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Abstract

Service learning is a widespread educational practice, which, at its foundation, deploys students into partnerships with community organizations toward mutual benefit. Thirty years into the practice, there is a substantial body of research pointing to benefits of service learning for students, with less examination on benefits for community partners with whom students are engaged in service. Further, there is a dearth of examination of equity in service learning partnerships between universities and community organizations. This mixed methods program evaluation examined benefits and equity in service learning partnerships brokered and supported by the Ginsberg Center at the University of Michigan. Through this study, we sought to increase our understanding of perceived benefits for community partners, as well as university faculty and staff partners. Additionally, the study was aimed at increasing our understanding of the extent to which equity was present in these partnerships. Quantitative and qualitative data were collected using partner interviews and extant partnership surveys. Findings point to important perceptions about benefit for both community and university partners and that overall benefits outweigh challenges for both partner groups. Findings also illuminate a relationship between perceptions about equity and benefits and point to the Ginsberg Center playing an important mediating role in fostering this relationship. Implementing recommendations to strengthen key infrastructural supports for these partnerships within Ginsberg Center and, more broadly, within the University of Michigan can mitigate challenges, ensure mutual benefit, maximize equity, and advance the mission of the Ginsberg Center to create positive social change for the public good.
AN EXAMINATION OF BENEFIT AND EQUITY
IN COMMUNITY-UNIVERSITY SERVICE LEARNING PARTNERSHIPS
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION TO THE PROBLEM

The field of service learning in higher education is nearly 30 years old, and the number of students involved has increased exponentially since its inception. In the United States, service learning and community service have become a reliable part of the university experience, with the number of students involved as high as 70% of all undergraduates (National Task Force on Civic Learning and Democratic Engagement, 2012). Finley (2011) found that almost 50% of seniors having participated in curricular or other credit-bearing service-learning, and student civic engagement overall is at its highest level in 50 years (UCLA Higher Education Research Institute, 2016). Service learning in higher education is an applied learning pedagogy that spans an array of disciplines to deepen students’ understanding of critical concepts and theories (Furco, 1996; Giles & Eyler, 1994; Jacoby, 2014). Through course-based and co-curricular experiences, the intention of service learning is to engage students in activities that address community needs, concerns, and challenges in order to achieve desired learning outcomes. It is widely considered an important mechanism for students to develop skills and competencies that apply theoretical concepts to real-world practice and has been identified as a high-impact practice in higher education (Brownell & Swanner, 2009; Finley, 2011; Kuh, 2008).

It is not difficult to imagine why students and faculty alike find service learning compelling as a vehicle that provides students with opportunities to engage with the pressing social concerns of our time as a part of their university education. Through
service learning, student and professional scholars have an opportunity to join with outside practitioners to address community challenges.

**The Scholarship of Engagement**

Through service learning, students actively engage with community concerns and challenges through direct or indirect engagement with community partners (Furco, 1996; Giles & Eyler, 1994). Service learning is situated within what Boyer (1996) termed “the scholarship of engagement” (p. 19). Boyer (1996) called on universities—especially research universities—to reconnect their academic mission and resources to practical social concerns. He cautioned that higher education must reclaim its roots as a fundamentally publicly engaged endeavor, with a charge to interact with communities toward improving society above the individual. The scholarship of engagement expands the concept of scholarship beyond just the creation or discovery of new knowledge, to include teaching, application of knowledge, and the integration of research, teaching, and service (Boyer, 1996; Fitzgerald, Bruns, Sonka, Furco, & Swanson, 2012; Marullo & Edwards, 2000). Barker (2004) built on Boyer’s (1996) engaged scholarship to make explicit its inclusive nature, which spans disciplines as well as teaching, research, and service functions to connect scholars more closely to communities. Barker (2004) advanced a taxonomy to include five central practices of the scholarship of engagement including public scholarship, participatory research, community partnerships, public information networks, and civic literacy. Service learning spans all of these practices.

**Experiential Learning**

Service learning has its roots in experiential learning, building on Dewey's (1916, 1938) emphasis on the importance of learning through doing, with reflection, toward the
development of an educated democratic society. Experiential learning in higher education is a form of active learning from real-world experiences, distinct from lectures and classroom learning. Experiential learning, and service learning as one form of it, enriches traditional academic programs by integrating action, reflection, experience, and concepts (Claxton, 1990; D. A. Kolb, 1984, 2015; A. Kolb & Kolb, 2017; Lewis & Williams, 1994). D. A. Kolb (1984, 2015) offered a model for the way in which experiential learning facilitates taking in and synthesizing new concepts and experiences. His four-stage cycle presented concrete experience as the primary genesis of new learning, as it provides learners with the basis on which to observe and reflect on the experience. From there, the experience is assimilated into the learner’s abstract concept schema, from which the learner can draw implications to try out or experiment with this new learning. Figure 1 depicts D. A. Kolb’s (2015) core elements of experiential learning, including concrete experience, reflection, conceptualization, and experimentation. Through experience and reflection, learners are encouraged to develop new skills, attitudes, and perspectives.
**Figure 1.** Stages of the experiential learning cycle (Kolb, 2015).

**Service learning.** Service learning is one form of experiential education, through which students actively engage with community concerns and challenges through direct or indirect engagement with community partners (Furco, 1996; Giles & Eyler, 1994; Saltmarsh & Hartley, 2017). This type of learning can occur over time, but is more commonly of limited duration, such as a semester or other short-term project period, and can be course-based or co-curricular (Jacoby, 2014). Drawing on the components of experiential learning, a vital component of service learning is intentional reflection, which serves as a means for students to connect their experience with concepts, toward increased understanding or other transformational learning to use in future experiences. This intentional reflective component is key in distinguishing community-engaged or service learning from volunteerism or similar community service experiences that do not incorporate reflection (Eyler, 2002; Jacoby, 2014). As described above, reflection is an essential component of the cycle of learning through experience (D. A. Kolb, 1984).
Service learning is considered an important part of educating students to develop behaviors and commitments of informed and active democratic citizenship (National Task Force on Civic Learning and Democratic Engagement, 2012; Saltmarsh, 2005). Research shows that service learning has significant positive impacts on students, including increased achievement, retention, skill-building, and college completion (Butin, 2003; Warren, 2012). Service learning is closely associated with community-engaged learning and community engagement. Although these terms and concepts have some distinct elements from one another, they can be used interchangeably (Furco, 2012; Stanlick & Clayton, 2015). This flexibility is particularly important for practitioners who use different terms and translations for diverse audiences and communities.

**Mutual benefit.** A fundamental assumption of service learning is that it can be mutually beneficial and that a university’s academic and other vital interests advance while simultaneously advancing the interests of community organizations with which students engage, such as nonprofits, schools, government institutions, and other community groups (Bringle & Hatcher, 1999; Giles & Eyler, 1994; Kendall, 1990). In light of the definition of service (n.d.) as providing help, use, or benefit, the word service necessarily takes on central importance in examining service learning. The use of the term service learning claims that students engaging in this practice will not only learn but will also be of use or benefit to the community partner served. In practice, and in the existing body of research, the actual usefulness of service learning for community partners remains under-examined, and it cannot be assumed that prevalence and volume of engagement activities correlate with benefits or positive impact.
Furthermore, the terminology of *mutual benefit* lacks the more nuanced consideration of equity, since mutuality is technically achieved even when one partner receives almost all the benefits and the other receives almost no benefit. For example, in distributing a dollar, it is accurate to claim that mutual benefit exists when one party receives a penny while the other receives ninety-nine cents. For most, however, the stark disparity of this scenario intuitively prompts the question of whether this distribution is fair and equitable.

**Considerations of Equity**

In considering service learning partnerships, the question of fairness and equity is significant, since universities have a mixed history of engaging in communities in a variety of capacities and typically hold an uneven concentration of resources and power relative to community partners (Bortolin, 2011; Fisher, Fabricant, & Simmons, 2004; Sandmann & Kliwer, 2012). There is little by way of descriptive or objective measurement of equity; the presence or lack of equity—especially the distribution of resources across socio-economic class, gender, physical and mental capacities, geographic location, or other grouping is a normative judgment, based on a socially constructed reality (Reynolds, 2014). For the purpose of examining equity in service learning partnerships, Blanchard (1986) offers a helpful framing. He offers that equity does not mean equal, whereby each party receives the same amount or level of benefit; rather, the focus of equity is on fairness, based on considerations such as need, effort, or ability to contribute. This conceptualization of equity conveys the notion that both community and university partners should accrue a fair share of both burdens and privileges in their partnerships (Falk, Hampton, Hodgkinson, Parker, & Rorris, 1993).
Burdens, privileges, costs, and benefits manifest in both the partnership process and outcomes. Regens and Rycroft (1986) describe these two distinct, yet interconnected, ways of understanding equity as procedural and substantive (p. 9). Procedural equity examines the process of equity, including elements such as fairness, treatment, access, inclusion, respect; substantive equity examines the actual distribution or outcomes related to tangible benefits for the equity process. Examining how these elements of equity are experienced in service learning partnerships is important to more fully understand the veracity of the field’s explicit claims of mutuality in benefit, including whether the distribution of benefit is fair.

There is a significant body of important extant research about service learning in universities (Bloomgarden & O’Meara, 2007; Blouin & Perry, 2009; Bringle, Hatcher, & Muthiah, 2010; Brownell & Swaner, 2009; Eyler, Giles, & Braxton, 1997; Miron & Moely, 2006; Sandy & Holland, 2006). A substantial majority of this research focuses on the ways in which universities, particularly students, benefit from service learning, with significantly less research examining the extent to which service learning is of use or benefit to community partners. Scholars and practitioners have yet to consistently demonstrate through empirical evidence that community engagement and service learning hold consistent benefit for community partners, or that the partnerships through which engagement happens are equitable.

The disparity in research on community compared to university benefit, together with the existing constraints of university-community engagement, raise questions and uncertainty about the accuracy of the assumption of mutual benefit foundational to the
theory of service learning. Further, the presence of equity in explicit aim or practice in university and community service learning partnerships has not been examined.

There is also an important body of research and analysis pointing to the structural, cultural, and practical constraints to mutuality in benefit when universities engage with communities. Chief among these constraining factors include the time and scope limitations created by the academic calendar (Bortolin, 2011; Sandmann, & Kliewer, 2012), the lack of clear reward for community-engaged scholarship in tenure and promotion (Butin, 2006; Hou & Wilder, 2015; Saltmarsh, Giles, Ward, & Buglione, 2009), lack of preparation for students who engage with community partners (Sandy & Holland, 2006), and inconsistent institutional support for sustaining partnerships (Amey, Eddy, & Ozaki, 2007; Blouin & Perry, 2009). Challenges to mutually beneficial engagement are particularly prevalent in certain categories of universities. Specifically, large, elite research-intensive universities exhibit less mutuality in civic engagement than their smaller private liberal arts and regional public university peers; they, instead, prioritize the unidirectional dissemination of knowledge developed through expert-driven methodologies within the university rather than knowledge co-created through community partnerships (Holland, 2005; Weerts & Freed, 2016).

Critiques of universities being disconnected and irrelevant in adequately addressing pressing contemporary challenges are not new; and their value, tied to a commitment and contribution to society and the public good, continues to be the subject of public debate (Boyte & Hollander, 1999; Fitzgerald et al., 2012; Murphy, 2015; Pasque, Hendricks, & Bowman, 2006). Can the field of service learning contribute to demonstrating a positive impact of universities on communities and society as a whole?
Institutions of higher education are already making this claim, as engagement with communities through service is highlighted in mission statements and marketing materials and include implied or explicit messages about positive community impact (Baron & Corbin, 2012; Morphew & Hartley, 2006; Rosing, 2015). Additional examination is needed to understand the effects of service learning on community partners. Given the purpose of service learning, as well the aspirations held for it in transforming students and communities, it is crucial to understand more fully whether the ambitions held and promoted by faculty, staff, and students are supported by evidence. For university faculty, administrators, and students engaged in service learning as an educational strategy or activity, the uncertainty about mutuality in benefit for university and community partners creates a problem of practice. The extent to which service learning partnerships are equitable is an additional consideration and potential complication.

Through this evaluation research, I examined whether and how service learning partnerships supported through the University of Michigan’s (UM) Edward Ginsberg Center created benefit for university and community partners. This study examined the following three evaluation research questions. Through each question, I sought to determine the benefits of service learning partnerships for community and university partners, and how equity manifests within these partnerships:

1. To what extent and in what ways is there perceived community partner benefit from service learning partnerships supported by the UM Ginsberg Center?
2. To what extent and in what ways is there perceived University partner benefit, particularly UM faculty and staff, perceive benefit from service learning partnerships supported by the UM Ginsberg Center?

3. To what extent do partners perceive equity in university and community partnerships supported by the UM Ginsberg Center?

The Ginsberg Center has three core stakeholder groups: social sector community partners, including nonprofits and other community organizations, preK-12 schools, and local governments; UM students; and UM faculty/staff. For the purposes of this examination, university partners included UM faculty and staff. The Ginsberg Center’s central intention is to foster supported connections between community and university partners to bring benefit to both. This evaluation was the first in the 21-year history of the center and focused on whether and to what extent the Ginsberg Center is achieving its intended outcomes.

**Program Overview**

This study was conducted as an evaluation of the Ginsberg Center at the UM. The Ginsberg Center is a service learning and community engagement center, with a mission to cultivate and steward equitable partnerships between UM and communities to advance social change for the public good (UM Edward Ginsberg Center, n.d.).

**Context.** UM is a highly ranked and prestigious public institution of higher education, with three campuses, more than 63,000 total students, and 5,000 faculty members (UM, n.d.). Planning and decision-making are very decentralized, and autonomy is highly valued. The Ginsberg Center is located on UM’s main campus in
Ann Arbor, Michigan, where approximately 45,000 students are enrolled. UM’s main campus is a Carnegie Classified research I institution, indicating high research activity.

UM has a growing commitment to community-engaged teaching, research, and service across the institution; and 56% of graduating students report participating in civic engagement activities (UM Engaged Michigan and Budget and Planning, 2017). In addition to the Ginsberg Center, there are multiple centers, offices, and individual faculty or staff focused on promulgating community-engaged service, teaching, or research. Two institution-wide presidential initiatives have emerged that create an opportunity and even an imperative to examine the outcomes and equity in UM’s engagements within communities (UM Office of the President, n.d.). First, UM is investing $85 million in a five-year strategic planning effort to foster practices and policies that align with a community in which diversity, equity, and inclusion are fully integrated as central to UM’s academic excellence. Second, UM is in the fourth year of an initiative to encourage public engagement through its core academic functions of research, teaching, and service.

