

**PARTICIPATORY DEMOCRACY AND LIBERAL LEARNING:  
THE CENTER FOR CIVIC ENGAGEMENT AND LEADERSHIP  
AT ST. LAWRENCE UNIVERSITY**

**Ron Flores**  
**Director of the Community-Based Learning Program**  
**Associate Professor of Sociology**

*Democracy has to be born anew every generation, and education is its midwife*  
*John Dewey, 1889*

The mission of the **Center for Civic Engagement and Leadership** is to increase and enhance opportunities for students to be agents of positive social change both on and off campus. The Center combines academic and co-curricular activities within a living-learning community where students work together with community partners to develop and direct community projects that address locally identified needs. The emphasis of the programming is to develop citizenship and leadership skills through: community based learning including course work, independent studies, participatory action research and dialogue training; volunteerism, where students, faculty and staff support and enhance community initiatives that address community needs; and, leadership training, practice, and reflection. Unlike many other colleges and universities where civic engagement programs are housed in different divisions, some in academics and others in student life, the Center creates a dynamic partnership between existing academic programs Community Based Learning (CBL) and the First Year Program (FYP) with established co-curricular programs such the David Garner Center for Voluntarism and the St. Lawrence University Leadership Academy.

The Center meets a central goal of a liberal arts education, namely the development of future citizens who will contribute to the greater good of our society both on a local and global level. At we state in our Aims and Objectives, our commitment to the intellectual development of our students is,

...complemented by recognition of students as whole persons living in a culturally diverse world. For this reason the University...provides opportunities for moral, social religious and aesthetic growth and encourages and expanding sense of responsibility for and service to humanity (St. Lawrence University 2005, p.9)

Achieving this aim is especially important today, as research on in-coming college students has shown that while they are skeptical of formal political processes and institutions, they are highly committed to personal involvement as a way of improving conditions especially on the local level (Levine and Cureton, 1998). Further, high school students are increasingly involved in a variety of community activities (Duckenfield 2002) and many arrive on college campuses intent on continuing that tradition. The availability of community service programming sponsored on campus, especially in the first year, has a significant effect on future levels of involvement both in college and beyond (Vogelgesang 2002).

The demand for community based programming is evidenced by the steady increase in student participation in experiential learning and leadership programming during the past few years. For example, Community-Based Learning enrolled over 600 students in a variety of academic courses involving some 50 community agencies and organizations during the past two years. At the same time, the number of students in community service and volunteerism programs organized by the Garner Center for Collegiate Volunteerism numbered over 600 each year. With the development

of the Center, we can now better connect the experiences of students in volunteer and CBL activities. In the past, we found that many students who were part of one program were not aware that they could further their community work in the other. A number of students in the SLU Buddies program, for example, expressed interest in better understanding the context of their work with underprivileged children, but never considered enrolling in a CBL course.<sup>1</sup> Similarly, students in CBL courses who wanted to continue with their community placements and get other students involved didn't know that they had the resources of the Garner Center available to them.<sup>2</sup> The center allows us to connect these experiences and coordinate student civic engagement efforts more efficiently and effectively.

The increasing desire of our students to be personally involved in making a difference in their communities was also reflected in the growing numbers taking advantage of the leadership opportunities on campus and the success of St. Lawrence University Leadership Academy. The academy promotes and supports student leadership development, and has worked with more than 250 students this year, who were involved in leadership trainings, co-curricular courses on leadership development, first-year class governance, and leadership honoraries. By bringing these three programs together, students now move seamlessly across student life, academics and communities both on and off campus creating a more integrated learning experience.

In addition, the Center is the focal point of a living learning community, which is consistent with the University's "commitment to continually developing residential programs and options that enhance the academic experience" ([www.stlawu.edu](http://www.stlawu.edu)). The administrative base for the Center is located in the Hulett-Jencks common area with the attached residence halls housing a variety of student groups and organizations committed to community involvement. This coming year, the second and third floors, for example, are occupied by upper-level students who are:

- engaged in self-initiated and designed community programs. One such theme suite is "Kids for Tomorrow" where students will use the Center for children centered programming.
- participating in student service organizations such as SLU Buddies, one of the Garner Center's most successful mentoring programs
- connected to community-based learning programs and courses such as a course of families and poverty. One group of students is living in a theme suite that focuses on women's health issues in the community and participating in a class on families, children and poverty
- working on participatory action research projects
- leaders on campus.

