty checklist of SLOs included/met in the course, and  
  - Post-course student self-assessment of learning (survey) |
**Objective 2 – Enable enhanced understanding of course content:**

| 2.1 – Students will demonstrate ability to effectively apply theories, concepts and methods to practical problems. | Students will score at least at a Proficient level on a:  
• Common rubric,  
• Faculty checklist of SLOs included/met in the course, and  
• Post-course student self-assessment of learning (survey) |
|---|---|
| 2.2 – Students will demonstrate effective use of problem-solving skills and strategies in service-learning assignments. | Students will score at least at a Proficient level on a:  
• Common rubric,  
• Faculty checklist of SLOs included/met in the course, and  
• Post-course student self-assessment of learning (survey) |
| 2.3 – Students will demonstrate the ability to effectively transfer course theories, concepts and knowledge to novel situations. | Students will score at least at a Proficient level on a:  
• Common rubric,  
• Faculty checklist of SLOs included/met in the course, and  
• Post-course student self-assessment of learning (survey) |

**Objective 3 – Develop critical and creative thinking and reflection skills:**

| 3.1 – Students will demonstrate higher levels of critical and creative thinking by recognizing and analyzing problems, identifying viable solutions when possible, and defending choices of solutions. | Students will score at least at a Proficient level on a:  
• Common rubric,  
• Faculty checklist of SLOs included/met in the course, and  
• Post-course student self-assessment of learning (survey) |
|---|---|
| 3.2 – Students will demonstrate an ability to analyze and reflect upon their own and others’ beliefs and assumptions about an area of service. | Students will score at least at a Proficient level on a:  
• Common rubric,  
• Faculty checklist of SLOs included/met in the course, and  
• Post-course student self-assessment of learning (survey) |

**Objective 4 – Promote social responsibility, global awareness, and openness to diverse perspectives:**

| 4.1 – Students will demonstrate comprehension of the community issues that are relevant to their service-learning course content. | Students will score at least at a Proficient level on a:  
• Common rubric,  
• Faculty checklist of SLOs included/met in the course, and  
• Post-course student self-assessment of learning (survey) |
|---|---|
| 4.2 – Students will demonstrate awareness of global issues, processes, trends and systems in relation to their service-learning experiences. | Students will score at least at a Proficient level on a:  
• Common rubric,  
• Faculty checklist of SLOs included/met in the course, and  
• Post-course student self-assessment of learning (survey) |
| 4.3 – Students will demonstrate the ability to understand, make reasoned judgments, and respond to differences in perspectives and viewpoints. | Students will score at least at a Proficient level on a:  
• Common rubric,  
• Faculty checklist of SLOs included/met in the course, and  
• Post-course student self-assessment of learning (survey) |
| 4.4 – Students will gain practical experience and make community contacts that will help them start and/or advance their careers. | Students will score at least at a Proficient level on a:  
• Common rubric,  
• Faculty checklist of SLOs included/met in the course, and  
• Post-course student self-assessment of learning (survey) |
Course-Level Measures of Student Learning Outcomes

a. **Formal integration of SLOs in course syllabi**: Faculty who engage in the formal service-learning course revision process (via the Service-Learning Faculty Scholars program) will integrate the institution’s service-learning SLOs into their specific course learning goals and objectives. Faculty will be expected to include at least one relevant SLO in each of the four objective areas. Faculty will design reflective course assignments and activities requiring students to link their service experiences to other course materials in ways that achieve one or more of the stated service-learning SLOs. In this way, effective assessments of student academic performance will also constitute assessments of those service-learning SLOs that faculty have incorporated explicitly into their course goals and objectives. The Center for Service-Learning will develop and provide faculty with assessment rubrics that they may use to help them structure reflective assignments in ways that meet service-learning SLOs.

b. **Student self-assessment surveys**: Pre- and post-course surveys will capture students’ perceptions of what they learned in the course with specific questions addressing each of the SLOs. Additional survey questions will assess students’ overall experience and satisfaction with the service-learning and community engagement aspects of the course, including feedback on how the service-learning experience might be improved to enhance their learning process.

c. **Faculty course assessment**: At the end of each semester, faculty members teaching a SL course will receive a checklist of the service-learning SLOs and identify which were included/met in the context of the specific course. They will also be asked to keep representative samples of student learning experiences, ranging from samples of those who have succeeded to those who struggled. Faculty will consult these samples during annual focus groups meetings facilitated by the Director of Service-Learning.