Despite these high-profile and promising initiatives focused on advancing diversity, equity, and inclusion, the public good, and engagement with public and community partners, community engagement and service learning at UM seems to mirror national trends in the imbalance of examination of mutuality in service learning (University of Michigan Edward Ginsberg Center, 2016). There are significant and increasing activities and investments across campus, reflecting the assumption of mutual benefit for university and community partners when students or faculty engage, without corresponding investment to understand actual outcomes or equity for community
partners. Prior findings from interviews and focus groups conducted by Ginsberg Center staff and consultants with more than 300 UM and community partner stakeholders indicated challenges to mutually beneficial engagement between UM and external community organizations. These included under-coordinated efforts on campus, uneven preparation of students engaging with community partners, a lack of clarity about how and where to engage, and a lack of emphasis on continuity in relationships with community partners (Ginsberg Center, 2016). These challenges contribute to confusion or additional work for community organizations and UM stakeholders and diminish the positive impact that UM seeks in its community and public engagement.

**Description of the program.** The Ginsberg Center draws on the importance of intentional relationships that serve to connect people and organizations to others with shared interests as a means to build healthy communities (McKnight, 2003). The center’s theory of action is premised on mitigating the barriers to mutually beneficial and equitable engagement between UM and community partners, as previously described. Specifically, it is based on the need for clear pathways for connection, training and support for those seeking to connect, coordinated efforts across campus, and investments in stewarding sustained relationships as four key components necessary for consistency in advancing mutual benefit in UM’s community engagement. Therefore, as identified in its current strategic plan, the Ginsberg Center (2016) seeks to provide the following supports:

- Clear pathways for community partners to connect with UM resources and for UM faculty/staff and students to connect with community partners via a matchmaking process (pp. 23-24).
• Consultation and training to prepare UM faculty/staff and students for community engagement (pp. 18-22).

• Collaboration and increased coherence among interested UM faculty/staff and students with common or converging community engagement agendas (p. 25).

• Long-term relationships with community partners for future connections and impact through teaching, research, and service (pp. 23-24).

The logic model in Figure 2 describes the Ginsberg Center’s service learning partnership theory of action in more detail. The logic model provides details of program elements related to university partners, which include students, faculty, and staff, and community partners, all of whom have continued to be developed since the Ginsberg Center’s 2016 Strategic Planning and resulting organizational change process (McLaughlin & Jordan, 1999; Mertens & Wilson, 2012; Taylor-Powell & Henert, 2008). The model includes four intended outcomes: student learning, benefit for UM partners, benefit for community partners, and increase in equity in brokered partnerships. This study will focus on three of these outcomes in relation to community partners and UM faculty/staff partners, denoted by flags in the logic model in Figure 2. While student learning outcomes and benefits from service learning may be the subject of future examination, these outcomes have been researched extensively and are, therefore, not the focus of this study.
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Community partner inputs, process, and outcomes. Prior to brokering a partnership, Ginsberg Center community engagement staff meets with staff or volunteers from social sector community organizations who have had a previous partnership with the center or who would like to explore partnership opportunities. During this initial intake meeting, Ginsberg Center staff gathers the priorities, needs, and project ideas shared by the community partner with which UM could be of assistance; and these are cataloged using a customer relationship management (CRM) system (Wailgum, & Frulinger, 2018). Ginsberg Center staff then seek UM faculty/staff, student, or related resources, using the CRM as well as existing networks of partners across campus to match with the priorities and needs identified by the community partner. When potential UM resources are identified by the Center, and there is an interest in being matched, Ginsberg Center connects the UM and community partner via electronic introduction or a face-to-face facilitated meeting, depending on the complexity of the match, and each respective partner’s preference. Ginsberg Center offers a partnership toolkit to community partners, which includes sample memoranda of understanding, resources to identify partnership expectations, project goals, roles and responsibilities, and examples of effective university-community projects and partnerships previously undertaken. A few weeks after a match is made, Ginsberg Center sends an email to the partner to inquire about the status of the match and offers additional support, as needed. After the completion of the project that initiated the UM-community partnership, a Ginsberg Center staff member sends a survey to the partner to gather information about the experience and outcomes of the partnership. Ginsberg Center staff also reaches out to community partners annually to update priorities, needs, and project ideas in the CRM;
and the process for matchmaking begins again. Figure 3 provides a visual depiction of the Ginsberg Center process of matching university and community partners, which begins with gathering community-identified priorities, needs, and ideas.

**Figure 3.** Ginsberg Center’s matchmaking process.

**Faculty/staff partners’ inputs, process, and outcomes.** Ginsberg Center faculty engagement staff meets with faculty/staff for one or more of the following purposes including matchmaking support, course design or research consultation, and/or support for preparing students for community engagement. Each of these is described below.

**Matchmaking support.** Faculty/staff who have had a previous partnership with the center or who would like to explore partnership opportunities meet with staff to share their priorities and ideas for teaching, research, and/or service engagement with community organizations. Ginsberg Center staff checks the CRM for potential
community partner matches. When potential matches are identified and there is interest in being matched, Ginsberg Center connects the UM faculty/staff and community partner via electronic introduction or a face-to-face facilitated meeting, depending on the complexity of the match, and on each respective partner’s preference. Ginsberg Center offers a partnership toolkit to the UM faculty/staff partner organization, which mirrors that provided to community partners and UM students, including sample memoranda of understanding, resources to identify partnership expectations, project goals, roles and responsibilities, and examples of effective university-community projects and partnerships undertaken previously. A few weeks after a match is made, Ginsberg Center sends an email to the faculty/staff partner to inquire about the status of the match and offer additional support, as needed. After the completion of the project that initiated the UM-community partnership, Ginsberg Center sends an electronic survey to the UM faculty/staff partner to gather information about the experience and outcomes.

**Preparation for engagement.** For faculty/staff who are interested in bolstering their own or their students’ understanding of best practices in community engagement, Ginsberg Center staff conducts workshops, modules, and training sessions. In order to understand faculty/staff’s perceptions of learning, experience, and outcomes surveys are disseminated to all participants.

**Curriculum, course, or research design consultation.** For faculty/staff who are interested in developing or refining a community-engaged course, program, or research project, Ginsberg Center staff provides design consultation and support. To understand faculty/staff perceptions of the experience and outcomes, surveys are disseminated to all participants.
**UM student partners’ inputs, process, and outcomes.** In addition to supporting students through courses and academic programs, Ginsberg Center student engagement and advising staff meet with student organizations and groups in two primary ways. These include meeting with students to connect them to community partners and working with students to prepare them for their engagement.

*Seeking matchmaking support.* Students who have had a previous engagement with the center or who would like to explore new community partnership opportunities meet with staff to share their priorities and ideas. Ginsberg Center staff checks the CRM for potential community partner matches. When potential matches are identified, and both the community partners and student group express interest in being matched, Ginsberg Center connects the UM student group and community partner via electronic introduction or a face-to-face facilitated meeting, depending on the complexity of the match, and each respective partner’s preference. Ginsberg Center offers a partnership toolkit to the UM student partner group, which mirrors the toolkit provided to community and faculty/staff partners, including sample memoranda of understanding, resources to identify partnership expectations, project goals, roles and responsibilities, and examples of effective university-community projects and partnerships previously undertaken. A few weeks after a match is made, Ginsberg Center staff sends an email to the student partner to inquire about the status of the match and offer additional support, as needed. After the completion of the project that initiated the UM-community partnership, Ginsberg Center sends an email with a link to an electronic survey to the student partner to gather information about the experience and outcomes of the partnership.
**Preparation for engagement.** Students enrolled in select community-engaged courses and those seeking to engage with community partners in co-curricular ways participate in workshops, modules, training, and advising sessions focused on best practices in community engagement offered by Ginsberg Center staff. These sessions incorporate a critical service learning lens, integrating teaching and reflection about changing systems of oppression that lead to the symptoms to be addressed through the students’ service learning (Mitchell, 2008). To gain an understanding of students’ perception of their learning and experience with these offerings, brief surveys are disseminated to all student participants.

**Ginsberg Center organizational structure.** The Ginsberg Center has 14 full-time professional staff and 30 part-time undergraduate and graduate student staff, fellows, and interns. The center is formally situated in the Division of Student Life, and the director has an administrative reporting line to the Vice President of Student Life, and a functional reporting to the Office of Government Relations. Additionally, the Office of the Provost and Ginsberg Center share oversight of a faculty role charged with supporting university-wide efforts to promote civic engagement among faculty. There are three areas of focus for Ginsberg Center with professional and student staff assigned to each. These areas include student education, advising, and grant support; faculty consultation and grant support; and community engagement. Additionally, professional and student staff work as matchmakers to broker partnerships between these three stakeholder groups. The annual operating budget is $1.6 million with approximately 50% of funding provided by revenue from a portfolio of endowments, 45% from UM’s General Fund, and 5% or
less from grants and other revenue. Figure 4 provides an overview of the Ginsberg Center’s organizational structure and roles.

![Ginsberg Center’s organizational structure](image)

**Figure 4.** Ginsberg Center’s organizational structure.

**Significance of the Study**

This evaluation seeks to produce results that add to the existing body of knowledge about service learning partnerships, and especially the extent to which these partnerships are aligned with the explicit aims of mutuality in benefit. Additionally, given the gap in the existing literature examining equity in service learning partnerships, evaluation findings related to perceived equity can contribute to the field.

The work of the Ginsberg Center has significant connections to the public engagement and diversity, equity, and inclusion initiatives underway at UM. Community engagement and service learning are forms of public engagement, bringing UM students, faculty, and staff in contact with members of the public. Furthermore, UM students, faculty, and staff members engaged in service learning and related community
engagement efforts most often hold privileged economic and social status, compared to those with whom they engage in the social sector. In this way, engaging with community organizations and their constituents is fundamentally working across individual, group, and cultural differences (Cress, Collier, & Reitenauer, 2005). Community engagement enables entry for UM students, faculty and staff to observe and attempt to impact the inequitable systems that cause health and quality of life disparities and, therefore, should be understood as a part of UM’s diversity, equity, and inclusion efforts. Given the intersections between these major initiatives currently underway at UM, this evaluation examining mutuality and equity in benefit in partnerships between UM and community partners is timely.

Findings and implications of this evaluation research could be used by Ginsberg Center staff, administrators, and advisory boards to inform changes and improvements to the Ginsberg Center’s model to support mutually beneficial and equitable UM-Community partnerships. Additionally, findings and recommendations could be used by administrators and other community engagement offices, across UM and beyond, to inform the ways they develop and evaluate programs and structures through which the university engages with external community organizations. This evaluation also represented the first such examination of the Ginsberg Center’s intended outcomes of creating equitable partnerships and benefit for community organizations and UM faculty/staff.

**Overview of the Evaluation Approach**

I constructed an evaluation research design and plan for data collection and analyses aligned with the problem of practice and each of my evaluation questions.
Following, I outline the approach, purpose, and focus of the evaluation, the specific evaluation questions, and key definitions related to the study.

**Program evaluation model.** This study is an outcome evaluation of the Ginsberg Center, drawing from the CIPP (Context, Input, Process, Product) evaluation model (Stufflebeam, 2003). This model is consistent with the use branch and the pragmatic paradigm in that it was chiefly developed to be used as a tool for improvement so that programs can be most helpful for their intended stakeholders (Mertens & Wilson, 2012). The CIPP model creates a framework for understanding the evaluand’s context, input, process, and products to answer evaluation questions. The model includes products, also known as outcomes, as one of its key foci, and these are of primary importance to this evaluation.

**Purpose of the evaluation.** The Ginsberg Center’s service learning partnership model was reimagined in 2016, after an extensive and broadly inclusive strategic planning process (UM Edward Ginsberg Center, 2016). The Ginsberg Center has adopted an approach of emphasizing community partner-identified interests and priorities as the genesis of service learning partnerships, as opposed to those that originate from ideas and interests of students or faculty. This approach is consistent with calls for university engagement to be responsive to community concerns, especially through listening to community representatives’ perspectives on pressing challenges and issues (Byrne, 2006; Fitzgerald et al., 2012; Sandy & Holland, 2006). The primary purpose of this evaluation was to gain an increased understanding of the effectiveness of this approach and the Ginsberg Center’s model, built with this approach in mind. Additionally, answering the questions posed through this evaluation research can
contribute to the scholarship and practice of service learning and university-community engagement.

This evaluation focuses on understanding the merit and worth of the Ginsberg Center’s approach to service learning, specifically its direct and mediating work to advance mutually beneficial and equitable partnerships between UM and community partners. Through surveys and interviews, stakeholders can gain a better understanding of the intrinsic value—the merit—of focusing on long-term relationships, marked by reciprocity and co-creation. In addition to merit, stakeholders will gain a better understanding of the extent to which there are beneficial outcomes and added value—the worth—for community partners, faculty/staff, and students (Lincoln & Guba, 1980).

This evaluation is intended to be summative, as findings will provide indications of the model’s efficacy in achieving planned outcomes. Summative evaluation findings will be used to inform continued refinement and improvement of the Ginsberg Center’s service learning partnership logic model as presented on in figure 2. Ginsberg Center’s model rests on important and well-intended assumptions that emphasizing community partner interests as a starting point for UM partnerships, a so-called outside-in approach, will lead to better outcomes and, eventually, more significant and positive impacts. This approach is also consistent with research that points to the importance of community partner involvement in every aspect of the partnership, including origin and planning, to achieve better outcomes (Bucher, 2012; Miron & Moely, 2006; Sandy & Holland, 2006). However, despite consistency with existing research, it is critical to understand more about the efficacy of this model that seeks to maximize benefit and equity for both UM and community partners. To the extent that intended outcomes are being achieved, this
may lead to replication or adoption by engagement offices at the University of Michigan or other institutions of higher education. There are multiple audiences for the evaluation, including University of Michigan administrators, Ginsberg Center staff, community partners, UM faculty and staff, students, and people within other institutions of higher education.

**Focus of the evaluation.** The focus of this evaluation is on outcomes (or products in the terminology of CIPP) related to service learning partnerships brokered and supported through UM’s Ginsberg Center. The logic model in figure 2 describes the Ginsberg Center’s service learning partnership theory of action in more detail. The logic model provides details of all significant program elements including context, inputs, processes, outputs, and outcomes, all of which have continued to be developed since the Ginsberg Center’s 2016 Strategic Planning process and organizational changes that resulted from it (McLaughlin & Jordan, 1999; Mertens & Wilson, 2012; Taylor-Powell & Henert, 2008). Specifically, the outcomes to be examined include benefit for community partners, benefit for UM faculty and staff partners, and the presence of equity in partnerships.

**Evaluation questions.** This study examines the following three evaluation research questions. Through each question, I sought to determine the benefits of service learning partnerships for community and university partners, and how equity manifests within these partnerships:

1. To what extent and in what ways is there perceived community partner benefit from service learning partnerships supported by the UM Ginsberg Center?
2. To what extent and in what ways is there perceived University partner particularly UM faculty and staff, benefit from service learning partnerships supported by the UM Ginsberg Center?

3. To what extent do partners perceive equity in University of Michigan and community partnerships supported by the UM Ginsberg Center?

Definitions of Terms

- Benefit (n.d.) – “Something that produces good or helpful results or effects or that promotes well-being.” For illustration, a non-exhaustive list of examples of benefits in university-community partnership includes: increased capacity, increased social or economic capital, increased skills and knowledge, and tangible work products (James & Logan, 2016; Srinivas, Meenan, Drogin, & DePrince, 2015).