Each floor of the residence halls has a very spacious lounge where students can come together to share and exchange ideas on programs, projects and course work. These spaces are also suitable for meetings and conversations with community partners. The residence halls are also surrounded by spacious lawns suitable for a variety of outdoor activities associated with community programs and ample parking for community partners.

---

<sup>1</sup> One of the first outcomes of the Center has been the creation of a new course on families, children and poverty, which grew out of the experiences of SLU buddies.

<sup>2</sup> In the past, the problems were also felt in the community as local agencies would have volunteers from the Garner Center and students in course based community program arriving at the same time. This posed an unfortunate burden on community partners as they were forced to readjust programming to accommodate the more than expected number of volunteers. Since the goals of community service and community based learning are not the same, the experiences of students also suffered. Last year, CBL and the Garner Center did a very good job keeping each other informed thereby minimizing these unfortunate situations.

The first floors of both residence halls house an FYP college whose members combine community service with academic reflection. The incorporation of a first year college is a critical component of the overall project since the first year represents the point in a college career where foundational development of the basic skills of civic engagement, namely defining problems, working collaboratively and developing problem solving skills are developed (Zlotkowski 2002, 2004). Students who participate in well organized community based service programs during their first year are not only more likely to continue their community service throughout their four years, but become catalysts for significant positive change in the local community as well. Community Mentors (described below) and Community Assistants also live on the first floor to help guide the first years in their college experiences both on and off campus.

Since the Center combines academic and student life programming, it is accountable to Dean of Academic Affairs and the Dean of Student Life. The directors of the Community-Based Learning Program, The David Garner Center for Collegiate Volunteerism, and the SLU Leadership Academy are responsible for supervising Center programs and ensuring the integration of their functions. Primary responsibilities of the Center for College Volunteerism and Community Based Learning are distinguished by the typology developed by Furco (1996), where programming focusing on service and clients such as community service and volunteerism are administered by the Garner Center, while those that either balance service and learning or emphasize primarily learning (internships) are directed by Community Based Learning Programs. Internships, practicums and field studies are generally coordinated by departments, although the Center can provide support. The Leadership Academy is primarily responsible for developing the skills students need to develop and direct programs in both community service and community based learning.

The everyday operation of the Center and its programs falls primarily to the Assistant Director of the Center (not yet in place) and the Assistant Director for Community Placement Services. The Assistant Director of the Center will be responsible for the daily operation of the Center (including budget oversight, managing student workers, operations and coordination of all programming). The Community Placement Coordinator is primarily responsible for managing student placements in the community and overseeing the community mentor program detailed below.

Although faculty and staff over see the operation of the Center, it is the students who determine the nature of the programs and projects of engagement and it is their skills and talents that determine the success of the Center's initiatives. Simply put, the Center strives to create a learning community that emphasizes student ownership. At the core of that ownership is the Community Mentors Program. Each student Community Mentor (CM), who is a paid member of the Center staff, works with community partners to identify needs within their organizations and develop partnership programs to address those needs. The CMs then have primary responsibility for the coordination of the partnership programs as well as to mentor and manage other students who are incorporated into their programs through course work and/or volunteer programs. In addition, these CMs take on certain specialized tasks based on expertise and interest. For example, some serve as teaching assistants in community-based learning courses, others as volunteer coordinators, while others serve as participatory action research project directors. All community mentors are required to enroll in CBL102: *Introduction to Leadership Studies*, where they are trained in leadership skill development. We hired twelve community mentors this year and we anticipate that they will work, on average, about ten hours a week during the first semester. That does not include their time volunteering in the community.