Institution-level Measures of Student Learning Outcomes

a. **Faculty Focus groups and presentations**: Small groups of faculty teaching service-learning courses will be brought together annually to discuss the accomplishments and challenges they experienced in their attempts to achieve the service-learning SLOs. Faculty experiences in the focus groups will be shared across campus and used to inform future instructional training and program development.

b. **Student focus groups, interviews, and surveys**: On an annual basis, the Center for Service-Learning will host interviews and focus groups for students who have enrolled in service-learning courses. Surveys will also be administered to graduating students to assess their achievement of the service-learning SLOs. Students’ reflections on their learning experiences will be documented and coded by Center for Service-Learning staff. Insights will be shared with the campus community and used to inform future instructional training and program development.
Institutional Self-Assessment
To measure and monitor service-learning program implementation at the institutional level, the College has adapted Andrew Furco’s (2002) well-known rubric for service-learning institutionalization. The rubric is designed to assist the College in tracking which institutionalization components are progressing well and which need additional attention.

Using the Furco rubric as a guide, the QEP assessment subcommittee identified five key content dimensions on which the success of the College’s service-learning institutionalization efforts will depend: (a) institutional support; (b) program development; (c) faculty support and involvement; (d) student support and involvement; and (e) community support, participation and partnerships. Table 11 provides the alignment between the service-learning goal and its associated objectives that drive each of the five content dimensions.

Table 11: Assessment Plan for Service-Learning Institutionalization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Content Dimension</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Institutional support</td>
<td>Staffing</td>
<td>Establish at least 2 FTE permanent Center staff and 2-3 student staff by 2013</td>
<td>Positions created</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Funding</td>
<td>Establish base budget support for Center for Service-Learning</td>
<td>Budget created</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Support</td>
<td>Create service-learning course designation for course catalogue/academic transcript by 2012; provide capital to grow to 30 service-learning sections offered by 2015; establish lower level service-learning requirement for all associate degree programs and establish upper and lower level requirement for all baccalaureate degree programs by 2015; offer adequate number of courses/sections to meet student involvement goals</td>
<td>Monitor service-learning course offerings to assure adequate number and representation of courses across departments; Recruit faculty for course revision trainings as necessary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Departmental Support</td>
<td>Integrate service-learning into all academic school/departmental level strategic plans and academic course offerings by 2015</td>
<td>Strategic plans will reflect service-learning institutionalization goals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation &amp; Assessment</td>
<td>Create effective information management system for service-learning assessment</td>
<td>Center for Service-Learning will partner with the Office of Institutional Effectiveness to develop and monitor the assessment system</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Development</td>
<td>Definition of service-learning</td>
<td>Create institution-specific definition of service-learning</td>
<td>Completed Spring Semester 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alignment with institutional mission and strategic plan</td>
<td>a) Include service-learning as a central and valued teaching, learning and outreach strategy in College's mission statement; include in strategic planning documentation</td>
<td>Revised mission statement completed Spring Semester 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) Integrate service-learning into all academic School-level strategic plans</td>
<td></td>
<td>Service-learning integrated into institutional strategic plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alignment with other CCGA educational reform efforts</td>
<td>a) Integrate service-learning into emerging residential Living-Learning Communities (LLCs) in Fall Semester 2011</td>
<td>Track number of students who participate; develop assessment tool to evaluate impact on social and academic development, including impact on retention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>b) Integrate &quot;Introduction to Service-Learning&quot; as a thematic unit in first-year seminars (CCGA1101) beginning in 2011; add one-time reflective service experience component beginning in 2012</td>
<td>Track number of students participating in one-time reflective service component; compare student satisfaction and self-assessment of learning in sections with and without reflective service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Coastal Georgia</td>
<td>Quality Enhancement Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Faculty support and involvement</strong></td>
<td><strong>Recognition of excellence</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty awareness</td>
<td>Establish 4 service-learning excellence awards: 2 for faculty, 1 for a student (or student group) and 1 for an outstanding community partner by 2012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nominating committee to determine criteria for award</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty involvement</td>
<td>Increase faculty knowledge of service-learning through participation in basic information sessions and guest speaker events; at least 60% of faculty will attend at least one workshop per year; 80% of faculty who participate in trainings will indicate a good understanding of service-learning pedagogy and an awareness of curricular models; all faculty will be required to attend at least one activity per academic year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Track number of faculty participating in information/training sessions and conduct post-session surveys of effectiveness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty support</td>
<td>Progressively increase the number of full-time faculty who will develop and teach service-learning courses; grow to a cadre of 20-25 faculty consistently teaching at least one service-learning course/year by 2015; provide on-going faculty workshops on service-learning integration; 75% of faculty who participate in service-learning activities will indicate satisfaction with the experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Track number of faculty who complete training in service-learning course revision; conduct post-session surveys of effectiveness and use results to improve programming; track and monitor number of faculty teaching service-learning courses on semester by semester basis; conduct annual surveys of faculty satisfaction; engage in targeted recruitment in departments where faculty participation may be low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty support</td>
<td>Identify, support and recognize faculty advocates in all academic schools; convene cohort-based instructional training and curricular revision programs 1-2 times annually; encourage faculty participation in, and feedback on, all aspects of service-learning programming</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conduct post-session surveys of effectiveness for all information/training sessions; conduct 1-2 faculty focus groups per year to solicit feedback on service-learning teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty leadership</td>
<td>Faculty incentives and rewards</td>
<td>Student support and involvement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrate faculty leaders as advocates-mentors in Service-Learning Scholars (SLS) program and as members of Service-Learning Advisory Committee (SLAC); enlist as mini-grant peer reviewers and student poster session reviewers; encourage and sponsor faculty presentations of their work on- and off-campus; at least 15 faculty members will serve in leadership roles annually by 2014.</td>
<td>Offer mini-grants, course reassignments, conference travel funds for service-learning faculty practitioners annually; establish service-learning teaching excellence awards by 2013; establish service-learning as valued criteria in faculty evaluation and promotion process by 2014; offer annual reception for service-learning faculty.</td>
<td>All students entering a degree program will demonstrate an understanding of service-learning, course offerings available, and expectations of enrollment in courses by 2012. Post-course assessment of CCGA1101 first-year seminars; modification of student advising protocols to encourage and monitor students involvement in service-learning.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty leadership</th>
<th>Faculty incentives and rewards</th>
<th>Student support and involvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Track and monitor faculty participation in leadership/mentorship programs, assuring wide representation; track conference presentation and workshops facilitated on- and off-campus.</td>
<td>Track number/amount of faculty incentives provided (mini-grants, course reassignments) and recipients; require signed agreements and final reports for all mini-grants allocated.</td>
<td>By 2015, at least 75% of all students graduating in a degree program will have taken at least one service-learning course at the College; 70% of students will indicate satisfaction with service-learning experiences; establish lower level service-learning requirement for all associate degree programs and upper level requirement for all baccalaureate degree programs by 2015. Registrar review of student records; evaluation of student advising requirement around service-learning course selection; monitor availability and range of courses sufficient to assure full student participation; conduct post-course satisfaction surveys to students; track number of students completing service-learning courses and hours served; survey graduating students on service-learning and benefits to their education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community support, participation and partnerships</td>
<td>Community partner awareness</td>
<td>Convene annual campus/community forum on service-learning; create community partner manual by 2012; 75% of all active community partners will claim a strong understanding of service learning and satisfaction with the partnership by 2013; participate in on-going outreach and site visits; organize regular community partner workshops, work with local community foundations, United Way and Georgia Center for Non-Profits to disseminate information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community involvement</td>
<td>Establish sufficient community partnerships to accommodate service-learning activities; Increase number of community partnerships by at least 10% each year; establish wide range of partnership; i.e., direct service, research, advocacy, etc.</td>
<td>Number of community partner MOUs signed, name/number of agencies partnering with faculty and students and nature of partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community impact</td>
<td>Establish sufficient community partnerships to accommodate service-learning activities</td>
<td>Administer annual community partner impact surveys assessing satisfaction and dimensions of impact; analyze Community Advisory</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Student leadership opportunities