- Community partners – Nonprofits, pre-Kindergarten through Grade 12 schools, governmental and quasi-governmental organizations, and other organized community associations and groups within the social sector, external to UM.

- Community engagement – The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching (n.d.) defines community engagement as a “collaboration between institutions of higher education and their larger communities for the mutually beneficial exchange of knowledge and resources”. Community engagement is closely associated with service learning. Although these terms and concepts have some distinct elements from one another, they can be used interchangeably (Furco, 2012; Stanlick & Clayton, 2015).
• Equity – In relation to partnerships, a fair share of benefits and burdens, based on considerations such as need, effort, or ability to contribute (Blanchard, 1986; Falk et al., 1993). This relates to both the process of partnership, such as fairness, treatment, access, inclusion, and respect; and, the actual outcomes related to tangible benefits resulting from the partnership (Regens & Rycroft, 1986).

• Matchmaking – A partnership-building process that draws upon interests and priorities identified and shared by constituent groups served by the Ginsberg Center, including community organizations, faculty/staff, and student groups. When aligned interests and priorities are identified, community partners are connected to UM partners and vice versa, based on mutual interests and needs. This process begins with community partner-identified interests, based on which Ginsberg Center staff scan internal UM networks to find UM partners with aligned interests that can be applied as a part of students’ curricular or co-curricular service, or faculty research, teaching, or service (UM Ginsberg Center, n.d.).

• Service learning – A form of course-based, co-curricular, or similar credit-bearing experiential education in which students engage in activities that address community needs, concerns, and challenges and engage in reflection designed to achieve desired learning outcomes (Furco, 1996; Giles & Eyler, 1994; Jacoby, 2014).

• University partner – Faculty and staff within UM, whose teaching, research, or service deploys students to engage with community partners.
Summary

Service learning is a practice within higher education that promises benefits for university and community partners. Through a program evaluation, I explored and examined three evaluation questions that seek to determine the benefits of service learning partnerships for community and university partners, and how equity manifests within these partnerships. Chapter 2 provides a review of extant research, theory, and related literature. Chapter 3 provides a description of the methods used in this evaluation study. Chapter 4 details the findings from the data collected and analyzed as a part of this examination. Finally, Chapter 5 presents the implications for policy and practice, resulting recommendations, and identification of areas for future research.
CHAPTER 2: REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

This chapter provides a review of existing literature related to service learning to provide important context for the questions about benefit and equity that are at the center of this evaluation. There is a significant body of knowledge and related research on university-community engagement and service learning, including impacts and benefits, though considerably less on equity in partnerships. My problem of practice and gaps in the literature have informed the focus and questions for my evaluation research. This chapter presents major themes of exploration and examination within the existing literature related to this study of mutuality and equity in benefit of service learning partnerships. The first section provides a broad overview and discussion of the purpose and practice of universities in relation to societal aims and engagement with and contribution to communities. This synthesis of the literature provides important context for understanding service learning in higher education and how that context drives my research questions related to benefit. The second section reflects and considers the construct and pedagogy of service learning, including foundational scholarship on theory and practice. The third section examines research on how service learning impacts students, which corresponds to my second evaluation question. The fourth section presents a review of faculty motivations for, barriers to, and benefits of utilizing service learning, which also relates to my second evaluation question. The fifth section probes the research and related literature on experience and outcomes for community partners, which directly relates to my first evaluation question. Lastly, the sixth section presents
considerations of equity in service learning partnerships, which connects to my final evaluation question.

**University Engagement with Communities**

There are many forms of university-community engagement, from institutional hiring and procurement practices (Dubb & Howard, 2015), to educational and academic activities such as community-engaged teaching and service learning and applied and community-based research (Fisher et al., 2004). The exploration of the literature on university-community engagement emphasizes activities related to the educational and academic missions of public research universities since this is the most directly comparable context for my evaluation research.

Ernest Boyer (1990) is widely regarded as a catalyst for the modern scholarship of engagement movement, which called for higher education to dismantle the impermeable walls of the ivory tower. In his groundbreaking work *Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate*, Boyer (1990) observed concerns with changes in higher education in the United States over time, and argued that higher education had moved past its early roots of teaching to build character and preparing students to be civic and religious leaders, past its evolution of supporting faculty and student focus on serving democratic and community aims, and toward an over-emphasis on research to advance academic interests detached from the real world (Boyer, 1990, p. 8). In a way, Boyer (1990) offered a vision for higher education to rediscover its history in whole, to expand definitions and notions of scholarship beyond the discovery of new knowledge toward “recognition that teaching is crucial, that integrative studies are increasingly consequential, and that, in addition to research, the work of the academy must relate to
the world beyond the campus” (p. 75). Boyer’s work helped inspire practice and scholarship toward civic engagement within higher education, including the growth of service learning.

In response to Boyer’s (1990) call for change, scholars continue to focus on how to fully manifest a vision for university engagement with communities as central to the purpose and mission of higher education. National organizations, important national convenings of scholars and university leaders, and resulting publications referenced Boyer as they recommitted to the public purpose of universities (American Association of State Colleges and Universities, 2002; Boyte & Hollander, 1999; Campus Compact, 2000). These convenings and publications created momentum for an engagement movement while also acknowledging the need to move beyond rhetoric.

In a review of articles published in a leading higher education engagement and outreach journal over 10 years, Sandmann (2007) observed an evolving clarity about terminology, definitions, and processes for community engagement in higher education. She summarized key developments during the decade to include a growing consensus around engagement as a bi-directional and reciprocal arrangement, differentiated from more traditional university outreach and one-way dissemination of knowledge and affirmation that teaching and research involving students engaging with communities should be a central component of university-community engagement. According to Sandmann (2007), this second theme was heavily influenced by emerging service learning practice and research. Finally, Sandmann (2007) called for additional analysis of scholarly engagement publications, increased empirical studies on the scholarship of
university engagement, and additional development of engagement theories that include critical theory perspective.

Fitzgerald et al. (2012) echoed Sandmann’s (2007) prompting for a theory of the scholarship of engagement and issued a renewed call for community engagement in practice, particularly by public and land grant research universities. In addition to tying engagement to the academic mission of the public university, they acknowledged that much work remains undone to integrate community engagement as core to the academic mission and stressed the importance of aligning university structures, epistemology, tenure and promotion policies, and pedagogy with this commitment to engagement. Additionally, they advanced four key elements of university engagement with broader communities including that it be scholarly in process and product; that it extends to the full academic mission of teaching, research, and service; that it is reciprocal and mutually beneficial; and that it upholds the values and processes of a civil democracy.

Boyer’s (1990) challenge and blueprint for changing higher education to better align with communities and pressing social concerns helped to catalyze some important though inconsistently applied changes within the sector. Continuing assertions about the nature of university engagement with communities signal both the growing commitment to this concept and also the challenges at play in meaningfully integrating engagement into the culture and practice of universities. Important research has examined the ways in which reciprocal university engagement with communities has progressed, as well as confirmed that cultural, economic, and institutional barriers remain (Fisher et al., 2004; Saltmarsh & Hartley, 2016; Weerts & Freed, 2016; Weerts & Sandmann, 2008).
Key continuing institutional barriers to reciprocal engagement with communities identified include a continuing pervasive positivist epistemology within universities, preferencing the idea of knowledge as neutral rather than co-created by participants, a lack of inter-disciplinary cooperation and supports within universities, a lack of support for community engagement in faculty tenure and promotion, and inadequate financial and logistical support for community engagement. According to Norris-Tirrell, Lambert-Pennington, and Hyland (2010), partnerships between universities and communities continue to be constrained by the department or college structure, which reinforces individual fields’ theory-building and knowledge and discipline-based approaches, and results in fragmentation and maintaining the status quo. This perspective is reinforced by Harkavy and Hartley (2012), who frame the tendency of research universities toward silos instead of collaboration or partnership and, thus, constraining the creation of sustained partnerships.

Weerts and Sandmann (2008) conducted interviews with campus administrators, faculty, and community partners; they documented reviews of six research universities and identified key attributes that counteract these constraints toward advancing reciprocal engagement and community-university partnerships. These included commitment by executive leadership and deans; centralized structures to support coherence and engagement; faculty commitment to engagement as a pedagogy for student learning; intentional recruitment of faculty whose work is oriented toward engagement; and effective boundary spanning staff who demonstrate neutrality, listening skills, management of power dynamics, and a service ethic (Weerts & Sandmann, 2008, p. 93). These findings were consistent with other studies and analyses of barriers and facilitators
of reciprocal university engagement with communities (Abes, Jackson, & Jones, 2002; Saltmarsh & Hartley, 2016; Sandmann & Kliwer, 2012; Weerts & Freed, 2016). The case study methodology in the research of Weerts and Sandmann (2008) promoted a deeper analysis of factors that inhibit and promote reciprocal engagement, though it did not address whether the engagement yielded positive impacts for community partners.

**Service Learning Pedagogy and Construct**

Service learning is a key pillar within university-community engagement and is the focus of my evaluation research. It is both a pedagogical method for educating students and a construct for how universities can engage with broader communities, built on the assumption that student learning and community benefit can be achieved simultaneously (Kendall, 1990).

**Historical roots.** Embedded and catalyzed in the work of John Dewey (1938), the basis for service learning has been in practice since the early 1900s. Dewey’s progressive emphasis on education as a means to strengthen and preserve democracy through students’ engagement within the broader world is foundational to service learning. He wrote about the idea that rote learning, delivered through rigid teacher-centered methods, diminished student learning and was outdated for the needs of modern democracy. Dewey’s (1916) assertion, “Education is not preparation for life; education is life itself” (p. 239) conveys his belief that education should actively engage students in relevant, real-world experiences and service toward membership, meaning-making, and agency in society.

Freire (1972) also rejected the persistent traditional notions of education, premised on the contained and unidirectional emphasis of the teacher as expert and
student as an empty vessel to be filled with knowledge. Freire’s (1972) emphasis on education was less on preserving traditional notions of democracy and more on empowering those typically excluded from access to resources and decision-making. He argued that authentic learning, critical thinking, and liberation from oppression could only occur through praxis, which is learning in context, in relation to others, and through engagement and reflection. For Freire, the focus of praxis was raising consciousness toward system reform, social justice, and society’s transformation. Dewey (1916) and Freire (1972) both fueled ideas about learning through service and engagement with others; this is a foundational premise of service learning.

Giles and Eyler (1994) authored one of the most important contributions to the practice of service learning in higher education, which traces its modern roots back to the 1980s, with significant expansion in the 1990s to the current day (Saltmarsh & Hartley, 2017). Giles and Eyler (1994) acknowledged the tension in service learning between a movement of action-oriented practitioners and a field undergirded by theory and scholarship. They observed that the practice had great promise but that this promise would only be advanced by empirical research. For the advancement of service learning to be actualized, it would need to be more aligned with higher education’s academic core. That same year, the first journal focused on service learning research was established (Howard, 1994).

**Service learning pedagogy.** Over the past three decades, service learning has grown in its theoretical base, as a field, and as an area of inquiry. Today it represents a significant component of broader university engagement activities as a pedagogy that bolsters student academic learning (Eyler, 2002; Furco & Billig, 2002; Giles & Eyler,
1994; Sandmann, 2007), and as a vehicle to deepen civic learning (Saltmarsh & Hartley, 2011; Weerts & Freed, 2016). Service learning requires students to engage with community concerns and challenges them through direct or indirect engagement with community partners (Furco, 1996; Giles & Eyler, 1994). Even though it can be ongoing engagement, it is more commonly of limited duration—such as a semester or other short-term project period—and can be course-based, co-curricular, or similar credit-bearing experience.

A key element of service learning is reflection. This activity facilitates students to connect their experience with concepts, toward increased understanding or other transformation to use in future experiences. This reflection distinguishes service learning from community service or similar volunteer experiences (Eyler, 2002; Jacoby, 2014). It is important to notice that all of these heavily cited descriptions of service learning place primary emphasis on student learning. This point is significant since community benefit, which is essential to the construct of reciprocity and mutual benefit on which service learning is premised, is largely de-emphasized or even absent. This emphasis on student benefit above community benefit endures into current practice, and this ongoing uncertainty about the extent to which service learning can be reciprocal when used as a pedagogy for student learning is a key driver for this evaluation research.

**Tensions in service learning pedagogy.** In practice, service learning is used to describe a multitude of activities that can be summarized as emphasizing both service and learning, with an undefined balance between the two (Furco, 1996; Sigmon, 1994; Stoecker, 2014). It can occur within courses and in co-curricular structures, be one-time or longer-term in duration, be direct or indirect service, be tied to specific curricula or
content or focused on a particular issue or personal learning goal, and be oriented toward social change or response to concerning symptoms of societal problems. These inclusive, or lack of refined, operational distinctions have important implications for the design, process, and outcomes of service learning, including the benefits derived for university and community partners.

Multiple scholars have offered critiques that service learning is too often aligned with a missionary ideology, paternalism, and a charity lens (Marullo & Edwards, 2000; Moore & Lin, 2009; Weah, Simmons, & Hall, 2000). Additionally, scholars have questioned the philosophical underpinnings of service learning, which deploys students with relatively undeveloped skills and expertise to work with marginalized populations or to provide advice to seasoned professionals working within communities (Blouin & Perry, 2009; Stoecker & Tryon, 2009).

Marullo and Edwards (2000) proffered the argument that students who engage in service learning as acts of charity, focused solely on meeting immediate needs of those with fewer resources, intentionally or unintentionally maintain the status quo and ensure that the immediate needs the student sought to address would continue in perpetuity. The orientation of the service learning activity toward societal change is an important tension in service learning. Particularly important is the degree to which the focus of the activities is neutral regarding race and systems of injustice or place a central focus on social change. This distinction is particularly important as it may result in different learning outcomes than intended for students engaged in service learning (Butin, 2003).

A formative work by Mitchell (2008) highlighted and explicated this tension in service learning. Mitchell (2008) conducted a meta-analysis of service learning literature
primarily from the 1990s and 2000s and concluded that service learning falls “into two camps—a traditional approach that emphasizes service without attention to systems of inequality, and a critical approach that is unapologetic in its aim to dismantle structures of injustice” (p. 50). Although other scholars named the concept of critical service learning or critical community service (Rhoads, 1998; Rice & Pollack, 2000; Rosenberger, 2000), this Mitchell’s (2008) work is widely regarded as the genesis for critical service learning theory. As pedagogy, critical service learning includes student service and reflection and an assumption of mutuality consistent with earlier service learning literature (Furco, 1996; Giles & Eyler, 1994). However, Mitchell contends that service must go beyond simply helping those in need, to specifically focus on and interrogate the root causes of the need for service in the first place, as well as the social power dynamics that place students in the position of helpers. Through prompts, questions, and content materials examining antecedents for the symptoms of racial and economic inequities, this critical approach aims for students to move beyond the dominant narrative about individual responsibility and failings as causes for issues such as poverty and incarceration, toward understanding how systems of oppression play a role in shaping personal choices and outcomes. Critical service learning is squarely rooted in social change. It, like other forms of critical pedagogy, seeks to connect theory and practice to empower students to identify, interrogate, and take action to change systems of oppression (Mahoney, 2016).