In addition, Community Mentors,

- Assist with orientation of new students to the Center for Civic Engagement and Leadership programs and to their appropriate agencies at the beginning of the semester;
- Act as an intermediary between the Center for Civic Engagement and Leadership and the community agencies;
- Monitor students' volunteer hours at the placement agency and consult with respective coordinators at the Center for Civic Engagement and Leadership;
- Oversee students' activities in their community partnerships and hold roundtable discussions once a month to monitor the progress of students' learning and understanding;
- Meet regularly with the community agency supervisors to discuss issues regarding student placements and report any changes that need to be made to staff at the Center for Civic Engagement and Leadership; and
- Be actively involved with at least one community agency, including volunteer work.

Since the community mentor program expects students to be able to identify problems and develop programs in collaboration with community partners, faculty, staff and fellow students, the Center conducted a series of orientation sessions prior to the beginning of the academic year where CMs were trained in community issues, program management, recruitment and monitoring of student volunteers. As the program matures, we will take advantage of the summer months to further develop community leadership skills of our community mentors and other students as well. For example, one very attractive model we are considering comes from the Bennion Center at the University of Utah, where students are selected (and, given a stipend) to participate in an intensive leadership training program that combines leadership skills development with community service (Fisher 1998). If we were to implement such a program, these students would be responsible for developing a community program that they would direct as community mentors during the upcoming academic year. Another program would be a public service summer fellowship program, where students would engage in some form of public scholarship under the guidance of a faculty member and a local agency to assess community needs and develop an action plan for addressing those needs. In addition to presenting the action plan, the student would be expected to seek out funding sources and submit a grant proposal to support the program that they would then manage over the following academic year.

### **Building and Sustaining Long Term Campus-Community Partnerships**

The success of the Center for Civic Engagement and Leadership, if measured by the personal growth, civic responsibility and leadership skills of our students, faculty and staff as well as the benefits to the local community, rests on the nature of the campus-community partnerships. Developing such relationships, however, is quite complicated and begins at the institutional level. Relationships between colleges and their local communities can be strained, especially when the University sees its interests as both distinct and superior to those of the community. Such attitudes filter down through the campus influencing the ways faculty, staff and students engage with community partners. Under these conditions, the community is seen as a place where needs and interests of students, courses and faculty are served. Such a unidimensional relationship is doomed to failure and can only exacerbate tensions between town and gown (Holland and Gelman 1998). For sustained, mutually beneficial partnerships to emerge, colleges have to see themselves as a part of rather than apart from the community (Saltmarsh 1998). Colleges certainly have their own interests – as do communities - but Saltmarsh argues that universities can come to conceive their relationship with local communities in a way where the “self interests of the University are indistinguishable from the interests of the community” (p.7). This is only possible if the University sees its relationship with the locality as important and built on sharing and reciprocity.

For Torres and Schaffer (2000), this is the first stage in the process of building and sustaining productive partnerships.

In the remainder of this section, I will briefly profile some of our current partnerships. Most of our existing partnerships are in the early building stages, which offer our incoming community mentors the opportunities to both shape the character of our developing partnerships as well as create new ones.

### ***Partnerships on the Akwesasne Reservation***

This past year, we have begun the process of building and rebuilding partnerships on the reservation. We are currently working with multiple agencies such as the Boys and Girls Club and the Freedom School and have focused our efforts on meeting the tutoring needs of Mohawk children.

### ***The Senior Buddies Program***

This program supplements the Meals on Wheels delivery program with daily visits to the senior citizens as well as buddying up residents of the United Helpers Nursing Home with SLU students.

### ***Community Performing Arts Partnership***

This partnership which attempts to bring together local primary and secondary schools with St. Lawrence University students and faculty to enhance the presence and variety of performance arts in the curriculum of our area schools.

### ***Families in Distress: The Supervised Visitations Program***

This partnership project joins St. Lawrence students with the local Family Court. Currently, students are trained by the Department of Social Services and assigned (typically in teams of two) to families in crisis. The students then serve as supervisors of parental visits that the Court has mandated must be supervised.