Establish student-led service organization/advisory board to be coordinated in partnership with Student and Academic Affairs by 2012; establish service-learning student assistant program in Center for Service-Learning by 2013; establish student-led, co-curricular service-learning programs (e.g., alternative breaks) by 2013

Track students involved in advisory bodies; track students involved in assistants program and faculty/community partnerships; track number and nature of alternative break service activities involving College students including students involved, hours served and community partner organizations

Student incentives and rewards

Establish student award for Excellence in Service-Learning Award; establish annual service-learning student poster session and showcase event; establish community-engaged transcript certificate for student leaders in service-learning; provide credit/stipend for students serving as service-learning student assistants (leveraging mini grant funds)

Track number of student posters submitted for annual poster session/showcase and number of attendees; track number of nominations for service-learning excellence awards; track students who enter the community-engaged certificate/minor program and monitor satisfaction
### Integrating Assessment with Institutional Effectiveness

Each College organizational unit creates an annual unit assessment plan using a standard template [Exhibit 10] to facilitate more meaningful and strategic evidence of institutional effectiveness – an effort to more tightly align the College’s strategic goals (institutional expected outcomes) with unit goals (expected outcomes at the level of programs and services).

The College establishes goals for all its administrative and educational support services units that involve administrators and faculty, working in concert with Academic Affairs and Student Affairs programs. These goals are derived from and consistent with the stated mission and vision of the College and are responsive to the annual strategic planning process.

Looking at goals from the previous year and the strategies used for their attainment, each unit focuses on an assessment of whether or not the goal was achieved and/or led to improvement, the impact of the improvement activity on the targeted goal or objective/outcome, and future implications based on the results of the improvement activity. This analysis and discussion closes the loop and provides a springboard for planning the activities for the next cycle.

