

Meeting Notes on Data Collection: July 16, 2008

Outline (sorted by constituent group: students, institution, community)

- *Why we need to collect data?*
- *What can we collect?*
- *How can we collect the data?*
- *Who can collect data?*
- *Dreams for data collection*
- *Barriers to collection*

Why we need to collect data

Students:

- to validate student outcomes
- collect thinking in the state among institutions
- Show differences in recruitment, retention, engagement
- what students are learning, community knowledge and impact
- To understand student development and impact of service learning on student development
- to institutionalize service learning
- Learn what is important to students
- to improve/inform instruction, compliments to academic instruction
- NCA collects it/accreditation requirements
- part of mission
- gain skills: makes employable, grad schools
- more interesting, get out of classroom
- for demonstrating improved competency of student outcomes
- for alumni support and networking
- develop and engage citizens
- marketing purposes (\$)

Institutions

- Fulfill and expand mission of institution
- Quantitative vs. Qualitative (moving past testimonials)
- Solidify the “feeling” that it works, that it changes lives
- Institutions must be data-driven and accountable
- Raise consciousness of issues, found through action
- Identify the connection between student, institution, and community
- Demonstrate, defend and promote engaged learning

Communities:

- Adapt efforts to different community depending on the institution
- Establish institution as part of the “community”
- Increased public demand for accountability (accreditors)
- Status with Carnegie class
- Impact on communities

- How are students contributing to the community?
 - Think in terms of stakeholders- who would want that beyond the institution
- External - Community members to foundation (funding sources). Ability to demonstrate impact on community
 - Improved state of community is proof to the community that the university is making an impact (value)
- Internal – Academic vs. Non-academic (stakeholders)
 - Departments are part of the who?
 - Faculty want loop closed for assessment of the course
 - Students want immediate results
 - Exiting college- what did they learn?
 - Long term-how they continue to be engaged
 - Broad definition of engagement (civic, student)

What can we collect

Students:

- service opportunities offered and participated in
- Student satisfaction/ attitudes
 - With class
 - With placement
 - With experience
 - With outcomes
- post-undergraduate service learning
- Employments rates post undergrad
- activities toward diversity/appreciation for
- #participating
- # hours
- Enrollment in SL classes
- Student orgs.
- Grades
- Retention rates
- Employer surveys
- Civic engagement (voting, spectrum of engagement post-grad)

Institutions:

- HLC/NCA needs to know that we have the capacity to serve, that we are responsible to our constituencies, and that the constituencies value our services.
- Criterion

- institutional investments in service-learning, whether financially or with partners
- Building inter-dependent partnerships. Did the partner secure funding and/or sustain their program?
- Sustainability and ways of supporting growth and stability
- From an accreditation stand point- there are certain reporting measurements that are required.
- State requirements
- Requirements from foundations
- Statewide/National comparative data to find commonalities
- Recruitment factors
- Community-i.e. legislators
 - What needs are met, what problems are solved, is there positive change?
 - We are responsible to our constituencies! So more than accounting to our people in accreditations, we need to be accountable to our constituencies. And, if we are accountable to our local communities, we will have more meaningful data
- What about board representation?
- service-learning in the promotion and tenure policies

Communities:

- Participation level data (# of projects, # of students, etc.) (counts)
- Student surveys (freshman, NESSE, exit surveys)
 - Very broad
 - Useful to compare yourself to other institutions
 - Longitudinal surveys (senior survey vs. freshman survey)
- Organizational surveys (business, potential employers of students)

How can we collect the data

Students:

- Surveys
- internal systems
- BESY
- CCSSE
- NSSE
- rubrics
- syllabi
- pre/reflection

Communities:

- Satisfaction scale
- Employee surveys (be careful potential legal issue)
- Community sense of campus engagement with community
- Community needs assessment, evaluation
- Indicator:
 - Anecdotal stories only show the good
 - Need the negative information to look at quality improvement program

Who can collect data?

- Student services
- Faculty
- Students
- marketing departments
- Foundations
- Higher Learning Commission, etc.
 - They have four components for engaged learning
- Inter-department/agencies connections
 - What happens in the curriculum accreditations, can anyone demonstrate that there is value in the department of accounting? But, the people in accreditations do not know whether a student in Accounting is involved
 - So, we must include student activities
- Intermediate School Districts (K-12)
- Non-profits

Who?	What?
<i>Employers</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Team building • Retention • Global Perspectives • Variety of experiences
<i>Faculty</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assess student learning or course learning • Current Context • Career Advancement – promotion and tenure • Proof of a valid pedagogy • How does this learning relate to future employment • Effectively assess this work to the goals of the college or
<i>department</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impact on the community

<i>Administration</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Credibility for engaged scholarship • Resource allocation decisions • Ability to apply for grants or state funds • Numbers – how many classes, students, hours to community • Persistence and retention • Placement rates • Students gaining “global perspectives” or creating “global citizens” • Alumni relations • Recruitment of students
-----------------------	---

Dreams:

- Impact of K-12 mentorship on college access (shown to students)
- Community impact of increased college access, as a result of volunteerism
 - Rate of students going to college
- Creating an avenue to hear and learn stories of lives changed by service learning
- Funding source for media outlets to show data—ex. documentary from England showing service-learning impact on people’s lives
- Impact on student life, sense of community
- Show the type or background of student who participates in service learning
- Increasing self-efficacy, motivation, non-cognitive variables
- Ancillary benefits to service learning—sense of belonging, space to be, support, connections socially
- Students who stay in local community and/or state due to SL experience
- Deeper understanding of underlying social issues
- Service-learning incorporated into STEM
- Attitudinal changes by students toward faculty, institution as a result of SL
- Collect data on sense of community created by SL experience
- Time; data over time; longitudinal
- Show improvements of quality of life
- Show demographics/background of students participating in SL

Barriers to Collection:

- Tenure and promotion (publication/institutional values)
- Indifference and apathy
- Data collectors and programmatic disconnect
- Lack of respect/attention to non-\$makers
- Overwhelming amount of data/programs
- Overcomplication- lack of eye on the basics, the mission
- Institutional Structure does not allow the data to get to where it needs to be (e.g. reported to a VP or Dean, but not passed on to faculty or staff)

- Lack of respect/understanding of SL as a pedagogy
- Autonomous university/college structure- how do we share cross-campus/institution (not aggregated though)
- Time spent reporting, collecting, reporting
- Narrow down the “what” to be collected
- One of the biggest issues is addressing “drive-by services” by not reporting it except maybe in Furco data jargon. But if you have a meaningful partnership, then it is mutual
- Autonomy of the institutions in the state + government regulations – sometimes hard to share data + Ferpa regulations
- No clear set of standards for HLC or Carnegie Classification
- Burden of additional data collection
- Time for individuals to report the data
- Hard to define success or to assess learning outcomes – short and long term
- NSEE already collects some data – some feel that is enough.
- Is the data helping generate decisions about revenue?
- There is a disconnect between IR and those who know the work.