Mitchell’s (2008) critique is aligned with other scholars who have advanced concerns about the danger of service learning as typically practiced by predominantly White faculty at predominantly White universities, where service most often deploys
predominantly White students with undeveloped skills to engage with communities of color with the aim of developing increased understanding and respect for difference (Butin, 2003; Green, 2003; Mitchell, Donahue, & Young-Law, 2012; Stoecker & Tryon, 2009). Many of the concerns raised by critical scholars focus on the pedagogical flaws of service learning, as designed around meeting the learning needs of predominantly White students, at the expense of students of color and community partners. Without appropriate scaffolding, service learning can reinforce previously held stereotypes and prejudices and undermine intended outcomes while creating isolation or stigma for students of color whose identities are often ignored or tokenized (Butin, 2003; Mitchell et al., 2012).

These critiques and analyses advance the notion that service learning is not a universally beneficial practice and that the specific methods, design, and execution matter greatly in achieving the intended benefit for both students and communities. Like other major research universities and the vast majority of all universities and colleges in the United States, UM is what critical scholars have described as an historically White college or university (Allen, Epps, & Haniff, 1991; Brunsma, Brown, & Placier, 2012) with history, traditions, iconography, curriculum, and policies designed by Whites for Whites. Related, concerns about the ways in which the White racial identities of faculty and students impact the efficacy of service learning for university and community partners are particularly relevant to the setting for this evaluation.

**Summary of Impacts on Students**

An important premise of this evaluation is that a disproportionate volume of research has been conducted on how service learning benefits students. In the following
sections, I seek to provide both verification of the robust body of research on student benefits as well as more closely examine some specific student impacts.

From its beginning, service learning has been heralded as an important vehicle for student learning, and a multitude of studies have examined the impact of service learning on students across an array of disciplines. A large majority of studies indicate that service learning contributes to modest but significant positive impacts on students, including increased academic learning and retention, civic learning and commitment, identity development and intercultural competency, and personal and professional skill-building (Astin, Vogelsang, Ikeda, & Yee, 2000; Butin, 2003; Celio, Durlak, Dymnicki, 2011; Eyler, Giles, Stenson, & Gray, 2001; Kilgo, 2015; Kuh, 2008; Warren, 2012).

The following is a review of heavily cited, primarily peer-reviewed studies. As discussed previously, there is a lack of unified operational definition for service learning, and, as a result, the literature reviewed includes a multitude of settings and mechanisms for assessing student impacts based on how each researcher defined and implemented service learning. Given the context for this evaluation—within a community engagement center that engages students in a wide array of service learning activities—considering a diversity of definitions and assessment methods can be instructive. These studies speak to the benefits derived by students as a result of their participation in service learning, which directly aligns with my second evaluation question, examining the extent to which University partners benefit from service learning partnerships supported by the UM Ginsberg Center. Although students are not a central focus of this study, the significant existing base of research documenting student benefit serves as a driver for faculty and staff to engage in service learning, and thus, is explored in this literature review.
It is important to note that a common constraint of most of the studies presented in this section is that they do not account for the type or quality of service learning, such as the setting for service, the amount and quality of reflection incorporated, or the design of the course or program. Additionally, though some studies attempt to mediate the impacts of the practice to understand why it is effective, there is still more examination needed to fully understand why service learning is an effective pedagogy (Warren, 2012). The review of the literature highlighted the need for future inquiry into the efficacy of service learning as a strategy that benefits students; however, this evaluation research does not include this as a focus.

**Retention and college completion.** Service learning is positively associated with college completion and retention, though relatively few studies have closely examined this relationship. Several medium- to large-scale quantitative studies with participant group sizes ranging from 140 to 2,300 students have connected student participation in service learning to persistence in college and higher rates of graduation (Bringle et al., 2010; Gallini & Moely, 2003; Lockeman & Pelco, 2013; Mungo, 2017). All but Mungo’s (2017) study compared students who participated in service learning courses with a specific control group who did not participate. Mediating factors related to student perception of academic challenge have been established as essential to academic persistence, with effects diminishing or being negated when contact with faculty or lack of time spent on course content was removed. Student perception of academic challenge was particularly important in the quantitative study conducted by Gallini and Moely (2003) as they found that the positive but small effect size of .27 decreased substantially when students indicated a lack of academic challenge, such as time devoted to the course,
reflecting on course content outside of class, and expectations of learning, all compared to their non-service learning courses. This finding points to the importance of ensuring that faculty attend to course design that intentionally integrates service learning experiences with rigorous course content and objectives.

The quantitative studies referenced above vary in the robustness of methods including control groups, considering pre-course variables, and clearly defining and distinguishing the service learning course design. Presenting the largest effect size of .8, Mungo’s (2017) examination of service learning appears to be the weakest in methodology and analysis, as it does not account for any mediating or moderating factors in establishing the effect for graduation rates for students who participated compared to those who did not. Additionally, Mungo did not use a specific control group but rather used general enrollment data to compare with the participant group. Table 1 provides a summary of sampled research studies examining the service learning outcomes related to college student retention and completion.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author(s)</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Main conclusions</th>
<th>Effect Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bringle, Hatcher, &amp; Muthiah</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>805</td>
<td>Increased retention</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gallini &amp; Moely</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>Increased retention</td>
<td>.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lockeman &amp; Pelco</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>832</td>
<td>Increased graduation rate</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mungo</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>2,728</td>
<td>Increased graduation rate</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Cognitive and academic gains.** Findings from studies on cognitive and academic benefits of service learning for students is mixed. Even though multiple studies have found positive cognitive development or academic outcomes for students engaged in service learning (Astin & Sax, 1998; Astin et al., 2000; Eyler & Giles, 1999; Kilgo, Ezell Sheets, & Pascarella, 2015; Mungo, 2017; Reising, Allen, & Hall, 2006; Sedlak,
Doheny, Panthofer, & Anaya, 2010; Strage, 2000; Warren, 2012), many of the studies had small effect sizes. Others have found no benefit (Kilgo, Pasquesi, Ezell Sheets, & Pascarella, 2014). Table 2 provides a summary of sampled research studies examining the service learning outcomes related to college student cognitive development and academic achievement.

In a major quantitative study on the academic gains attributable to service learning, Astin and Sax (1998) analyzed data from 3,450 students across 42 liberal arts colleges through the national Cooperative Institutional Research Program and College Student Survey instruments, for four first-year cohorts and a follow-up survey of a sampling of each cohort. The researchers used data from the surveys to determine that about two-thirds of students had participated in service during college and used the one-third non-participants as the control group. They further controlled for key variables such as pre-college service participation and college entrance scores and found that students participating in service had small but positive outcomes in all 10 academic outcome areas measured, including grade point average, increase in general knowledge, and increase in disciplinary knowledge. The study examined specific sectors for service, including education, human services, public safety, and environment placements. Although this study was important in demonstrating the benefits of student participation in service, the effect sizes ranged from .03 to .2 for each of the academic outcomes was small. Additionally, this study looked at service overall, including but not exclusive of service learning.

Strage (2000) examined service learning specifically, conducting a mixed methods analysis of several semesters of students in the same child development course,
to compare academic performance in one semester of 166 students who participated in a service learning design compared to 309 students in three semesters where service learning was not incorporated. Strage (2000) found that students enrolled in the service learning semester gained more mastery of course content, measured through scores on class exams, particularly on essays within the exams, with an effect size of .03, the difference between the group test scores was minimal. Additionally, she found that students were more reflective about the ways in which course content manifests in practice. There are several potential issues with this study, including potential improvements from one semester to the next related to the service learning course design that occurred. Additionally, since the non-essay components of the exams were consistent across student groups, it is important to consider whether the instructor/researcher was biased when judging these more subjective elements to be superior.

In addition to Strage’s (2000) work, Lockeman and Pelco (2013) conducted a quantitative study to examine the relationship between service learning and college completion, including academic gains as measured by student GPA. They found that students who participated in service learning earned higher GPAs than those who did not, with an effect size of .40, indicating a moderate effect for students who participated in service learning over those who did not. Most recently, Mungo (2017) used a quantitative, retrospective study and found that students who participated in service learning courses finished their college careers with higher grade point averages than their peers who did not enroll. Unlike her somewhat simple analysis of graduation rates, as described in the previous section, her analysis of grade point average did include mediating and moderating factors such as pre-college GPA and ACT test scores. Mungo
(2017) concluded that students who participated in service learning classes graduated with higher GPAs than those who did not participate, but the effect size of .16 was small.

Another large-scale study by Kilgo et al. (2014) found no positive links between critical thinking skills and cognition. The study analyzed several student outcomes using longitudinal data and found positive links to other outcomes for students who participated in service learning. The findings indicated that increased critical thinking skills and the need for cognition, however, were not among them. This robust quantitative study provided analysis considering multiple moderating variables, such as gender, major, pre-college experiences, and college experiences.

Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author(s)</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Main conclusions</th>
<th>Effect Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Astin &amp; Sax</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>3,450</td>
<td>Increased GPA</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Increased field knowledge</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kilgo, Pasquesi, Sheets, &amp; Pascarella</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>1,852</td>
<td>Decreased need for cognition</td>
<td>-.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Decreased critical thinking</td>
<td>-.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lockman &amp; Pelco</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>832</td>
<td>Increased GPA</td>
<td>.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mungo</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>2,728</td>
<td>Increased GPA</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strage</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>Higher test scores</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. GPA = Grade Point Average*

**Social responsibility and civic attitudes.** The promise of deepening students’ social responsibility, and habits of and commitment to citizenship and democratic processes and outcomes are at the heart of the purpose of service learning. Accordingly, the link between service learning and civic-related student impacts and outcomes are among the most important in the field and the body of literature. Multiple quantitative research studies have found that student participation in service learning does indeed lead to increased social responsibility, citizenship skills, teamwork skills, and supportive attitudes toward social responsibility (Eyler et al., 2001; Finley, 2011; Gallini & Moely, 2003; Moely, McFarland, Miron, Mercer, & Illustre, 2002; Strage, 2000). Table 3
provides a summary of sampled research studies examining the service learning outcomes related to college student civic learning and social responsibility.

In a well-known early study, Eyler et al. (1997) conducted a quantitative comparative analysis of pre- and post-semester surveys of 1,140 undergraduate students who participated in service learning and 404 students who did not. They found that student participants had small but significant increased predictors of citizenship, including attributes such as connection and commitment to the community, increased perceptions of efficacy in working with others to influence social change, and increased the likelihood to identify social problems originating with systems instead of individuals. The effect size for each was small at less than 0.1. Additionally, the study did not account for student experiences and backgrounds when comparing service learning and non-service learning outcomes and, therefore, it is possible that students in the non-service learning control group participated in other forms of service learning.

Moely et al. (2002) conducted a similar comparative study of civic commitment for students engaged in service learning, examining 217 students who engaged in service learning and 324 who had not. In a covariance analysis comparing pre- and post-tests, they found that students who participated indicated an increased commitment to future civic action, increased attitudes toward social justice, and increased agreement that societal factors affect individual outcomes, as compared to students who did not participate. The effect size of less than 0.2 was small.

As discussed in the previous section, a large-scale study by Kilgo et al. (2014) examined several outcomes by comparing students who participated in service learning to
those who did not. They found a weak effect size (.1), but a significant link between service learning and social and political involvement.

A more recent small-scale study by Blankson, Rochester, and Watkins (2015) examined service learning-related civic outcomes for 44 students at a historically Black college. This study is important since all previous major studies, including those cited within this section, have been conducted at colleges and universities with majority White student populations. Blankson and colleagues (2015) administered a validated pre- and post-course survey using convenience sampling to 44 students and compared results between students who participated in service learning courses and those who did not. Their examination found no link between participation in service learning and civic attitudes, but did find a link to increased political awareness and civic action. There are significant constraints to these findings including the small sample size, different types of service learning engagement by students studied, and the potential for bias in the sampling methods.

Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author(s)</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Main conclusions</th>
<th>Effect Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Blankson, Rochester, and</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>Increased commitment to civic action</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watkins</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No increase in other civic attitudes</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eyler, Giles, &amp; Braxton</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>1,540</td>
<td>Increased systems orientation</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Increased political action</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Increased commitment to social justice</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kilgo, Pasquesi, Sheets, &amp;</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>1,852</td>
<td>Increased social &amp; political involvement</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pascarella</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moely, McFarland, Miron,</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>541</td>
<td>Increased commitment to civic action</td>
<td>.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mercer, &amp; Ilustre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Increased social justice attitudes</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Increased systems orientation</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* ns = Not Significant
**Intercultural learning.** Service learning is called upon to enhance intercultural learning for university students, many of whom will experience diverse environments for the first time when they go to college, and when they go to work after college. Therefore, providing students with increased opportunities to confront bias, clarify values, and test theories about justice can improve students’ intercultural learning (Mitchell, 2008). Numerous contributions to the service learning literature have linked it to students’ social and personal identity development, intercultural development, and increased racial understanding (Astin & Sax, 1998; Eyler et al., 1997; Finley, 2011; Kilgo, 2015; Mitchell, 2013). Table 4 provides a summary of sampled research studies examining the service learning outcomes related to college student intercultural learning.

Kilgo (2015) conducted a large-scale longitudinal pre- and post-test study of 1,934 undergraduate students from 17 universities. This quantitative study found that service learning was linked to intercultural effectiveness. The total effect size was small at .16. However, when indirect mediating factors were present—including academic challenge, integrative learning, past diversity experiences, and positive interactions with diverse peers—the effect size was .45, showing a more substantial effect when other factors are present. While the study did not control for the specific type of experience in which students engaged, it offers potential cues to design service learning experiences.

Mitchell (2013) conducted a small qualitative study of 11 students engaged in a curricular multi-semester service learning fellowship to examine the relationship between service learning, meaning-making, and understanding of social justice. Through interviews and analysis of course assignments, Mitchell (2013) used a constant
comparative method to conclude that participants who participated in service learning made progress on social justice sense-making.

As discussed in the previous section, Eyler et al. (1997) conducted a comparative quantitative analysis of pre- and post-semester surveys of 1,140 undergraduate students who participated in service learning and 404 students who did not. They found that student participants had a small but significant increase in perspective-taking and openness to new views and information, compared to their non-service learning peers.

Becker and Paul (2015) conducted a qualitative study of 93 students engaged in four service learning courses, analyzing the extent to which their participation in service learning was linked to challenging or entrenching stereotypes around race. Through course assignments and reflections, they found that racial stereotyping was prevalent among White students, but less so with Black students, regardless of course design.