The Center for Service-Learning became a new unit of Academic Affairs in Fall Semester 2010. As such, the Center will be responsible through its annual assessment process for addressing service-learning objectives and incorporating evaluation findings into the ongoing enhancement of the institution. This will be a key evaluation process to determine the QEP’s overall effectiveness in improving student learning, both at the course-level and institution-wide level.
Among the measures to be included in the Center for Service-Learning’s unit assessment plan will be surveys to: (a) participating faculty to determine if the service-learning program is meeting their needs and what changes would benefit them; (b) students to determine if service-learning objectives and learning outcomes are being met; and (c) community agencies to determine if their service-learning partnership is working positively. Additionally, quantitative measures such as retention rates of participating service-learners compared to non-service-learners will become part of the evaluation process.
XII. Conclusion

Service-learning at the College of Coastal Georgia will become a key feature of the educational experience at the College, allowing students to develop the skills and capacities they need to be successful in a 21st-century work and living environment. Additionally, service-learning is academically integrated – service is part of the coursework, not an additional requirement, and it includes substantial, ongoing forms of structured reflection (before, during, and after the service). Further, service-learning values local knowledge and involves community collaborators in the design of the service project; it is based on collaboration and reciprocity; and its partners work together to identify problems and interventions that meet short- and long-term goals.

Through a process of active reflection, students are able to link their service experience to classroom texts in ways that allow them to gain a deeper understanding of course content, develop skills in community leadership, advance their awareness of global issues and diversity, and exercise social responsibility. At the same time, service-learning allows students to practically test and apply their skills and ideas through hands-on career and professional development experiences that also serve vital community needs.

Ultimately, participation in service-learning courses will provide students with outstanding academic and career benefits that include:

- Gaining a deeper understanding of course concepts through the opportunity to test and apply ideas in hands-on, real life community environments;
- Making a positive contribution to the community;
- Practicing and exploring possible career tracks;
- Having a meaningful experience to put on one’s resume;
- Developing strong communication skills through collaboration with diverse groups in the community;
- Increasing connections with faculty members and community mentors;
- Developing one’s capacity to connect academic theory to practice; and
- Developing research, critical thinking, and interpersonal skills.

The institutional intent is to build capacity for the practice of service-learning, empowering the College to become Georgia’s College for Service-Learning.
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### XIV. Supporting Evidence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exhibit Id</th>
<th>Title/Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>College of Coastal Georgia QEP Topic Proposal Form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Faculty Senate Resolution endorsing the QEP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Staff Assembly Resolution endorsing the QEP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Student Government Resolution endorsing the QEP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Student Evaluation of Service-Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Service-Learning Faculty Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Service-Learning Faculty Scholars Workshop Agenda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Student/Agency Agreement Form and Faculty/Agency Agreement Form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Community Partner Impact Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Unit Assessment Plan Template</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Exhibit 1
As part of the reaffirmation of accreditation process, the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS) Commission on Colleges requires its members to identify, justify, develop and implement a Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP). The QEP is a carefully designed and focused course of action that addresses a well-defined issue or issues directly related to improving student learning within the context of the College’s mission and resources.

Please submit your topic proposal by October 31, 2009, using the electronic submission form below.

Name

Department

Telephone Number

Email Address

**Topic** – Give your idea a working title that should be descriptive of the focus

**Summary** – Provide a brief description of the proposed topic

**Student Learning** – Discuss what aspects of student learning are to be affected by this topic. What are the goals and objectives for improving student learning? Why is it important for student learning in this area to be improved at CCGA?
**Description and Scope** – Provide a narrative description of types and sequence of activities being proposed, detailing the timeline for initiation and completion of the elements of the QEP.

**Resources** – Identify all the resources necessary to develop, deploy and monitor this topic, including a budget of estimated costs.

**Assessment** – Describe the kinds of assessments that would be possible to demonstrate the effects of the QEP activities on student learning. What kinds of measures and instruments would be used? What kind of assessment schedule should be followed?

**Bibliography** – Describe any works cited in the preparation of this topic proposal, including major sources that would be used in the development of a research-based plan.
FACULTY SENATE

SENSE OF THE SENATE RESOLUTION 1-2011

Senate Support of Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP)

Statement: It is the Sense of the Faculty Senate that the College of Coastal Georgia’s Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP), Learning through Engagement: Service Learning, as an integral part of our reaccreditation process for the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges (SACSCOC), is worthy of our full endorsement and support. Guided by the college’s mission and input from administration, faculty, staff, students, and the community, the QEP will enhance the understanding of course content through community service and engagement by students and faculty, thus promoting leadership development as well as long-term social responsibility. We fully support and encourage widespread involvement by students and faculty as we implement this plan on our campus.