### ***The Culture Club and Creating Global Citizenship Partnerships***

This project was initiated by the Banford Parents Organization. The parents, concerned about the relative lack of exposure to cultural and racial diversity by their children, approached us with a plan to develop an after school “culture club” where children would be introduced to the cultures of the world by SLU students who had traveled abroad. Currently, SLU students are working on a format to make this program a reality this semester

### ***Other Partnerships***

Our community mentors already have their hands full with a variety on initiatives that are in various stages of development including a Children’s after school care program, an English language tutoring program in the Prisons, a Hunger and Poverty Partnership that brings together a number of community partners and a Youth Center initiative.

### **Academic Programming**

Although one of the more exciting features of the Center is the integration of student life and academic affairs, there are dimensions of the programming that remain within the sole purview of one or the other. When community service combines with credit bearing course work, the activities fall under the umbrella of academic affairs, specifically community based learning. The academics of civic engagement and leadership are especially exciting because they represent one of the more powerful models of engaged learning pedagogies. Pedagogies of engagement are those teaching strategies that give students agency in their learning experience. They provide

opportunities for collaborative work, where students learn to respect and incorporate the view of others as well as opportunities for the application of theories and skills to authentic situations whether in the lab, the field or in the community (Jones, Valdez, Nowakowski and Rassmussen, 1994).

An extensive review of the literature by Eyler, Giles and Gray (2000) revealed that these are just some of the many positive outcomes associated with engagement pedagogies that connect classroom learning to community experiences. The authors found that it had its most powerful influence on personal and social outcomes, such as improved interpersonal skills, greater sense of social responsibility, increased commitment to community service, reduced acceptance of stereotypes and greater sense of personal worth and autonomy. While its effects on learning and academic outcomes were more mixed, the authors did find that students exposed to community based learning were more motivated to work harder, better understood basic concepts and theories, and demonstrated improved critical and analytical skills. Rebecca Daniels and I found that oral and written assignments were notably better when we employed community based learning into our First Year Program (Daniels and Flores 2004).

It is important to note that achieving successful student outcomes is a product of a finely crafted course that integrates the community experience into the fabric of the course. This is best done through reflection assignments that ask student to consider in writing how their experiences speak to course materials and how these materials have served to inform their work in the community (Bringle and Hatcher 1999, Cooper 1998, Kottkamp 1990). Although there are many forms of reflection assignments, two of the more powerful tools for student reflection are the journal (Cooper 1998) and the portfolio (Zubizarreta 2004).

Journals (and there are many types) typically include entries detailing student activities at their respective agencies coupled with more directed entries that tie these activities to course readings and class discussions. Journals should be collected periodically during the semester to allow for faculty input. In my courses, they come to resemble a written dialogue between the student and me as we go back and forth sharing our thoughts about experiences in the community and their connections to course material. Portfolios, which may include their journals, ask students to integrate their work on all assignments into their reflection. Portfolios should include all writing assignments from the semester, including all drafts, in-class and out-of-class free writes, responses to readings, responses to oral presentations and other assignments organized in a way that captures for the student the learning experience. Students are asked to reflect on what they learned, why they learned it and how they will use that knowledge in their life experience. The portfolio provides a rich insight into the student's learning as it relates to the various dimension of the course.

In addition to developing integrative reflection assignments, constructing a classroom setting that maximizes the community experience as text and where student engagement is given primacy, is not only difficult (Zlotkowski 1999) but perhaps even counternormative (Howard 1998). Traditional pedagogies (information dissemination or "banking" models) assume a passive student as well as a sense that learning is an individual or private endeavor.<sup>3</sup> Both of these goals are inconsistent successful pedagogies of engagement, which highlight the collaborative and public

---

<sup>3</sup> By this Howard (1998) argues that the student's focus is on his or her own learning and grader. S/he does not see him or herself as responsible for the learning of anyone else other than themselves. It is for this reason, for example, that students will look only to the professor when they speak in class since their motive for speaking in class is to maximizing their grade. Again, the emphasis is on personal benefit.