Table 4

Sample Studies of Effects on Student Intercultural Learning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author(s)</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Main conclusions</th>
<th>Effect Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Becker &amp; Paul</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>No effect on color-blind racism</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eyler, Giles, &amp; Braxton</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>1,540</td>
<td>Increased perspective-taking</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kilgo</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>1,934</td>
<td>Open to new views &amp; information</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitchell</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Increased intercultural efficacy</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. N/A designates a qualitative study, thus no available effect size*

Considerations for Faculty

Faculty are a critical part of service learning, serving as both central instigators of the opportunity, and mediators for learning for students (Eyler & Giles, 1999). Their use of the pedagogy fits within the larger debated construct of community-engaged scholarship and growing examination, including small and large-scale research studies of accelerators, deterrents, rewards, and cautions for faculty who participate in service
learning (Abes et al., 2002; Bloomgarden & O’Meara, 2007; Butin, 2003; Cooper, 2014; Furco, 2001; Hartline, 2017; Post, Ward, Longo, & Saltmarsh, 2016; Pribbenow, 2005; Saltmarsh et al., 2009; Sobrero, & Jayaratne, 2014; Thomas, 2019; Wurdienger & Allison, 2017).

**Benefit and motivation for engagement.** Faculty identified student benefits, including increased learning, commitment to citizenship, improved employment prospects, and excitement as a primary motivator for their engagement in service learning, and consistently expresses the belief that engagement with and in community settings is an important part of an undergraduate education (Butin, 2012). Personal commitment to the community, opportunities for multidisciplinary learning, interest in engaged pedagogy, and encouragement from peers or students were other consistent motivations identified by faculty from a social science, humanities, and science, technology, and engineering disciplines (Abes et al., 2002; Bloomgarden & O’Meara, 2007; Butin, 2006; Cooper, 2014; Pribbenow, 2005; Sobrero, & Jayaratne, 2014).

There is very little empirical evidence of the ways in which faculty benefit from service learning. However, Hou (2010) contributed greatly to what is known about faculty benefits by developing and disseminating a quantitative online inventory measuring faculty perceptions of benefits and barriers from service learning. Analyzing survey responses from 362 faculty respondents from major research institutions in the southern U.S., Hou compared responses to the inventory of the 102 faculty who use service learning and the 260 who did not. She found that faculty employing service learning reported more benefits in the classroom and the community, while non-service learning faculty reported more barriers in the classroom. These benefits were again
reflected in a study by Driscoll (2014), who conducted a document review of applications from 120 colleges and universities who successfully applied for a Carnegie Classification for Community Engagement, a distinction that affirms an institutional commitment to community engagement. In response to questions in the application about the impacts of community engagement on faculty, the two most common responses were improved pedagogy and increased student learning.

**Barriers to engagement.** Hou’s (2010) study, described above, found that both faculty that used service learning pedagogy and those who did not identify institutional barriers with tenure and promotion as a reason faculty do not participate in service learning. The study drew primarily from tenured and tenure-track faculty, which could have resulted in sampling bias since this group, compared to non-tenure-track faculty, typically has different requirements and foci, especially related to teaching and research. Despite this potential sampling bias, further understanding how institutional tenure and promotion policies and practices impact faculty is important and directly related to my second evaluation question, which examines the extent to which University partners, including faculty, benefit from engagement with community partners.

Eddy (2010) provides instructive framing for faculty who engage in community-university partnerships, encouraging them to consider how their partnership efforts and time commitment will be incorporated into the university reward structure. This framing is particularly important since faculty concerns about the lack of department or institutional support for service learning in the tenure and promotion process was the most frequently identified reason they do not engage in service learning (Bloomgarden & O’Meara, 2007). Peer discouragement and the financial resources required for service
learning and community engagement were also identified as barriers (Abes et al., 2002; Bloomgarden & O’Meara, 2007; Butin, 2005; Cooper, 2014; Sobrero, & Jayaratne, 2014). Service learning also requires more flexibility and adaptability in course planning for faculty, since each engagement varies based on changing contexts, needs, priorities, and capacities on campus and within communities. This need for flexibility creates an increased time commitment for professional development and preparation (Abes et al., 2002; Ostrander, 2004).

Community Partner Experience and Impact

A growing number of scholars have criticized service learning pedagogy for its neglect of community partners, noting the dearth of focused examination of community benefits involved in service learning partnerships (Bloomgarden, 2017; Butin, 2003, 2006; Cruz & Giles, 2000; Geller, Zuckerman, & Seidel, 2016; Soria, Mitchell, & Nobbe, 2016; Stoecker, 2016; Stoecker & Tryon, 2009). Even though the examination of the theory and practice are still heavily weighted toward university interests, and student benefits, in particular, there has been an uptick in the body of research focused on understanding outcomes and experiences for community partners who engage with universities through service learning. This examination is a part of my evaluation research, with my first research question looking directly at community partner benefit, and my third question examining equity for community partners in service learning partnerships.

**Community partner outcomes and impacts.** What changes for a community partner as a result of partnership with a university? This critical question provides a focus for the field and this evaluation research. Driscoll’s (2014) Carnegie Classification
of Community Engagement study, referenced earlier, found that while nearly all applicants were authentically assessing how students were impacted by community engagement, far fewer were assessing community impacts. Also, those who responded most often reported isolated anecdotes or outputs, rather than impacts or outcomes.

Several researchers have conducted small scale studies in a growing attempt to understand the answer to this question (Bushouse, 2005; James & Logan, 2016; Oberg De La Garza & Moreno Kuri, 2014; Schmidt & Robby, 2002). These studies are limited in scale, as they focus on one or just a few community partners, but they provide important insight into how some are trying to answer this question of community partner benefit. For example, interviews with nonprofit partners who engaged with service learning projects in a nonprofit management course were asked about the usefulness of the engagement, as measured by whether they implemented recommendations or reports generated by the students (Bushouse, 2005). Ten of the 11 respondents indicated that the student recommendations or reports were useful. Two other published studies looked at outcomes for elementary students who received tutoring from college students engaged through service learning (Oberg De La Garza & Moreno Kuri, 2014; Schmidt & Robby, 2002). The studies diverged in their findings related to the community benefits derived. On the one hand, Oberg, De La Garza, and Moreno Kuri (2014) administered validated reading assessments at the beginning and end of the project period and found no increase in reading proficiency for a tutoring program explicitly geared toward reading gains for 39 elementary children. On the other hand, Schmidt and Robby (2002) compared validated reading and math assessment scores at the beginning and end of the school year for two groups, some of whom receive tutoring and some who did not, representing 506
second- through sixth-grade students deemed to have low reading or math proficiency. Their findings indicated gains in both reading and math for the 160 elementary students tutored, which were the primary aims of the tutoring program.

More recently, James and Logan (2016) conducted an exploratory mixed methods case study of a graduate-level service learning course examining community impact to explore the impacts of community-university partnerships for community partners. They built on the construct developed by Gelmon, Holland, Driscoll, Spring, and Kerrigan (2001), which included capacity-building, economic, and social benefits for community partners in service learning partnerships. Through theming and analysis of interviews with community partners and their clients, James and Logan (2016) adapted the framework of Gelmon et al. (2001) categorizing community partner impacts into capacity-building, economic, social, and adding the category of personal benefits. Table 5 provides a summary of these categories and elements, adapted from James and Logan (2016, pp. 20, 24). While this study is limited in its generalizability due to its limited participation of only one service learning partner and a selection of clients of the partner, it provides helpful framing for considering the types of potential benefits for community partners. This framing can be helpful to begin to develop a more generalizable model for determining specific goals to work toward in service learning partnerships, enabling small scale studies to contribute to a larger understanding of the ways in which community partners benefit. This work has informed the interview protocol for this evaluation research, specifically related to the evaluation question examining community benefits.
Table 5

Categories and Examples of Beneficial Impacts for Community Partners

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of impact</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capacity building</td>
<td>• Types of service offered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Number of clients served</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Variety of activities offered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Increased understanding of assets and needs (of itself; its clients)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic benefits</td>
<td>• Identify and hire new staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Identification of funding opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Completion of projects that the organizations would typically have to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>purchase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social benefits</td>
<td>• Identify new connections and networks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Increase in number of volunteers after the close of the project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Tangible improvement on community issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal benefits</td>
<td>• Professional growth: contributing to educating students toward future</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>community impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Learned new skill or knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Developed new connections for personal network</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Adapted from Gelmon et al. (2001) and James & Logan (2016).

Engagement experience and process. Relatively few studies have looked at how community partners view their experiences and relationships with their university partners in service learning partnerships and the extent to which they found value in the engagement (Blouin & Perry, 2009; Miron & Moely, 2006; Sandy & Holland, 2006). Through interviews with more than 150 community partners in total, these qualitative studies had consistent findings. Overall, partners in each of these studies indicated that their service learning partnerships were worthwhile, though they reported both positive and negative experiences with students and faculty. Themes that emerged from partners generally fall into categories of benefits and costs. Benefits identified included extra labor from students, in some cases increasing the number of clients that could be served; fresh perspectives from students; and access to university resources by opening access to other university partnerships (Blouin & Perry, 2009; Miron & Moely, 2006; Sandy & Holland, 2006). Costs included risk associated with young and relatively unskilled labor, especially for organizations working with vulnerable populations and investing time and
resources toward orienting and training students who often do not deliver corresponding value. Community partners indicated that process factors such as class schedule, lack of student commitment and training, misaligned or unclear course goals, communication, and limitations of the academic calendar negatively influenced their perceptions and held negative implications for the longevity of the ongoing partnership (Blouin & Perry, 2009; Miron & Moely, 2006; Sandy & Holland, 2006). While these studies represent important and consistent contributions to our understanding of community partners’ perceptions and experiences with service learning partnerships, they represent a relatively small sample, date back a decade or more, and do not focus on equity in the partnership. Additional partner interviews and related data collection, including data that focuses on equity in community and university partnerships, will add to our understanding.

Still, the findings point to the potential relationship between positive process and beneficial outcomes. Based on this potential, attending to and improving the engagement process is essential, including equity in university and community partner voice, project co-creation based on community-identified needs, consistent student preparation that attends to identity and cultural competence, effective communication, follow-through, extending beyond the academic calendar, and maintaining longevity in relationship as being important to effective service learning partnerships (Bennett, Sunderland, Bartleet, & Power, 2016; Blouin & Perry, 2009; Cruz & Giles, 2000; Miron & Moely, 2006; Sandy & Holland, 2006; Stoecker, 2016; Stoecker & Tryon, 2009). Weighing in from the tradition of community-based participatory research, Schultz, Israel, and Lantz (2003) contributed to our understanding of the importance of attending to partnerships as a means to improve effectiveness and benefit. In their examination of community-based
participatory research partnerships, they offered a conceptual framework for determining partnership effectiveness by understanding partner perceptions of goal achievement; personal, organizational, and community benefits; the extent of partner involvement; shared ownership and cohesiveness/commitment; and degree of partner and community empowerment. This evaluation study places partner perceptions at the center of understanding benefit for community and university partners in partnerships brokered by the Ginsberg Center.

**Considerations of Equity**

I have reviewed literature examining the foundations, strengths, challenges, and hallmarks of service learning and broader university-community partnerships. Mutual benefit is a key element of reciprocal university engagement with communities, including engagement through service learning (Bennett et al., 2016; Mitchell, 2008). Beyond this concept of mutuality, consideration of equity is also important.

**Equity as a concept and goal.** As discussed in Chapter 1, for the purpose of examining equitable benefit in service learning partnerships, equity does not mean equal; instead, the focus is whether a fair amount of benefit is distributed or achieved based on considerations such as need, effort, or ability to contribute (Blanchard, 1986). This notion of fair distribution, including the focus of this research on service learning partnerships, is drawn largely from public administration tradition and literature concerned with social equity (Frederickson, 1990, 2010). Social equity is premised on the idea that all people have equal and inalienable rights and is conceptualized as fairness of systems, policies, and decision-makers in the distribution of public goods, services, and resources within and between societal groups (Frederickson, 2010; Gooden, 2015;
Guy & McCandless, 2012; Woolridge & Gooden, 2009). In this tradition, equity has become a core value of public policy-making and administration, along with the values of economy, efficiency, effectiveness. Given that the Ginsberg Center is a part of a public university that receives direct state appropriations of tax funds with a governing board elected through statewide elections, understanding toward ensuring equity is of central importance in determining merit and worth.

Social equity is primarily a normative concept in that it puts forth notions about what should be and what is right and fair, based on shared values. Determining the presence or lack of equity—especially the fair distribution of resources across socio-economic class, gender, physical and mental capacities, geographic location, or other groupings—is based on a socially constructed reality (Reynolds, 2014; Thomas, 2019). This premise of mutuality and fairness creates difficulty in empirically determining or measuring equity since there are multiple perspectives on what is fair. However, Osterle (2002) suggests three important considerations in determining how to establish equity goals or standards, including what resources or burdens should be shared; between or among whom; and the mechanisms or principles by which the resources and burdens will be shared. Once those goals are determined, Regens and Rycroft (1986) provide two avenues by which to understand achievement or progress. They discuss two forms of equity, procedural and substantive. Procedural equity examines the process or procedures of equity, including elements such as fairness, access, inclusion, and respect; substantive equity examines the actual distribution or outcomes related to costs and benefits that result from the equity process. Regens and Rycroft’s procedural concept of equity provides a basis for research question 3 in this examination of equity in university
and community partnerships as it seeks to measure fairness or related process issues in these partnerships related, but not exclusive, to the helpfulness (outcome) of the expected service or deliverable.

**Equity in university-community engagement.** A search of the literature of equity and higher education returns scholarship largely focused on the fairness and distribution of students’—and to a lesser extent, faculty—equal access to programming and achievement within colleges and universities. The focus of research and programs in this vein focus on barriers and accelerators for gaining access and persisting, in order to obtain credentials that provide individuals with economic and social capital advantages or private good, in contrast to examining the ways in which universities promote equity for those beyond university boundaries and purview, also known as public good (Brennan & Naidoo, 2008). This latter notion of universities and the public good was introduced earlier in this chapter and is particularly relevant to this exploration of equity in university engagement with communities. This research responds to a central and continuing question about who benefits in university engagements with communities.

The literature on university engagement with communities through service learning partnerships includes an increased focus on the need for equity in these partnerships. For now, scholarship related to community-based research provides a helpful foundation when considering and promoting equity in university engagement with communities. Unlike service learning, which, as discussed previously, is primarily a pedagogy for educating students and was not created to change communities, community-based research developed to serve as a vehicle to advance community and social change (Jason & Glenwick, 2016).
University researchers engaged in this approach are more likely to recognize that community partners are drivers and co-creators of problem identification and knowledge discovery. Community-based research is fundamentally an approach to university and community partnership that begins outside the university and focuses on the development of process and product that will be valuable to community members, and thus requires cultural humility and commitment on the part of university partners (Minkler, 2005). The “outside-in” service model of the Ginsberg Center, which begins by listening to the interests and challenges of community partners, is consistent with this approach (UM Edward Ginsberg Center, 2016).