Approved by a unanimous vote of the Faculty Senate on August 19, 2011.
Exhibit 3
August 22, 2011

Ms. Holly Christensen, Chair  
QEP Development Committee  
College of Coastal Georgia  
8100 Lakes Blvd.  
Kingsland, GA 31548

Dear Ms. Christensen:

As chair of the College of Coastal Georgia Staff Assembly, representing approximately 175 staff members, it is my pleasure to endorse the College's Quality Enhancement Plan topic: Learning through Engagement: Service-Learning. As a part of the college's mission statement, academically based service learning is a natural fit for our new four year college. The QEP Committee, comprised of faculty, staff and students, worked tirelessly to plan and develop the QEP so that it will positively impact student learning as well as their long term social responsibility to their communities. Service-Learning will provide the vehicle for students, faculty, staff and the community to become partners while educating the students and having long term positive benefits for the surrounding communities.

Over the past year, the committee has made a concerted effort to keep the staff apprised of all the planning efforts to incorporate Service-Learning into the curriculum. The "Fall Launch" activities, which include all faculty and staff, in both 2010 and 2011, had presentations related to the service learning plan. In addition to being the principle topic at the November 2010 Staff Assembly meeting, the staff participated in a campus wide Service-Learning panel discussion held earlier this month and encouraged to visit the QEP website launched several months ago.

Therefore, the Staff Assembly heartily endorses the plan to incorporate service learning into the curriculum at the College of Coastal Georgia. We share the belief that service learning will enhance the overall quality of the educational experience for all students and it will have a profound impact on our local community.

Sincerely,

Chair, Staff Assembly  
College of Coastal Georgia
Exhibit 4
Resolution: Support/or the CCGA QEP focused on Service-Learning

WHEREAS, the Office of Student Life requires clubs and organizations to partake in community service projects in order to retain chapter status and to receive Student Activity Fees;

WHEREAS, the Student Government Association participates in numerous Service-Learning Projects in order to benefit the community and to bring awareness to students at the College of Coastal Georgia;

WHEREAS, the newly built Residence Halls have a Service-Learning Community Hallway in which students can come together to provide service to non-profit organizations;

WHEREAS, most bachelor programs at the College of Coastal Georgia require students to complete a given number of community service hours in order to be admitted into the programs;

WHEREAS, the College of Coastal Georgia is currently under accreditation review by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS);

WHEREAS, part of the re-accreditation process with SACS is to identify a Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP) and College of Coastal Georgia has selected Service-Learning for its QEP focus;

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Student Government Association shall formally support the College of Coastal Georgia's Quality Enhancement Plan to have a focus on Service-Learning.

Author: Lindsey Little, Student Government Association President, 2011-2012

Sponsor: Heidi Leming, Student Government Association Advisor
Assistant Vice President of Student Life

Approved by unanimous vote by the Student Government Association Executive Board on August 9, 2011.
Exhibit 5
Student Evaluation of Service-Learning

“Service-learning is experiential learning integrated into an academic class in a way meets learning objectives and serves community needs”

The success of service-learning at the College of Coastal Georgia is dependent upon your insight and evaluation. Please take a few minutes to complete this form.

Course Title/Number: ___________________________ Term/Year: Fall/Spring/Summer 20
Instructor: ___________________________ Grade Level: Freshman / Sophomore / Junior / Senior

1. Did you participate in the service component of the class? ☐ Yes ☐ No

2. If you did not participate in the service component of this class, please check the reason why:
   (select all that apply)
   ☐ Class and/or work hours interfered with service hours
   ☐ Unable to arrange transportation to service site
   ☐ Chose alternate class assignment over service component
   ☐ Could not connect with community agency representative in time to complete service
   ☐ Unaware service component available
   ☐ Felt my services were not valued
   ☐ Did not feel the service was relevant
   ☐ Other: ___________________________

If you did NOT complete the service component of this class, please proceed now to Question #14 on page 2.

3. Name of service agency or project: ___________________________

4. Approximate number of hours served: ___________________________

Please indicate how strongly you agree or disagree with each statement:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5. I received a thorough orientation at the agency where I served.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. The service deepened my interest in the subject matter of this course.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I had the opportunity to discuss my service experience with others in class.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I will recommend this service-learning course to others</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Did your participation in the experiential, hands-on component enhance your understanding of the course material or subject matter?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. If given the opportunity, would you take a service-learning course again?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Why or why not? ___________________________
11. Please indicate the extent to which your participation in this service-learning course has *influenced* each of the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Very Little</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>Quite a bit</th>
<th>Very much</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Your ability to solve complex, real-world problems</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Your understanding of people with backgrounds different than your own</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Your choice of major</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Your career plans</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Your desire to contribute to the welfare of your community</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Your understanding of yourself</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Your ability to work effectively with others</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Your personal code of ethics and values</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. To what extent has the service learning experience in this course *enabled* you to:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Very Little</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>Quite a bit</th>
<th>Very much</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Access the larger community as a resource for skill building and learning</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Apply theories and concepts to practical problems or in new situations</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Improve problem-solving skills</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Think critically and creatively</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Use new information to make decisions and solve problems</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Collaborate and build relationships with community organizations</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Practice and build leadership skills, including skills of interpersonal communication and collective action</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Reflect on your own and others’ beliefs and assumptions about a social issue(s) or an area of service</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Feel more connected to your peers/classmates</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. Feel more connected to the College</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k. Acquire job or work-related knowledge and skills</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l. Learn more effectively on your own</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. Did you feel the service offering of this course was effective? ☐ Yes ☐ No

