



IUPUI

CENTER FOR SERVICE AND LEARNING

Office of Community Engagement

IUPUI Taxonomy for Service Learning Courses – Course Design Centric for Institutional Assessment and Research

Thomas W. Hahn, Julie A. Hatcher, Mary F. Price, and Morgan L. Studer

| SL Course Attributes | Level 1 | Level 2 | Level 3 |
|--|--|--|---|
| 1) Reciprocal partnerships and processes shape the community activities and course design. | The instructor contacts a community organization to host students and provides a brief overview of the course (e.g., learning outcomes, syllabus) and the purposes of the community activities. | The instructor meets with the community partner(s) to discuss the course (e.g., preparation/orientation of students, learning outcomes, syllabus), and to identify how the community activities can enrich student learning and benefit the organization. | The instructor collaborates with and learns from the community partner(s) as coeducators in various aspects of course planning and design (e.g., learning outcomes, readings, preparation/orientation of students, reflection, assessment) and together they identify how the community activities can enrich student learning and add to the capacity of the organization. |
| 2) Community activities enhance academic content, course design, and assignments. | The instructor includes community activities as added components of the course but they are not integrated with academic content or assignments. The syllabus does not address the purposes of the community activities. | The instructor utilizes the community activities as a “text” to provide additional insight into student understanding of academic content and ability to complete assignments. The syllabus describes the relationship of the community activities to learning outcomes. | The instructor integrates the community activities and relevant social issue(s) as critical dimensions for student understanding of academic content and ability to complete assignments. The syllabus provides a strong rationale for the relationship of the community activities to learning outcomes. |
| 3) Civic competencies (i.e., knowledge, skills, disposition, behavior) are well integrated into student learning. | The instructor focuses on discipline-based content with little attention/priority given to civic learning or development of civic competencies. | The instructor focuses on discipline-based content and connects to civic learning and civic competencies when relevant to the community activities. | The instructor focuses on the integration of discipline-based content with civic learning and civic competencies and emphasizes the relevance of the community activities to the public purposes of the discipline in society. |
| 4) Diversity of interactions and dialogue with others across difference occurs regularly in the course. | The instructor, the course, and community activities offer students limited opportunities for interaction and dialogue with others across difference. | The instructor, the course, and community activities engage students in periodic interactions and dialogue with others across a range of experiences and diverse perspectives. | The instructor and community partner(s) engage students in frequent interactions and dialogue with peers and community members across a range of experiences and diverse perspectives. |
| 5) Critical reflection is well integrated into student learning. | The instructor asks students, on a limited basis, to create reflective products about the community activities, usually only at the end of the semester. | The instructor structures reflection activities and products about the community activities that connect the experience to academic content, require moderate analysis, lead to new action, and provide ongoing feedback to the student throughout the semester. | The instructor builds student capacity to critically reflect and develop products that explore the relevance of the experience to academic content, use critical thinking to analyze social issues, recognize systems of power, lead to new action. The instructor provides ongoing feedback to the student throughout the semester. |
| 6) Assessment is used for course improvement. | The instructor articulates student learning outcomes but no measurement tool is in place for assessing the service learning component of the course. | The instructor articulates student learning outcomes and uses a measurement tool to assess the service learning component of the course. | The instructor and community partner(s) articulate student learning outcomes, and use measurement tools to assess the service learning component of the course and influence on community outcomes. |



IUPUI

CENTER FOR SERVICE AND LEARNING
Office of Community Engagement

References



IUPUI

CENTER FOR SERVICE AND LEARNING
Office of Community Engagement

- Bradley, B. (1995). America's challenge. Revitalizing our national community. *National Civic Review*, 8(2), 94-100.
- Bringle, R. G. & Hatcher, J. A. (2009). Innovative practices in service-learning and curricular engagement. In Sandmann, L. R., Thornton, C. H., & Jaeger, A. J. (Eds.), *Institutionalizing community engagement in higher education: The first wave of Carnegie classified institutions*. New Directions for Higher Education (pp. 37-46). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass/ WileyPublishing.
- Bringle, R. G., & Clayton, P.H. (2012). Civic education through service-learning: What, how, and why? In L. McIlraith, A. Lyons, & R. Munck (Eds). *Higher education and civic engagement: Comparative perspectives*(pp. 101-124). New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Bringle, R. G., Clayton, P., & Bringle, K. E. (2015). From teaching democratic thinking to developing democratic civic identity. *Partnerships: A Journal of Service-Learning and Civic Engagement*, 8(1), 51-76.
- Gazley, B., Littlepage, L., & Bennett, T.A. (2012). What about the host agency? Nonprofit perspectives on community-based student learning and volunteering. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 41(6), 1029-1050.
- Giles, D. E., & Eyer, J. (2013). Review Essay: The endless quest for scholarly respectability in service-learning research. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 20(1), 53-64.
- Jacoby, B. (2015). *Service-learning essentials*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Hahn, T.W., & Hatcher, J. A. (2015, September 30). *What about service-learning matters? Using a taxonomy to identify variables to improve research and practice*[Webinar]. In IARSLCE Webinar Series. Retrieved from <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=03W27s3-XTw>.
- Mabry, J. B. (1998). Pedagogical variations in service-learning and student outcomes: How time, contact and reflection matter. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 5, 32-47.
- Mitchell, T.D. (2015). Using a critical service-learning approach to facilitate civic identity development. *Theory Into Practice*. 54, 20-28.
- Pigza, J., & Troppe, M. (2003). Developing an infrastructure for service-learning and community engagement. In B. Jacoby & Associates, *Building partnerships for service- learning*(pp. 106-130). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Smith, M. B., Nowacek, R. S., & Bernstein, J. L. (Eds.). (2010). *Citizenship across the curriculum*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.
- Stokamer, S. T. (2011). Pedagogical catalysts of civic competence: The development of a critical epistemological model for community-based learning. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement*, 17, 113-121.
- Terry, J. D., Smith, B. H., & McQuilla, J. D. (2014). Teaching evidence-based practice in service-learning: A model for education and service. *Journal on Excellence in College Teaching*, 25(1), 55-69.