process. Students are thus responsible not only for their own learning, but for the learning of others. Such pedagogies can not succeed if students are not actively teaching as well as learning. To achieve this goal is very difficult for the average faculty member who must create a decentered classroom where s/he must be willing to relinquish her position of power and control. This means that the class will be less predictable making the professor perhaps more vulnerable to losing his or her position as the authority. Students will also find this model uncomfortable since they have been socialized throughout their education experience to be passive receivers of information. These growing pains in pedagogical transformation are essential if we are to succeed to meeting the goals of developing future productive citizens and leaders and if we are to achieve the mandate of the Center. It is for this reason, that faculty development will be an essential component of the pilot. And, it may also be a reason by faculty involvement in these programs has been modest.

While community partner participation has been enthusiastic, faculty participation in community-classroom initiatives has less so, and much needs to be done to have this pilot succeed. Across the nation, faculty have found many obstacles to participation (Holland, 1999). At many institutions, faculty members receive little to no support to engage in the hard work of public service and CBL course development. Holland (1999) notes that Universities that detail the importance of civic engagement in their mission statement, have supportive infrastructures, invest in faculty development and provide incentives and rewards are most successful in drawing faculty into community involvement both in and out of the classroom. These are factors that we at St. Lawrence can work on through the Center and I'll turn to that discussion shortly.

There are, however, even more common reasons for the lukewarm faculty participation at SLU. A number of faculty have expressed to me an interest in participating in community based learning programs, but lament that they simply are over committed and are not able to devote the needed time to developing partnership and integrating community service into their classes. This problem is exacerbated by the fact that many are also locked into teaching required courses that they perceive as not compatible with community-based experiences. There are also faculty members who aren't very engaged in the community (and, this is certainly connected to time constraints) and have a difficult time seeing connections between their teaching and research and the community. This is strongly related to the way that many in the academy define the parameters of their professional work, which excludes any activity that occurs outside of campus (Boyer 1996).

Aside from the lack of time and confidence (perhaps comfort is a better word), integrating community based learning into a course is not easy. To be successful takes a considerable amount of planning and forethought especially in the developing relations with community partners and the integrating the community "text" into the course. I am very clear with any faculty interested in CBL that the planning process takes at the very least one semester, but most likely more. Much of that time is devoted to developing partnerships and getting the faculty members and the community partners comfortable with each other. Developing faculty development workshops that address these issues is a significant component of this initiative.

***Faculty Development Workshops:*** The center will sponsor (and/or co-sponsor with the Center for Teaching and Learning and/or The First-Year Program) a variety of faculty development workshops aimed at: recruiting faculty to incorporate engaged learning into their courses or develop new courses with an engaged learning focus, developing strong engaged learning courses that integrate out of class experiences with in-class materials, fostering productive and reciprocal relationships with community partners, creating assignments such as learning portfolios that enhance the engaged learning experience, and encouraging participation in the development of

Center programming. Workshops will also include strategies for incorporating co-curricular and residential dimensions into these courses.

### **The Positioning of Civic Engagement in the Curriculum: A Proposal**

One of the primary goals of the CCEL is to encourage and nurture the development of courses that foreground pedagogies of engagement<sup>4</sup> across the curriculum. To foster a sense of cohesion across the courses, the Center will propose an academic minor, *Civic Engagement and Leadership Studies* where teaching and learning will occur both in and out of the classroom. Consistent with the goals of engaged learning, the structure of the minor will give students considerable freedom to shape how and what they learn and apply what they have learned to real world situations. Unlike other minor programs of study, this minor will not necessarily be driven by courses but by student experiences in different community settings. Since the skills of citizenship and leadership can be taught and learned across a broad range of very different settings, the minor will offer three tracks, North Country Studies, Global Citizenship Studies and Democracy Studies.<sup>5</sup>

Instead of the traditional Introductory course, the minor (regardless of track) **will require a set of three introductory partial (half) unit courses**: CBL100: Introduction to Citizenship, Service and Democracy, CBL101: Introduction to Leadership Studies CBL102: Methods of Deliberative Dialogue and Democracy. Minors will be **required to participate in either one sustained program of voluntarism**, such as SLU Buddies or Habitat for Humanity and/or assume a leadership position on campus. Students will also be required to complete a course in participatory action research where they would gain the skills needed to better understand the issues they confront in the community and develop strategies for positive change. All students would be **required to complete a senior project**, which builds off their experiences in and out of the classroom.