   Why or why not? ____________________________________________________________

14. What did you feel were barriers or obstacles to participation in the service experience?

   ____________________________________________________________

Please mark all that apply to you: (Optional)

Ethnicity/Race: ☐ American Indian or Alaska Native ☐ Asian ☐ Black or African-American ☐ Hispanic ☐ Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander ☐ White, not of Hispanic Origin ☐ Other

Gender: ☐ Male ☐ Female ☐ Other

Exhibit 6
# Service-Learning Faculty Survey

Faculty Name: _________________________________ Course Number: ________________

Total Number of Students Involved: __________ Total Service Hours Completed by Students: __________

Please respond as honestly as possible, relying on your current beliefs or attitudes toward the particular issues raised. Indicate your level of agreement.

Scale:  
1 = **Strongly Disagree** / 2 = **Disagree** / 3 = **Undecided** / 4 = **Agree** / 5 = **Strongly Agree**

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Service-learning enhanced my ability to communicate the core competencies of the subject matter I teach.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>The service helped my students see the relevance of the core subject matter.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Overall, the student response to service-learning was positive.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>The service my students completed was beneficial to the community.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>The service my students completed interfered with their other academic responsibilities.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Reflection activities added depth to my students’ learning.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Using service-learning required more of my time as a teacher.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Using service-learning is worth the effort.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>I was able to effectively facilitate conversation about diversity issues related to students’ service-learning experiences.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>I will use service-learning as a teaching strategy with future courses.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Service-learning helps fulfill College of Coastal Georgia’s mission.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>There should be more courses offering service-learning at College of Coastal Georgia.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>I am satisfied with the assistance I received from the Center for Service-Learning (identifying placement sites, student scheduling, follow-up, etc.)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>desire to learn something new</td>
<td></td>
<td>desire for increased relevance in course</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>encouragement from colleagues</td>
<td></td>
<td>professional recognition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>encourage civic responsibility</td>
<td></td>
<td>prior experience serving the community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>enhance student learning</td>
<td></td>
<td>potential for scholarly work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>prior experience with service-learning</td>
<td></td>
<td>other:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
15. Teaching a course that incorporates service-learning has had an impact on the following: (Please indicate a [+] for positive impact, [-] for negative impact, and leave blank if no impact).

[ ] other courses I teach [ ] my own personal service in the community
[ ] my research agenda [ ] my relationship with community partners
[ ] my relationship with other faculty [ ] my relationship with administrators
[ ] my relationship with students [ ] my plan for publications/presentations (scholarly)

16. Please identify the **positive** aspects about your service-learning experiences.

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

17. Please identify the **negative** aspects about your service-learning experiences.

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________


[ ] time constraints [ ] coordination of placements
[ ] supervision of students [ ] reduced time for classroom instruction
[ ] handling diversity issues that may arise [ ] assessment of students’ learning and work
[ ] costs [ ] unpredictable nature of community work
[ ] effectively incorporating reflection [ ] communication with community representative(s) activities
[ ] other:

19. Please share with us any comments or suggestions you have to improve the service-learning experience for students, faculty, and/or community partners.

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

Thank you for completing the survey!
Exhibit 7
Service Learning: Bridging the Classroom AND the Community

Facilitator:
Clayton A. Hurd, Ph.D.
Assistant Professor of Anthropology & Director, Center for Service-Learning
College of Coastal Georgia

Date: Wednesday, January 5th, 2011
Time: 8:00 a.m. – 2:30 p.m.
Location: Science Lecture Hall

Agenda:

8:00-8:30 a.m.    Continental Breakfast
8:30-9:00 a.m.    Introduction/Overview
9:00-10:00 a.m.   Addressing Faculty Concerns
10:15-10:30 a.m.  Break
10:45 –Noon       Presentations of Examples/Models
Noon – 1:00 p.m.   Lunch on Your Own
1:00-2:00 p.m.    Brainstorming of Curriculum/Potential Projects
2:00-2:30 p.m.    Conclusion
Exhibit 8
Service Learning Student/Agency Agreement Form

Student Name: ___________________________  Email: ___________________________

Class Number/Name: _____________________  Instructor’s Name: _______________________

Name of Community Organization: __________________________________________________

Site Supervisor or Coordinator: _____________________  Phone/email: ______________________________

Service Learner Job Description: __________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________________

Student: I agree to…

☐ perform my duties to the best of my ability.

☐ adhere to organizational rules and procedures, including record-keeping requirements and confidentiality of organization and client information.

☐ be open to supervision and feedback which will facilitate learning and personal growth.