Although service learning literature specifically focused on equity is still emerging, some scholarship speaks to inequities in service learning partnerships (Bortolin, 2011; Stoecker, 2016). Bortolin (2011) conducted a discourse analysis of articles in a community-engaged research journal over two years from 2008-2010 and found that university interests and agency are privileged over that of communities. Specific themes were identified through coding and analysis of the word “community” within each article. The highlighted themes identified included community as the means by which the university enhances its academic work, community as the recipient of influence by the university, community as a place which the university makes better, and community as a factor in the financial interests of the university. A potential weakness of Bortolin’s (2011) study is the sampling method used. A randomly selected group of 10 examples of the use of the word was selected from each article, rather than analyzing every instance of its use. While this sampling made the analysis more feasible, it is not clear that the sampling is representative of the additional hundreds of instances the word
was used. Despite this potential weakness, these findings are important as they reinforce questions about the imbalance toward university interests over communities in service learning (Bortolin, 2011).

**Power and resource distribution.** Understanding power is fundamental to realizing equity in university and community partnerships. In order to move toward balanced benefit and equity in university and community engagement, including procedural equity in service learning partnerships, it is important to understand that inequalities in power in individuals and organizations impact relationships (Ocasio, 2017). In the case of university and community partnerships, power differences are enabled by an imbalance of resources such as funding and time, social factors such as class and identity, and fundamental assumptions about the origin and ownership of knowledge; all of these factors typically privilege universities, including their faculty, staff, and student actors, over communities (Dempsey, 2010; Wallerstein & Duran, 2003).

Knowledge genesis and ownership is of particular importance in university engagement with communities. History, dominant narratives, and cultural norms presume that university and scholarly knowledge are superior and of higher value than that within local communities (Fisher et al., 2004; Preece, 2016). Resting disproportionate authorship in the direction of service learning—including the power to know, name, prioritize, and tell the story—within universities serves to silence community perspectives, interests, and contributions while perpetuating university power and privilege. Deep cultural expectations about who is expert and has the authority to know are perhaps the most fundamental influence on the ways universities engage with
communities, including who gets to initiate and frame the parameters for engagement, and the extent to which attention and benefits are understood and prioritized for each partner. Privileging of knowledge within the university and accompanying meaning-making are almost always in the hands of the university actors. Service learning partnerships are no exception; and attention to dialogue and collaboration through participatory, feminist, and qualitative and comparable methods are suggested as means to equalize power and voice in university community engagements (Dodson & Piatelli, 2007; Preece, 2016).

Power, and especially attending to the power of knowing, informs the delivery model and theory of change for the Ginsberg Center and also informs the purpose and methodology of this evaluation. Research questions 1 and 3 explore this concept.

**Summary**

Even though it is a fundamental assumption of service learning that it is mutually beneficial, that university academic and other central interests can be advanced while advancing the interests of the community organizations with which students engage, current empirical understanding of this mutuality in benefit is imbalanced. The degree to which this benefit is equitable, that is both university and community partners get their fair share of benefits is even less examined in current service learning and related community engagement scholarship. A relatively robust body of research exists that demonstrates significant positive impacts on students who participate in service learning (Astin et al., 2000; Butin, 2003; Celio et al., 2011; Eyler et al., 2001; Kilgo, 2015; Warren, 2012) and a small but growing body of research with consistent findings exists on faculty involvement with service learning (Abes et al., 2002; Bloomgarden &
O’Meara, 2007; Butin, 2006; Cooper, 2014; Furco, 2001; Hartline, 2017; Post et al., 2016; Pribbenow, 2005; Saltmarsh et al., 2009; Sobrero & Jayaratne, 2014; Thomas, 2019; Wurdinger & Allison, 2017). Illuminating, but relatively little research exists on experience or outcomes for community partners, including the degree to which they benefit (Blouin & Perry, 2009; Bushouse, 2005; James & Logan, 2016; Miron & Moely, 2006; Oberg De La Garza & Moreno Kuri, 2014; Sandy & Holland, 2006; Schmidt & Robby, 2002). Given the premise of service learning in achieving mutual benefit for students and community partners, there is a need to understand more fully whether this premise is valid. Further, given the prevailing relative imbalance in resources such as time, money, and formal education, and the power differentials that can result when university faculty, staff, and students work with community partners, there is a need to more fully understand the degree to which equity is perceived to be present in these interactions.
CHAPTER 3: METHODS

This chapter describes the explanatory sequential mixed methods evaluation plan, approach, and protocols in detail including data sources, participants, procedures for data collection, and process of analysis of both quantitative and qualitative data. Additionally, this chapter reviews the project timeline, researcher positionality, ethical considerations, and assumptions, limitations, and delimitations of this evaluation research.

The central purpose in conducting this program evaluation was to provide insight regarding benefit and equity in partnerships between UM and community organizations, including examination of Ginsberg Center’s role in brokering and supporting these partnerships. The evaluation used extant survey data collected by the Ginsberg Center from July 1, 2017, through July 31, 2019, as well as new semi-structured interview data to address the following evaluation research questions in seeking to determine the benefits of service learning partnerships for community and university partners, as well as the presence of equity in those partnerships:

1. To what extent and in what ways do community partners perceive benefit from service learning partnerships supported by the UM Ginsberg Center?

2. To what extent and in what ways do UM partners, particularly UM faculty and staff, perceive benefit from service learning partnerships supported by the UM Ginsberg Center?

3. To what extent is there perceived equity in university and community partnerships supported by the UM Ginsberg Center?
Evaluation Approach and Model

As defined by Fournier (2005), “evaluation is an applied inquiry process for collecting and synthesizing evidence that culminates in conclusions about…merit, worth, significance, or quality of a program” (p. 140). The findings, conclusions, and implications of this study contributes to informing and improving the work of the Ginsberg Center into the future.

I was the architect and commissioner of this study, which centers on an evaluation of service learning partnerships supported by the Ginsberg Center. To conduct the study, I led an evaluation team of trained professionals and graduate student staff from the Ginsberg Center. At its foundation, this evaluation was a form of social inquiry, and through it, as an evaluator, I sought to determine and advance social accountability in the work of the Ginsberg Center (Mertens, 2015; Mertens & Wilson, 2012). This examination comports with the purpose of evaluation, as it was fundamentally about advancing social accountability in UM’s engaged teaching and learning practice by examining questions of mutuality and equity in service learning partnerships. Accordingly, I utilized an evaluation research approach to examine the extent to which the Ginsberg Center is advancing mutual benefit and equity in service learning partnerships.

Paradigm and branch. This examination aligned most fully with the use branch of evaluation, commonly understood as being consistent with the pragmatic paradigm. This paradigm holds practical usefulness and common sense at its core and utilizes mixed-methods to collect data to seek and produce knowledge that is functionally useful (Mertens, 2015). Above all else, findings from this evaluation will be useful in informing
decisions about future practice and policies that advance benefit for both UM and community partners, as well as equity in partnerships. Further, following Mertens (2015), rather than seeking an objective truth or reality, this research focused on understanding multiple realities in service to finding how those different perspectives intersect toward shared action and accomplishment. Critically, pragmatism asserts that knowledge is important, but only to the extent that it informs results. This stance is particularly well-suited to my inquiry, which sought knowledge beyond the stated intention of service learning as producing mutual benefit, but more so to understand whether the outcome is actually beneficial, intended, and equitable for universities and communities.

**Study design.** Consistent with the use branch and the pragmatic paradigm, I used an explanatory mixed methods design to answer the evaluation questions. Extant quantitative data were used to determine the extent that benefit in service learning partnerships was perceived, and qualitative methods were employed to further explain perceived benefit and equity for participants, all in service to improving policy and practice. This mixed methods approach using multiple data sources provided a more holistic understanding of the evaluation questions and problems (Creswell, 2014; Mertler, 2017).

**Focused on examining select outcomes.** This evaluation was based on the CIPP evaluation model, which is useful to discover both the value of a program and opportunities for improving it (Stufflebeam, 2003). The CIPP model creates a framework for understanding the evaluand’s context, input, process, and products (also known as outcomes) in order to answer evaluation questions. These elements are reflected in
Figure 5 and in the Ginsberg Center Logic Model, included in Chapter 1, figure 2. The focus of this evaluation was on outcomes, related to service learning partnerships brokered and supported through UM’s Ginsberg Center. Specifically, the service learning outcomes examined through this evaluation included benefit for community partners; benefit for University partners, specifically focused on University faculty and staff; and the presence of equity in partnerships.

![Figure 5. Simplified CIPP model with Ginsberg Center outcomes identified.](image)

**Evaluation Team**

I was the lead evaluator and worked with a standing evaluation team that included two additional professional staff members and three graduate student staff from the Ginsberg Center. These staff assisted with coordinating, collecting, and analyzing the extant quantitative and qualitative survey data used in this evaluation. They also participated in coordinating, transcribing, and analyzing interview data. The additional professional staff members hold a Ph.D. and MSW, respectively, and have significant experience conducting research. One has extensive experience conducting and teaching data and evaluation methods and processes, as well as serving as the lead for a Ginsberg Center service learning initiative called Community Technical Assistance Collaborative, offering evaluation and data support to community partners. The team’s graduate student
staff members had foundational or advanced exposure to mixed methods research through coursework or co-curricular programs at UM. Participation in this evaluation project enabled them to apply and deepen their understanding of core evaluation concepts. In that sense, this evaluation served as a service learning project.

All team members were provided with background and the purpose of this evaluation, foundational readings and videos about evaluation and conducting and analyzing interviews (Curry, 2015; DeCuir-Gunbey, Marshall, & McCulloch, 2011; McNamara, 2002), and data analysis, including access to an online suite of professional development materials covering mixed methods research from Grand Canyon University (Grand Canyon University Center for Innovation in Research and Teaching, n.d.). Additionally, the evaluation team met regularly to plan, debrief, and reflect, and work collaboratively on project deliverables. Table 6 describes the evaluation team participation and duties related to this evaluation study.
### Table 6

**Roles and Responsibilities of the Evaluation Team**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Source &amp; Stage of Study</th>
<th>Description of Related Tasks</th>
<th>Person Responsible</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Survey (Extant)              | **Collection**  
Oversight in collection and analysis  
Sent email with the survey link to matched UM and community partners; follow-up sent to partners who did not respond  
Coordinated survey dissemination & collection | M. Callan, the researcher  
Student staff member  
A. Healy, a professional staff member |
|                              | **Analysis**  
For Quantitative Questions: Conducted descriptive statistical analysis for the nominal and ordinal quantitative survey data. Based on variances, ran bivariate analyses such as Pearson’s correlation coefficient tests, and t-tests to explore associations between each of the partner groups | B. Christy, a professional staff member, with M. Callan, the researcher |
|                              | For Qualitative Questions: Conducted thematic content analysis using constant comparison of the data collected through 3 open-ended survey questions to identify codes, patterns, and themes. | M. Callan, the researcher, with coding conducted in collaboration with student & professional staff |
| Interview (New)              | **Collection**  
Design, collection, analysis  
Identified a stratified maximum variation sample of partners to invite for a semi-structured interview based on extant survey findings  
Sent email inviting stratified maximum variation sample for an interview  
Scheduled interviews with at least 10 partners from each subgroup | M. Callan, the researcher  
Student staff member, with M. Callan, the researcher  
Student staff member |
|                              | **Analysis**  
Conducted semi-structured interview via telephone  
Coordinated interview data collection process  
Prepared transcripts of interviews  
Conducted thematic content analysis using constant comparison of the data, to identify codes, patterns, and themes. | M. Callan, the researcher  
A. Healy, professional staff member  
Student staff  
M. Callan, the researcher, with professional & student staff |
Study Participants

Evaluation participants included two partner subgroups who have engaged in 108 service learning partnerships brokered by the Ginsberg Center from July 1, 2017, through June 30, 2019, including UM faculty and staff external to the Ginsberg Center, and community partners. Community partner participants included staff from 24 nonprofits, five governmental organizations, five K-12 schools, and three other organized community groups external to UM. Additional brokered partnerships that did not include some form of student service learning were not included in this evaluation. Additionally, although some community organizations and faculty/staff were involved in more than one partnership, the Ginsberg Center sent only one survey per unique partner, rather than a survey for each partnership. The survey instrument is included as Appendix A.

Sixty-one community partners and 47 faculty/staff partners were invited to complete a survey and asked to respond based on their most recent partnership experience. Thirty-seven community partners completed surveys for a 61% response rate. Table 7 provides community partner participant descriptive data.

Table 7

Descriptive Data of 37 Community Partner Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type of Organization</td>
<td>Governmental Institution</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nonprofit Organization</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>62.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>K-12 School</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other Community Group</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Size</td>
<td>&lt; 10 Paid Staff</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>24.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10-50 Paid Staff</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>40.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>51-250 Paid Staff</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&gt; 250 Paid Staff</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In addition to community partner responses, 27 faculty/staff partners completed surveys for a response rate of 57%. Table 8 provides university faculty/staff partner participant descriptive data.

Table 8

Descriptive Data of 27 University Partner Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University Role</td>
<td>Faculty (Tenure, Clinical, Lecturer)</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Graduate Student Instructor/Researcher</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reason for Engagement*</td>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Research</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Service</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Some respondents selected more than one category.

Through the survey design, timing, reminder process, and assurance of confidentiality I sought to minimize non-response bias. The response rate for each type of community partner organization and UM partner was consistent with the proportion of each type of matched partners overall, indicating the absence of a non-response bias.

Based on the evaluation design, I used a stratified maximum variation sampling to collect qualitative data through semi-structured interviews from participants from each partner group who completed the online survey. Substantial saturation, the point at which no new concepts emerge, is largely reached by the sixth interview, depending on the heterogeneity of the participants (Hennink, Kaiser, & Marconi, 2017). In order to ensure substantial saturation, I used guidance from Creswell (2014) for qualitative data collection procedures and conducted 11 interviews for each participant subgroup.

In selecting the sample frame for interviews, and consistent with explanatory sequential mixed methods design (Creswell, 2014), I used survey responses to consider
and seek variation by the partner sub-group, type of project, perceived benefit of the engagement; type of community partner; and perception of equity in selecting participants for interviews. Partners chosen represented a range of these categories, filling multiple descriptive and perceptual variation categories and, thus, a smaller sample of interview participants provided data representative of the larger population of partners from each sub-group. For example, a school partner rated the product received from the partnership as 4 out of 10, but rated the extent to which it aligned with equity as 9 out of 10. Another nonprofit community partner rated the helpfulness of the product or service as 8 out of 10, but rated it as 5 out of 10 on alignment with equity. These two community partners represented a diverse range of experiences and characteristics.