What set the tracks apart would be **the selection of two electives** and the focus of their senior projects. Those students in Democracy Studies, for example, could choose two electives in communication studies with an engaged learning focus. One such course could be modeled after SLU's successful Journey to Democracy Project, a course where students engaged in a series of sustained dialogues with community partners on local issues. In addition to the dialogues, students engaged in some form of community service and completed reflection assignment designed to integrate the experiences. In that course, students learned that there are always many different perspectives on community problems and solutions, which enhanced their appreciation of the complexity of democratic action. Those with a global citizenship focus would satisfy one of their electives as part of their internship experiences abroad (all students who study abroad are required to engage in some form of community service/internship). A second elective would come from a community based learning course with a community service component that matched their experience abroad. Such a student would then be able to engage in a senior project that compares his or her community experiences as a way of understanding how a similar issue is addressed in different societies. Students focusing on the local community would be expected to take a course

---

<sup>4</sup> In this proposal, terms such as pedagogies of engagement and engaged learning unless otherwise specified, will refer to types of engaged teaching and learning associated with citizenship and leadership development.

<sup>5</sup> At this point, we are certainly not committed to these specific minor tracks (they may be best seen as illustrations of what could emerge). We identified these three tracks based on the strengths of our academic programming in the Center for international and intercultural studies (Global Citizenship), the growth of our Rhetoric and Oral Communication Institute (Democracy Studies) and the emphasis of our Community Based Learning programs (North Country Studies). Further, what makes these three illustrations appealing is that the tracks would incorporate and integrate the strengths of the three programs along with co-curricular programs in volunteerism and leadership.

such as Introduction to the North Country, which lays the foundation for understanding the local community and includes a community service component.

The last, but perhaps most significant **requirement is a learning e-portfolio** that would be used across all courses and experiences connected with the minor. Current scholarship finds that learning portfolios complement engaged learning pedagogies superbly. The portfolio enhances reflection and encourages students to take ownership of their learning experiences (Zubizarreta, 2004). The portfolio would also serve to hold the minor program of study together as the student finds himself raising questions in one course to which the answers might be found in another course or community experience. Given that the portfolio represents the student's learning experience, it would become the basic tool by which the senior project is constructed. For the faculty, it allows for a clearer picture of learning outcomes, typically not seen with standard classroom assessment instruments.

The academic programming out of the Center would create important partnerships with other academic programs on campus. For example, the emphasis on communication skills as a foundation for democratic action is built on the strengths of the Rhetorical and Oral Communication Institute (RCI) and the Speech and Theater Department. The RCI sponsors a workshop series where students, faculty and staff learn deliberative and sustained dialogue training. The dialogue courses and the introductory course on deliberative dialogue would come out of the RCI. The Center for International and Intercultural Studies and the Department of Global Studies would be central to the development and success of a global citizenship concentration. The importance of engaged learning on a global level and the development of global citizenship skills are shared objectives of both the CCEL and the CIIS.

#### **Other CCEL programming, projects and programs:**

The Center will ensure that the research and accomplishments of our students gets disseminated across campus, the local community and academia by establishing a working paper series and ending each academic year with a campus-community symposium. The Working Paper Series will publish all center sponsor student research on their civic engagement experiences and profile our community partnership projects. Faculty and staff scholarship on engaged learning pedagogy will also be included in the series. The paper will be housed in PDF format on line to increase access to the larger academic community. At the conclusion of the academic year, the CCEL will sponsor a symposium on civic engagement and leadership. The Symposium will highlight student experiences, research and project outcomes across a variety of sessions, panels, workshops and award recognitions. A Keynote speaker – who will be given a very nice cap with the CCEL logo on front - would be invited. The Symposium would be organized and hosted by the community mentors and all papers presented would become part of working paper series.