☐ complete ___ hours of service per week from the time period beginning (mo), (day) and ending (mo), (day). If specific days and hours are agreed upon, they are listed as follows:

☐ M ______  T ______  W ______  Th ______  F ______

☐ meet time and duty commitments or, if I cannot attend, provide 24 hour notice so that alternative arrangements can be made.

Supervisor: I agree to…

☐ provide adequate information and training for the service-learner including information about the organization’s mission, clientele and operational procedures.

☐ provide adequate supervision to the service-learner and provide feedback on performance.

☐ provide meaningful tasks related to skills, interests, and available time.

☐ provide appreciation and recognition of the service-learner’s contribution.

Student__________________________________________Date ______________________

Supervisor__________________________________________Date ______________________
Service Learning Faculty/Agency Agreement Form

Faculty Name/Dept: ___________________________  Semester/Year: ___________________________

Course Number/Title: ___________________________

Community Partner (organization): ___________________________

Partner Contact Person/Title/Phone: ___________________________

Brief description of the learning objectives of the CSU course as they relate to the proposed service experience:

Briefly describe the nature of the service project or placement (include the community-identified needs the project or placement will meet):

Number of students desired for the project/placement (estimated): ___________________________

Weekly hours per student required for the project/placement (estimated): __________ Number of weeks expected: __________

Is a background check required? □ Yes  □ No  At what cost? __________

Is the student responsible for paying for the background check? □ Yes  □ No

Is a formal orientation required for students to serve? □ Yes  □ No  How long is it (hours)? __________
Level of student supervision the faculty member expects from the community partner:

Level of responsibility and skills that the community partner can expect from students:

Statement describing any student orientation/training activities offered by the community partner, the faculty member, or both:

We certify that the service project has been developed collaboratively by both the faculty member and the community partner to ensure that student learning objectives are met and that the service provided meets community-identified needs. Both the faculty member and the community partner have received a copy of this completed partnership agreement form.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Member Signature</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Community Partner Signature</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Exhibit 9
The Center for Service-Learning at the College of Coastal Georgia is committed to promoting strong, mutually-beneficial relationships between the College’s students, faculty and staff and the community organizations with whom we partner.

To this end, we are seeking your feedback on working with CCGA faculty and student service-learners during this last year.

By better understanding your needs and experiences, we can improve our communication, programming, and outreach strategies in ways that best serve the needs, interests and mission of your organization.

We request that you please take time to complete the following 27-question survey. It should take about 5-10 minutes of your time.

Thank you, and if you have further questions, please feel free to contact Dr. Clayton Hurd in the Center for Service-Learning at churd@ccga.edu or 912-279-5716.
Agency Information

*1. Agency/Organization Name:

2. Contact Name:

*3. What are the benchmark areas addressed by your organization? Please check all that apply.

☐ Addiction
☐ Animals
☐ Crisis response and assistance
☐ Cultural awareness
☐ Disabilities and/or disease
☐ Domestic violence
☐ Education/literacy
☐ English as a second language
☐ Environmental issues
☐ Family asset building Financial
☐ Stability or Literacy Health
☐ care
☐ Homelessness
☐ Hunger

☐ Immigration/refugee assistance
☐ Incarcerated youth and adults
☐ Low-income assistance
☐ Mental health
☐ Parenting
☐ Parks and gardens
☐ Recreation, sports, and fitness
☐ Senior citizens
☐ Substance Abuse
☐ Visual and performing arts
☐ Vulnerable youth
☐ Youth asset building
☐ Workforce or Work Skills Development

Other (please specify):

*4. Which age population do you primarily serve? Please check all that apply.

☐ Children (0-5)
☐ Children (0-12)
☐ Adolescents (13-21)
☐ Adults (22-59)
☐ Seniors (60+)

Other (please specify):
5. Which race/ethnic population do you primarily serve?

- [ ] African American/Black
- [ ] Asian/Pacific Islander
- [ ] Hispanic/Latino
- [ ] White/Non-Hispanic

Other (please specify):

6. Please describe the socio-economic status of the majority of the clients that you serve.

- [ ] Poverty
- [ ] Working poor
- [ ] Working class
- [ ] Middle class
- [ ] Upper class
- [ ] All of the above
Agency relationship with the College

7. What was your motivation for participating in a service-learning partnership with the College of Coastal Georgia? Please check all that apply.

- [ ] Increase capacity of my organization through student involvement
- [ ] Teach students about the mission of my organization
- [ ] Teach students about the non-profit sector
- [ ] Improve student academic learning
- [ ] Instill in students the value of community service
- [ ] Improve student understanding of critical public issues
- [ ] Encourage students to adopt careers in my type of organization
- [ ] Access expertise from the academic institution
- [ ] Get new ideas to improve my organization’s progress

Other (please specify):

8. How did your interactions with the university/college influence your capacity to fulfill the mission of your organization? Please check all that apply.