Selected UM faculty and staff and community partners were invited to participate in a telephone interview during July and August of 2019. Table 9 describes the purposeful sampling variety and targeted sample size, accompanied by the actual number of participants interviewed. A complete listing of survey respondents, including their responses to select quantitative questions, with interview participation noted, is provided as Appendix B.
Table 9

Prioritized Variations in Purposeful Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partner Group</th>
<th>Variations sought (target no. of interviews)</th>
<th>No. interviewed, by variation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community Partners</td>
<td>Type of deliverable*: direct service, event planning or obtaining resources, applying physical skill,</td>
<td>4 - Provide direct service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>application/production of knowledge, sharing knowledge (at least 1 participant interview per type of</td>
<td>4 - Plan event/obtain resource</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>deliverable)</td>
<td>3 - Produce/apply knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 - Share knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To what extent were products helpful: 0-5, 6-10 (approximately 5 participant interviews for each range)</td>
<td>7 - More helpful/helpful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 - Less helpful/unhelpful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 - Not rated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Do benefits of working with Ginsberg Center outweigh the challenges: 0-5, 6-10 (approximately 5</td>
<td>11 - Benefits &gt; challenges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>participant interviews for each range)</td>
<td>0 - Benefits &lt; challenges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To what extent was partnership aligned with equity: 0-5, 6-10 (approximately 5 participant interviews for</td>
<td>8 - More aligned w/ equity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>each range)</td>
<td>3 - Less aligned w/ equity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UM Faculty/Staff</td>
<td>Type of deliverable*: direct service, planning an event or obtaining resources, application/production</td>
<td>5 - Provide direct service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>of knowledge, sharing knowledge (at least 1 participant interview per type of deliverable)</td>
<td>2 - Plan event/obtain resource</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 - Produce/apply knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 - Share knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To what extent were products helpful: 0-5, 6-10 (approximately 5 participant interviews for each range)</td>
<td>11 - More helpful/helpful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0 - Less helpful/unhelpful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Do benefits of working with Ginsberg Center outweigh the challenges: 0-5, 6-10 (approximately 5</td>
<td>12 - Benefits &gt; challenges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>participant interviews for each range)</td>
<td>0 - Benefits &lt; challenges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To what extent was partnership aligned with equity: 0-5, 6-10 (approximately 5 participant interviews for</td>
<td>11 - More aligned w/ equity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>each range)</td>
<td>0 - Less aligned w/ equity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 - Unrated</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Partnerships fulfilled more than one category

Data Sources

Consistent with an explanatory mixed methods design, the evaluation team used both quantitative and qualitative data. Beginning in February 2019, quantitative partner data were collected using an extant, primarily quantitative, survey instrument. Beginning
in July 2019, qualitative partner data were collected using a new semi-structured interview instrument and protocol.

**Partnership survey.** All UM faculty and staff, and community organizations who work with the Ginsberg Center were asked to complete the extant Ginsberg Center Partnership Survey (UM Ginsberg Center, 2019). This Qualtrics survey was developed during the summer and fall of 2018 and tested in late December 2018 and January 2019 using field conditions. It was evaluated for construct validity by content experts and survey methodologists at UM. This pilot survey was conducted through a small-scale field test after the completion of the instrument, using respondent debriefs to identify confusing, infeasible, or otherwise problematic questions and recommending alternatives. Respondents included students, community partners, staff, and faculty, including experts in survey design. The field test did not include a representative sample of the target population (Federal Committee on Statistical Methodology, 2016). The survey had 53 questions in total, divided into shorter sets of questions based on sub-grouping status (UM faculty and staff or community partners). The survey used skip logic to gather data unique to each subgroup and took participants 5 to 9 minutes to complete.

The survey instrument is included as Appendix A. It contains 18 questions for community partners: six demographic or descriptive questions about their organization or partnership, three 10-point slider questions about satisfaction or benefit in the partnership, one 10-point slider question about equity in the partnership, four 5-point Likert scaled questions about the partnership experience, one 100-percentage point question asking respondents to distribute proportion of partnership benefit to each partner group, one 10-point slider scaled question about equity in partnership, and two open
response questions. The survey contains 22 questions for faculty/staff partners, including five demographic or descriptive questions about their organization or partnership, seven multiple-choice questions about their involvement with the Ginsberg Center, four 10-point slider scaled questions about the partnership or Ginsberg Center experience, two 5-point Likert scaled questions about their preparation for the partnership, one 100-percentage point question asking respondents to distribute proportion of partnership benefit to each partner groups, one 10-point slider scaled question about equity in partnership, and two open response questions. Table 10 provides sample questions drawn from the extant Ginsberg Center Partnership survey.
Table 10

**Sample Questions, Benefit by Partner Group**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partner Group</th>
<th>Sample Questions</th>
<th>Response Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community Partners</td>
<td>Is your organization a nonprofit, school, governmental organization, or other type of community organization?</td>
<td>Multiple choice categories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To what extent did working with UM partners outweigh the challenges?</td>
<td>10-point slider, from Benefits do not outweigh challenges to Benefits outweigh challenges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UM Faculty/Staff Partners</td>
<td>To what extent do the benefits of working with community partners outweigh the challenges?</td>
<td>10-point slider, from Benefits do not outweigh challenges to Benefits outweigh challenges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Partners</td>
<td>Please indicate any deliverables (products or services) expected as a result of your partnership connected through the Ginsberg Center. (check all that apply)</td>
<td>8 Checkbox categories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Were the expected products or services delivered?</td>
<td>Yes/No/Partially</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To what extent were the products or services delivered helpful?</td>
<td>10-point slider, from not useful to useful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To what extent was your partnership aligned with equity?</td>
<td>10-point slider, from not aligned to not aligned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Please distribute 100 percentage points among the following stakeholder groups, with points representing the proportion of benefit each has received from your community-UM partnership. (Community organization, UM students, UM faculty, UM overall, Community overall)</td>
<td>100 percentage points total assigned to 5 stakeholder categories — forced total of exactly 100 percentage points.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Semi-structured interviews.** A purposive sample of each partner group was invited to participate in a 30-minute semi-structured interview. The nine-question semi-structured interview was used to center the participant experience and capture qualitative data to elucidate and expand upon data collected through the previously described Ginsberg Center Partnership Survey. The interview was piloted with two representatives of each partner subgroup, focusing on identifying and editing ambiguous questions, ensuring that questions elicited adequate responses, and understanding the length of time
required for the interview (Dikko, 2016). Based on this testing, question one was added as a “warm-up” and framing question. Question two was changed slightly, omitting the word “engagement” from the question. Additionally, questions three and four were re-ordered, and question seven was added to elicit participants’ own definition or description of equity.

In the interview instrument protocol, three of the eight questions mirrored those asked within the survey, prompting participants to discuss any deliverables (products or services) expected as a part of the partnership, the helpfulness of those deliverables, and the degree to which the partnership aligned with their definition of equity. Additional prompts encouraged participants to discuss challenges and benefits in the partnership, ways in which the partnership impacted the community organization’s mission, and advice for the Ginsberg Center or the university overall to improve in community-university partnerships. Lastly, in order to more fully ascertain participants’ schemas and expectations about equity, I added the question: “How do you define or describe equity in a partnership?” I conducted each of the interviews via telephone, using Google Voice to record each one. Table 11 provides the semi-structured interview questions used for each participant sub-group.
### Semi-structured Interview Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partner Group</th>
<th>Research Question</th>
<th>Sample Interview Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community Partners</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2) What product or service did you expect to receive as a part of this partnership? Describe how the expected product or service compared to what was delivered. (For cases where a product or service was delivered) Was the product or service helpful to your organization? How do you make that determination? 3) What have been some benefits of partnering with UM? Are benefits different for different types of engagement or partnership? 4) What have been some challenges of partnering with UM? Are these challenges different for different types of engagement or partnership? 5) How did partnering with UM impact your organization’s capacity to fulfill its mission?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UM Partners</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2) What product or service did you expect to deliver as a part of this partnership? Describe how the expected product or service compared to what was delivered. (For cases where a product or service was delivered) Was the product or service helpful to the community organization? How do you make that determination? 3) What have been some benefits of partnering with community organizations? Are these benefits different for different types of partnership? 4) What have been some challenges in partnering with community organizations? Are challenges different for different types of partnerships? 5) How did partnering with UM impact your community partner’s capacity to fulfill its mission?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Partners</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7) How would you describe equity in a partnership? 8) Using your description or definition of equity, in what ways was your partnership equitable? In what ways did it miss opportunities to achieve equity? 10) How did the Ginsberg Center contribute to, or detract from, the partnership? How would you have approached this partnership without the Ginsberg Center’s help?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Data Collection

Quantitative data were gathered and analyzed from extant survey responses. Qualitative data were gathered and analyzed from limited open-ended questions on the extant survey, as well as through a new interview protocol with a selected sample from each participant group.

Surveys. Ginsberg Center’s evaluation team staff sent an email invitation to all university and community partners who participated in service learning partnerships supported by the Ginsberg Center from the period of July 1, 2017, through June 30, 2019. This list was generated through a query of matched opportunities in the Ginsberg Center’s CRM. The email included an invitation and link to complete a brief online survey. Automated follow-up email requests were sent one week after the initial email and another reminder one week later. The reminder emails included an offer to conduct the survey via a brief telephone interview instead of completing the online survey. Lastly, staff placed follow-up calls to participants who had not responded to the survey within two weeks of the initial invitation and invited participants to complete the survey online or during a telephone call.

For surveys conducted via a telephone structured interview, the interviewing staff member transcribed responses on to a hard copy of the survey and then entered the completed form into Qualtrics. Thirty-seven surveys were completed by community partners for a response rate of 61%. Twenty-seven surveys were completed by faculty and staff, representing a 57% response rate.

Interviews. Based on a purposive sampling of survey respondents from each participant subgroup, a member of the evaluation team emailed all selected interview
participants to invite them to participate in a 30-minute telephone interview to more fully explore and understand their survey responses and their perceptions related to their experience of service learning partnerships supported by the Ginsberg Center. A member of the evaluation team followed-up on these invitational emails with a telephone call to those who did not respond and repeated this process until there were at least 10 accepted invitations from each subgroup.

Of the 12 invitations extended to each sub-group, we received 11 accepted invitations from each. It is important to note that the community partner non-respondent was selected to be interviewed because of low ratings on several of the survey questions, indicating a more negative experience or view of the partnership experience. When I followed up on the non-response to the invitation, I learned that the respondent had left the partner organization. Once interview invitations were accepted from each participant, a member of the evaluation team scheduled a telephone interview. I conducted each interview and, before beginning each interview, explained that participation was voluntary, provided and explained a written consent form, and received permission to record the interviews. The interview consent form is located in Appendix D. I also took notes of a priori codes and other important concepts that were shared by the participant during each interview.

**Data Analysis**

To answer each of the questions posed for this evaluation research, the evaluation team analyzed both the quantitative survey data and the qualitative survey and interview data. Using two data sources enabled me to triangulate the data to more accurately answer the three evaluation questions, and I sought out contradictory data points in an
effort to minimize the interference of my own bias in analyzing the data (Anderson, 2010).

**Quantitative data analysis.** Using mostly descriptive statistical analysis with some inferential statistical analysis, we were able to summarize and present findings from the quantitative data collected as a part of this evaluation (Patton, 2009). Led by a professional staff member with extensive experience in quantitative data analysis, the evaluation team conducted descriptive statistical analysis for the nominal and ordinal quantitative survey data collected for the period of the evaluation, July 1, 2017, through June 30, 2019. For interval data, we focused on measures of central tendency and dispersions, including frequency, mean, median, and range. Based on variances observed through these descriptive statistics, we conducted bivariate analyses using Pearson’s correlation coefficient tests, Levene’s test for equal variances, and chi-squared and t-tests to explore associations between each of the partner groups (Creswell, 2014). The aggregate sample size was 64 survey respondents, with 37 community partners and 27 faculty/staff partners completing surveys. The numbers of responses provided us with a large enough sample size for us to use inferential statistics to identify meaningful differences and relationships within the sampled population with at least a 95% confidence interval.

**Qualitative data analysis.** To transcribe interviews, we used Temi, a low-cost automated transcription software platform, and paired it with a student staff review and correction process to create accurate transcripts for each interview. I reviewed and began to analyze each transcript as it was completed. After reviewing the entirety of each interview transcript, I conducted a thematic content analysis using constant comparison
of the data collected to identify codes, patterns, and themes. I used the same process to conduct an additional analysis of each interview to check for inconsistencies or alternative interpretations. Evaluation team members also conducted analyses of selected interviews, and we set aside time in evaluation team meetings for peer review to compare and discuss coding to maximize meaning and consistency in the coding process. This same process was used for qualitative data collected through open-ended questions on the extant survey. The Dedoose software program (Dedoose Version 8.2.14, 2019) was used to support coding and organizing for this content analysis, using a hybrid of emergent coding and a priori coding based on existing literature and informed by my evaluation questions (Creswell, 2014; DeCuir-Gunby et al., 2011).

The coding process. Initial codes were chosen, based on the evaluation questions, discussion in the existing literature on service learning and community engagement, and the focus on equity and benefit in this evaluation research. Terms and constructs such as benefits, fairness, challenges, mutual benefit, and equity were examples of initial a priori codes, although these codes were supplemented and modified throughout the review process. Coding was an iterative process. Through independent transcript review and use of notes taken during review, followed by targeted questions and discussion as a group, I led the evaluation team to refine codes over the course of multiple reviews of the qualitative interview and survey data, with each review providing clearer understanding of the codes in context (DeCuir-Gunby et al., 2011). For example, after coding the first four interview transcripts, we determined that "fairness" as a stand-alone/parent code was less useful than originally anticipated. Fairness is a core concept in Ginsberg Center's definition of equity but was not a significant element of interviewee definitions.
Since the interview questions were changed to solicit interviewee definitions rather than only using Ginsberg Center’s framing, fairness became a less central concept and was not included as a primary or parent code. Additional important nuance emerged during the coding process that was not captured in the originally conceptualized codes. In addition to challenges, benefits, and mutual benefits that emerged clearly within each interview (prompted in part by direct probing questions about benefits and challenges included in the protocol) other concepts emerged as important to adding correlates, dimension, and nuance in answering one or more of the evaluation questions. For example, equity was added at this point to capture how community and university partners described equity and sub-codes for equity such as decision-making, sustainability, and respect.

Although we omitted fairness as a primary code, we added it back as a sub-code for equity. We also added a communication code since numerous partners discussed how communication impacted their partnership. Upon initially adding communication as a code, the team discussed uncertainty about whether this should be a primary code or a subcode. We also added a deliverable code since a direct question about the service or product deliverable was included in the interview protocol. Finally, we added Ginsberg Center as a code since the interview protocol included questions about the Ginsberg Center and interviewees discussed specific details, descriptions, and analyses of the center’s role in their partnerships.

After repeated reviews of the data and team discussion, the codebook was modified to include primary or parent codes: challenges, benefits, mutual benefit, equity, communication, deliverable, and Ginsberg Center. Several of these primary codes were
assigned child or sub-codes. The full inventory and definition of codes used during the qualitative analysis for this evaluation is included as Appendix E. Lastly, in order to assess and attempt to maximize interrater reliability, we used Miles and Huberman’s (1994) reliability calculation for three randomly selected coded transcripts. Our team’s scores for the three selected transcripts were 80.6%, 86.2%, and 90.4%. Although intercoder reliability of 90% or more is preferred, 80% or more is typically considered acceptable (Neuendorf, 2002).