#### **Assessment**

On the academic level, information will be collected on the number of community based learning courses offered, the number of faculty offering engaged learning courses and mentoring engaged learning independent projects, and the number of students involved in engaged learning courses and independent projects. We will also monitor the level of faculty participation in engaged learning development workshops and the amount of money used by faculty on course development. Brief surveys of faculty will be administered and data analyzed that compares the experiences of faculty teaching an engaged learning courses compared to those who did not. On the co-curricular level, we will document any changes in the number of service organizations on campus, service based residential arrangements outside of the Center for Engaged Living and Learning and the number of new co-curricular initiatives that are service and/or leadership based.

On the community level, we will monitor the number of community partners involved in engaged learning programming and the number of collaborate classroom community projects implemented. More importantly, the assessment will look at the success of engaged learning from the community partner perspective. We will assess how classroom-community partnerships and student volunteer efforts have served to address unmet needs in the community. We will also assess the satisfaction of community partners with center programming and with student involvement in their respective agencies and programs.

The objective of engaged learning is to develop and nurture civic engagement among our as defined by the dimensions detailed above. While the center for Engaged Living and Learning will serve as the focal point for engaged learning, we are assuming that effects of the programming will ripple across campus. For that reason, we need to look at not only the direct effects of the center, but the indirect effects on other dimensions of engaged learning across the University and in the community. On the institutional level, our assessment will include a documentation of changes in the number of community based learning courses offered per semester, especially in the first year program and across departments, the number of faculty offering CBL courses and mentoring CBL independent projects, and the number of students involved in CBL courses. We will also monitor the level of faculty participation in CBL development workshops and the amount of money used by faculty on development.

As part of this assessment, we will review CBL courses with special emphasis on how well the course integrates student community placements and civic engagement with reflection assignments and classroom activities. The University already employed student course evaluations, which can be incorporated into the overall assessment of the CBL courses. Faculty attitudes and levels of satisfaction with CBL pedagogy will also be a part of the assessment. We will also assess the role that engaged learning plays in the tenure and promotion process. These are all important dimensions to take into account in our modeling because they will have direct impact on the capacity of the University to offer a variety of *excellent* opportunities for engaged learning.

On the community level, we will monitor the number of community partners involved in engaged learning programming and the number of collaborate classroom community projects implemented. More importantly, the assessment will look at the success of engaged learning from the community partner perspective. We will assess how classroom-community partnerships and student volunteer efforts have served to address unmet needs in the community. We will also assess the satisfaction of community partners with center programming and with student involvement in their respective agencies and programs. These types of analyses are already part of the University's Community Based Learning Program assessment protocol.

### **Works Cited**

Boyer, E. 1996. "The Scholarship of Engagement." Journal of Public Service and Outreach 1:11-20.

Bringle, R and J. Hatcher 1999. "Reflection in Service Learning: Making Meaning of Experience" Educational Horizons Summer:179-185

Campus Compact 2000. Introduction to Service Learning Toolkit: Readings and Resources for Faculty Providence: Campus Compact