- [ ] New insights about the organization/its operation
- [ ] Changes in organizational direction
- [ ] Increase in number of clients served
- [ ] Increase in number of new services offered
- [ ] Enhancement of existing services
- [ ] No influence
- [ ] Increased leverage of financial/other resources
- [ ] New connections/networks with other community groups

Other (please specify):
9. What are some of the challenges that you encountered in this partnership? Please check all that apply.

- Demands upon staff time
- Project time period insufficient
- Students not well prepared
- Students did not perform as expected
- Number of students inappropriate for size of organization
- No challenges encountered

Other (please specify) or Additional Comments:


*10. What were some of the economic effects of your work with the College of Coastal Georgia? Please check all that apply.

- Increased value of services
- Increased funding opportunities
- Increased organizational resources
- Identification of new staff
- Completion of projects
- Identification of additional volunteers
- Access to university technology and expertise
- No economic effects
- New products, services, materials generated

Other (please specify):


*11. Which of the following are challenges you encountered as a result of your connection with this course(s)? Please check all that apply.

- Mismatch between course goals and organization
- Little contact/interaction with faculty
- Insufficient number of service hours required in course to benefit the organization
- Confusion about the intended student learning goals
- Not applicable

Other (please specify):


12. As a result of your connection to this university/college course(s), how has your awareness of the university/college changed? Please check all that apply.

- I learned more about university/college programs and services in general
- I know who to call upon for information and assistance
- I am more involved with activities on campus
- I have an increased knowledge of university/college resources
- I have more interaction with students
- I have more interaction with faculty
- I have more interaction with university/college administrators
- I have taken or plan to take classes at the university/college
- My awareness of the university/college has not changed

Other (please specify)

13. How long have you been working with service-learning students from the College of Coastal Georgia?

- Less than one year
- 1-3 years
- More than 3 years

14. How long have you been working with the Center for Service-Learning?

- Less than one year
- 1-3 years
- More than 3 years
- I am not familiar with the SL Program
**15. Please rate your level of satisfaction working with staff from the Center for Service-Learning.**

- [ ] Very Satisfied
- [ ] Satisfied
- [ ] Neutral
- [ ] Dissatisfied
- [ ] Very Dissatisfied
- [ ] N/A

Additional Comments:

**16. Please rate your level of satisfaction with your connection to the College regarding:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Very Satisfied</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Very Dissatisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>level and quality of interaction with students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>level and quality of interaction with faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>quality of student work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>your input and feedback into the planning of the service-learning experiences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>scope and timing of activity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>level of trust with students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>level of trust with faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>student preparedness for the specific activities at the agency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional Comments:

**17. Please rate your overall opinion of the service-learning partnership.**

- [ ] Very Satisfied
- [ ] Satisfied
- [ ] Neutral
- [ ] Dissatisfied
- [ ] Very Dissatisfied
18. Please rate the benefits provided to your agency by the service-learning class.

- Very Satisfied
- Satisfied
- Neutral
- Dissatisfied
- Very Dissatisfied

19. Approximately how much time did you spend training and supervising College of Coastal Georgia service-learners?

- 5 hours
- 6-10 hours
- 11-15 hours
- 16-20 hours
- More than 20 hours

Additional Comments:

20. On a scale of 1 to 5 (1 being Low and 5 being High), rate the degree to which the students serving in your organization met your expectations.

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
Final Thoughts

21. What do you wish students had know or been aware of before serving in your organization? Please describe.

22. What was the best aspect of this experience for your organization?

23. What aspects of the experience would you change?

24. Do you plan to continue working with the university/college other service-learning activities? Please add any additional comments.

25. What additional support would you like to see offered through the Center for Service-Learning?

26. Approximately how many total hours did CCGA service-learning students contribute to your agency during the past academic year?

27. If known, please list the instructor’s name(s) and course title(s) [if known] of the service-learning course(s) that your partnered with this year.
Thank you for your willingness to participate in this survey!

If you have further questions, please feel free to contact Dr. Clayton Hurd in the Center for Service-Learning at churd@ccga.edu or 912-279-5716.
Exhibit 10
## Unit Assessment Plan

**Academic Year:**

**Unit Name:**

**Purpose:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AUGUST</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>MAY</th>
<th>Findings</th>
<th>JUNE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goals</td>
<td>List the unit's goals and describe how they contribute to building a strong and distinctive unit within the context of the College's expected outcomes -- align unit goals with corresponding strategic goal(s)</td>
<td>Identify the student learning and/or administrative outcomes needed to carry out the unit's core services or functions effectively</td>
<td>Identify the evaluations and assessments to be used to verify progress toward goal/outcomes attainment</td>
<td>Interpret the results and findings from evaluations and assessments and discuss the extent to which the unit's expected outcomes for its goals and plans have been achieved over the past year</td>
<td>Discuss the improvements that will be made in the quality and effectiveness of the unit that contribute to the College's advancement and success in achieving its expected outcomes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>