- Cooper, D. D. 1998. "Reading Writing and Reflection" In Academic Service Learning: A Pedagogy of Action and Reflection Robert Rhoades et al (eds) San Francisco; Jossey-Bass 47-56.
- Daniels, R. and R. Flores 2004. "The Impact of Community Based Learning on the Writing and Oral Communication Skills Development of First Year Students" Paper presented at the annual meeting of the International Education Conference, Honolulu Hawaii.
- Duckenfield, M. 2002. "Look Who Is Coming To College: The Impact of Service Learning in High School on New College Students" In Edward Zlotkowski (ed) Service Learning and the First Year Experience: Preparing Students for Personal Success and Civic Responsibility Columbia South Carolina: National Resource Center for the First Year Experience and Students in Transition.
- Enos, S. and M. Troppe 1996. "Service Learning in the Curriculum" in Service Learning in Higher Education: Concepts and Practices. Barbara Jacoby (ed) San Francisco: Jossey-Bass 156-181.
- Eyler, J. and D Giles 1999 Where is the Learning in Service Learning? San Francisco: Jossey Bass
- Eyler, J and D Giles and C Gray 2000. "Research at a Glance: What we Know About the Effects of Service Learning on Students, faculty, Institutions and Communities" in Campus Compact Introduction to Service Learning Toolkit: Readings and Resources for Faculty Providence: Campus Compact pg 19-21.
- Fisher, I. 1998 "We Make the Road by Walking" in Successful Service Learning Programs: New Models of Excellence in Higher Education edited by Edward Zlotkowski Bolton Mass: Anker Publishing Company
- Furco, A. 1996 "Service Learning: A Balanced Approach to Experiential Education" Expanding Boundaries Serving and Learning Corporation for National Service Washington DC pgs. 2-6
- Gelmon, S., B. Holland, A. Driscoll, A. Spring and S. Kerrigan 2001 Assessing Service Learning and Civic Engagement Providence: Campus Compact
- Holland, B. 1999. "Factors and Strategies the Influence Faculty Involvement in Public Service." Journal of Public Service and Outreach 4:37-43.
- Holland, B. and S. Gelmon (1998) The State of the "Engaged College" What we have Learned about Building and Sustaining University-Community Partnerships" AAHE Bulletin October: 3-6
- Howard, J. P.F. 1998. "Academic Service Learning: A Counternormative Approach" In Academic Service Learning: A Pedagogy of Action and Reflection Robert Rhoades et al (eds) San Francisco; Jossey-Bass

- Jones, B.F., G. Valdez, G. Nowakowski and C. Rasmussen 1994 Designing Learning and Technology for Educational Reform Oak Brook II: North Central Regional Educational Laboratory
- Kottkamp, R. 1990. "Means for Facilitating Reflection" Education and Urban Society 22:182-203
- Levine A. and Cureton J. 2002 "What We Know About Today's College Students" About Campus: Enriching the Student Learning Experience 3:4-9
- St. Lawrence University, 2005. "Aims and Objectives" St. Lawrence University Catalog p.9
- Saltmarsh, J. 1998 Exploring The Meaning of Community/Classroom Partnerships" National Society for Experiential Education Quarterly Summer: 2-3/21-22
- Stanton, T., D.Giles and N. Cruz 1999. Service Learning: A Movement's Pioneers Reflect in its Origins, Practice and Future San Francisco: Jossey-Bass
- Torres, J. and J. Schaffer 2000 Benchmarks for Campus/Community Partnerships Providence: Campus Compact
- Torres, J., R. Sinton and A. White 2000 Establishing and Sustaining an Office of Community Service. Providence: Campus Compact
- Vogelesgang L., Ikeda, Gilmartin and Keup 2002. "Service Learning and the First year Experience: Outcomes Related to Learning and Persistence." In Edward Zlotkowski (ed) Service Learning and the First Year Experience: Preparing Students for Personal Success and Civic Responsibility Columbia South Carolina: National Resource Center for the First Year Experience and Students in Transition.
- Ward, K. 1998. Addressing Academic Culture: Service Learning, Organizations and Faculty Work. In Academic Service Learning: A Pedagogy of Action and Reflection Robert Rhoades et al (eds) San Francisco; Jossey-Bass 73-80
- Zlotkowski, E. 1999. "Pedagogy and Engagement" in Colleges and Universities as Citizens Robert Bringle (ed) Boston: Allyn and Bacon
- Zlotkowski E. (ed) 2002 Service Learning and the First Year Experience: Preparing Students for Personal Success and Civic Responsibility Columbia South Carolina: National Resource Center for the First Year Experience and Students in Transition.
- Zlotkowski, E. 2004. "Service Learning and the First Year Student" in Challenging and Supporting the First Year Student: A Handbook for Improving the First Year of College M. Lee Upcraft, John Gardner and Betsy Barefoot editors : San Francisco: Jossey Boss
- Zubizarreta J. 2004 The Learning Portfolio Reflective Practice For Improving Student Learning Bolton: Anker Publishing.