Identifying themes and patterns. I organized the data by themes by themes and categories, looking for similarities and contradictions between participants, participant groups, and between interviews and survey responses for each evaluation question. Consistent with the work of Miles, Huberman, and Saldaña (2013) on effective strategies for qualitative research, Dedoose presents data in matrix format based on participant ID, sub-group, and type, and frequency of codes. This type of display of coded data enabled preliminary comparisons across and within community and university partner sub-groups. Additionally, these matrix presentations of interview data assisted in identifying themes and patterns by observing what codes were prevalent and less prevalent among participants, as well as the co-occurrences of codes within the qualitative data. Multiple reviews of the qualitative survey responses and interview transcripts, together with isolating thematic and counterfactual responses, enabled a deep analysis of comparisons between participants and sub-groups (Creswell, 2014). Themes were determined based on the prevalence of codes within the entire qualitative data set, using semantic level data and prioritizing direct quotes to limit inferences (Braun & Clark, 2006). Table 12 provides detail about the qualitative data analysis process.
Table 12

*Qualitative Data Coding and Analysis*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Read the full transcript as they were completed. Created notes about first impressions and questions that came up during the review (Used notes to capture impressions, surprises, modifications, etc., throughout all steps of the coding and analysis process)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Returned to the beginning of each transcript to conduct another review, identifying a priori codes (mutual benefit, benefit, challenge). Used Dedoose to identify a priori codes, with corresponding, highlighted textual content.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Went back through the transcripts again to identify additional common codes or refined codes that emerged. Used Dedoose to identify a priori codes, with corresponding, highlighted textual content.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Continued with the review process to identify patterns in the codes (such as frequency, sequence, similarities, and differences)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Considered these patterns to create thematic categories across interview transcripts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Repeated review process to collapse or expand codes into thematic categories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Formed interpretations of thematic categories and content, paying attention to similarities and differences with quantitative data and with existing literature</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Once data analysis was complete for both quantitative and qualitative data, I lead the evaluation team to integrate both. I then developed preliminary conclusions to inform this evaluation report. Table 13 provides a crosswalk of the evaluation questions, data sources used for each, and data analysis.
Evaluation Questions, Data Sources, and Data Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Question</th>
<th>Data Sources</th>
<th>Data Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1) To what extent and in what ways do community partners perceive benefit from service learning partnerships supported by the UM Ginsberg Center? | *Ginsberg Center Partnership Survey,* Community partner questions 2.7, 2.8, 2.9, 2.10, 2.11, 8.2  
  *Ginsberg Center Evaluation Interview: Questions for Community Partners* 3, 4, 5 | Quantitative: Descriptive Statistics, Inferential Statistics when indicated  
  Qualitative: Content review for emergent and a priori themes |
| 2) To what extent and in what ways do UM partners perceive benefit from service learning partnerships supported by the UM Ginsberg Center? | *Ginsberg Center Partnership Survey,* UM Faculty/Staff partner questions 3.8, 3.9, 3.11, 8.2  
  *Ginsberg Center Evaluation Interview,* questions for UM Partners 3, 4, 5, 6 | Quantitative: Descriptive Statistics, Inferential Statistics when indicated  
  Qualitative: Content review for emergent and a priori themes |
| 3) To what extent is there perceived equity in university and community partnerships supported by the UM Ginsberg Center? | *Ginsberg Center Partnership Survey* questions 8.4, 8.5, 8.6  
  *Ginsberg Center Evaluation Interview,* questions for Community partners 7, 8  
  *Ginsberg Center Evaluation Interview,* questions for UM Partners 7, 8 | Quantitative: Descriptive Statistics, Inferential Statistics when indicated  
  Qualitative: Content review for emergent and a priori themes |

Timeline for the Evaluation

The period for this evaluation focused on partnerships facilitated or supported by the Ginsberg Center from September 2017 through June 2019.

Phase I. The evaluation commenced with an approved proposal. Once the proposal was approved, I requested approval or verification of exemption from the Institutional Review Boards of William and Mary and UM. The College of William and Mary’s Education Internal Review Committee (EDIRC) determined that my study EDIRC-2019-06-18-13711-mfdipa entitled “An Examination of Benefit and Equity in Community-University Service Learning Partnerships,” is exempted from formal review as it falls under DHHS Federal Regulation 45CFR46.104.d.2. The UM eResearch system
issued a notice of exemption from IRB review for eResearch Study ID HUM00166259 entitled “An Examination of Benefit and Equity in Community-University Service Learning Partnerships” under 45CFR46.104.d.2. Exemption verifications from the College of William and Mary and UM are included as Appendix F.

Beginning in February 2019 and as an ongoing practice, extant surveys were distributed to community and UM partners associated with partnerships initiated or supported during the identified timeframe and continue to be distributed throughout this evaluation. The UM eResearch system issued a notice of exemption from IRB review for eResearch Study ID HUM00160095 entitled “Ginsberg Center Impact Assessment: Community-University Partnership Survey” per 45 CFR 46, 21 CFR 56 and UM policy (Appendix F).

**Phase II.** Beginning on July 9, 2019, the evaluation team contacted purposively selected partners to invite them to participate in an interview. Interviews were scheduled during July and August 2019, and transcripts of each interview were shared with each interviewee.

**Phase III.** Beginning in July 2019, the evaluation team tabulated and analyzed quantitative and qualitative survey data covering partnerships during the period of study. We also began to analyze completed interview transcripts. I then completed quantitative and qualitative data analysis and began to compile the evaluation findings and report.

**Phase IV.** I completed a draft of the evaluation report in October 2019 and shared it for feedback with the evaluation team, participants, and reviewers and peers external to the evaluation process with a requested turnaround by October 30th.
Phase V. Feedback from multiple participants, reviewers, and peers was incorporated into the final report of the evaluation findings and recommendations (Chapters 4 and 5).

Stakeholders

The stakeholder groups for this program evaluation include Ginsberg Center administrators and professional and student staff, UM faculty/staff interested in mutually beneficial and equitable community engagement, social sector community partners and their constituents, UM administrators within Academic, Government, and Student Affairs, current and future UM undergraduate and graduate students, and other institutions of higher education.

Researcher Positionality

Positionality is a researcher’s position on a research study and the researcher’s views the world based on gender, race, values, education, class, and experience (Bourke, 2014). The researcher’s position and background influences key aspects of the research, including considerations such as the topic of research, the context of the study, the study participants, and the interpretations and conclusions of the research (Bourke, 2014; Malterud, 2001). Accordingly, my personal and social identities, experiences, and values shaped my interest in researching benefit and equity in service learning partnerships, including my research questions, methodology, and interpretations.

As the researcher in this study, there were elements of my positionality that were particularly salient. My social identities as a White woman with relative economic and educational privilege played a formative role in shaping my belief that service learning can be an appropriate and ethical pedagogy. This belief, which mirrors much of the body
of literature on service learning, was undeniably built on dominant western narratives that cast formally educated White people as teachers, experts, and purveyors of progress and benefit to those who are less educated and non-White. In examining the balance of benefit and equity in service learning partnerships, I sought to begin to interrogate this core assumption. Also salient to my positionality for this study was my extensive personal experience with service learning as a former university student participant, a former community partner, and in my current role as the director of a service learning and community engagement center. This personal experience with service learning from three central vantage points—as a university student who derived substantial benefit from it, as community partner who found it to have constrained benefit, and as a university administrator who is responsible for promulgating it—shaped my assumptions about the common imbalance in service learning partnerships toward university interests.

Through this study, I attempted to test this assumption about the balance of benefit in service learning partnerships by incorporating perspectives from a range of service learning partners and participants. I worked to ensure that my positionality and related potential biases did not compromise or jeopardize the implementation, findings, or conclusions of this research by using bracketing (Tufford & Newman, 2010) and bridling (Dahlberg, 2009) strategies of reflection, memoing, and peer consultation to question, understand, and mitigate my presuppositions that could hinder my accurate collection and analysis of the data.

**Delimitations, Limitations, and Assumptions**

In designing this study, I set specific boundaries or delimitations, and attempted to account for limitations or weaknesses related to the timing, context, and size of the
evaluand. Additionally, this study was designed based on key assumptions about participants. These delimitations, limitations, and assumptions are described in the sections that follow.

**Delimitations.** There were intentionally set boundaries for this evaluation research which focused on service learning partnerships, broadly defined, brokered or supported by the Ginsberg Center. The focus or bounds of the evaluation was limited to three outcomes within a multifaceted process. The study used surveys and a selective subset of survey respondents to share perception and experiential data through semi-structured interviews.

- Longer-term impacts, context elements, inputs, and other processes were not examined as a part of this study. Additionally, Ginsberg Center’s Logic Model, included in Chapter 1, figure 2, includes two student outcomes: one related to benefit and one related to specific learning goals. These outcomes were not directly examined as a part of the evaluation.
- The multitude of non-service learning community-engaged partnerships occurring at Ginsberg Center were not examined, nor were service learning and other community-engaged partnerships occurring independently from the Ginsberg Center across the 19 schools and colleges at UM.
- Community partner representation in surveys and interviews included staff of partner organizations. Individual recipients or community members associated with or served by those organizations were not included in the study.
• For university partners, surveys were distributed only to faculty/staff who were identified as “main contacts” in Ginsberg Center’s CRM, which indicates their central leading or driving role in the partnership.

• Ginsberg Center staff and faculty are not included as participants in this study.

• Ginsberg Center is still developing valid and reliable mechanisms to collect data about partnerships from a representative sample of students who participate in service learning partnerships. Therefore, data about community-university partnerships collected directly from students is not a part of this study.

**Limitations.** I undertook an evaluation of service learning partnership outcomes at one center within a vast decentralized university, using a relatively small sample size of participants. I am the director of this center and had a significant influence on the development of the model, which was the focus of the evaluation. The period of study dated back almost two years; and since that time, many staff and faculty partners left UM, as did staff in community partner organizations. There were several potential limitations of this evaluation, which may have impacted findings and implications.

• The pool of 108 possible survey respondents was small, and the survey completion rate of 59% even smaller. Thus, findings for this evaluation have limited generalizability or transferability.

• The focus of the evaluation is on outcomes only, and thus, findings convey a limited understanding of the fidelity with which service learning partnerships were implemented as planned. Related, given the complexity of the systems and environment coming to bear on service learning partnerships, an additional
limitation was determining all of the factors that contribute to or detract from the achievement of Ginsberg Center’s examined outcomes.

- Given my role as the evaluator and position as director of the Ginsberg Center, there was a potential challenge to my credibility and resulting candor and responsiveness of participants. This limitation may impact evaluation findings and implications.

- The period of evaluation extends back nearly two years, which may have impacted the evaluation team’s ability to contact past participants and diminish the accuracy of data provided by interview participants reached. These factors may have contributed to findings that are not representative of all partners.

- Because we only collected survey data from faculty and staff who are identified as “main contacts” in Ginsberg Center’s CRM, the experience and learnings from student participants and other involved faculty or staff are not directly represented in this study. This may have impacted evaluation findings and implications.

In consideration of these limitations and the nature of a program evaluation regarding a specific entity, there is no intent to suggest generalizability of the findings beyond the specific investigation of the Ginsberg Center.

**Assumptions.** In designing this evaluation, I made the assumption that those UM and community partners who participate in providing quantitative or qualitative data would share their honest opinions, perceptions, and recollections of their partnership experiences. In order to maximize this likelihood, I assured participants that I would only share and publish survey data in aggregate, use identification numbers instead of names of interview participants, and use broad disciplinary or focus area instead of departments
or organizations they represent to maintain the confidentiality of each participant (UM Research Ethics and Compliance, n.d.). This evaluation reflects my follow-through with that commitment.

**Ethical Considerations**

This evaluation was designed to align with the Program Evaluation Standards of utility, feasibility, propriety, and accuracy (Yarbrough, Shulha, Hopson, & Caruthers, 2011). The following section describes how these standards were addressed in the study.

**Utility.** Yarbrough et al. (2011) describe the goal of evaluation utility as increasing or ensuring the likelihood that the evaluation will have positive consequences and substantial influence on the evaluand. Findings from this evaluation will contribute to the understanding of the efficacy of Ginsberg Center’s relatively unique service learning and community engagement model. Evaluation findings will be particularly useful to Ginsberg Center staff in decision-making about future programming, improvements, and resource allocation. Findings may also be useful in illuminating benefits and effective practices in university-community partnerships more broadly, information that can be useful to Ginsberg Center partner groups, UM administrators, and potentially others in higher education.

**Feasibility.** This study aligned with feasibility standards aimed at ensuring that the evaluation process was effective, efficient, balanced, and practical (Yarbrough et al., 2011). There was agreement among staff and administrators of the Ginsberg Center that evaluation of key established outcomes of the Ginsberg Center will be used for future decision-making about program improvements, resource allocation, and advocacy with a particular emphasis on ensuring that brokered partnerships are beneficial and equitable.
The evaluation was undertaken within a complex and changing context; the scope and focus of this evaluation took these factors into account while focusing on a small part of the context within which the evaluator and evaluand have significant influence. Interviews were designed to be relatively brief, taking approximately 30 minutes, and conducted via telephone to maximize convenience and predictability for participants. Additionally, to bolster the practicality and resource conservation required, the evaluation used an extant survey and collection procedures as foundational data for this evaluation. This survey is relatively brief, taking respondents between five and eight minutes to complete it online or via telephone.

**Propriety.** The evaluation was designed to be fair, legal, proper, and just which are the central components of the propriety standard (Yarbrough et al., 2011). By design, the evaluation was transparent and inclusive of central stakeholder groups involved with the Ginsberg Center. The invitation email asking participants to complete the extant survey used for this evaluation provided a statement of purpose conveying that participation is focused on providing Ginsberg Center with data for program improvement, that participation was voluntary, and that results would only be shared in aggregate unless express permission was provided by the respondent. Invitation emails inviting the purposive sample to participate in an interview included the purpose of the evaluation and why the participant was selected to participate. A consent form was provided to all interview participants, including the purpose of the evaluation, the voluntary nature of participating, what was expected of them, and what they could expect from me as the evaluator.
Accuracy. I used both survey and interview data to bolster the accuracy of my evaluation findings. To enhance honest participation and bolster accuracy, I declared my role as an evaluator as well as my position within the Ginsberg Center and communicated to participants that completion of surveys and participation in interviews was voluntary. I received consent before recording any interview, shared transcripts of the interview with the participant, and shared a draft report before finalizing the evaluation report to maximize accuracy. In addition to continually comparing and triangulating data and member checking drafts with participants, I sought to enhance credibility by sharing draft reports with a peer external to the evaluation process and outside of the Ginsberg Center (Anderson, 2010; Creswell, 2014; Mertler, 2017). I used identification numbers instead of names of participants and did not use specific departments or organizations they represented to maintain the confidentiality of each participant (UM Research Ethics and Compliance, n.d.). Lastly, the findings and recommendations of the final evaluation report were disseminated to all participants and stakeholder groups.

Conflict of interest. Yarbrough et al. (2011) asserted that “evaluations should openly and honestly identify and address real or perceived conflicts of interests that may compromise the evaluation” (p. 145). I was the commissioner of this evaluation, lead evaluator, and, as the director of the Ginsberg Center, the positional leader of the evaluand. Given these multiple embedded roles, it was vital for me to declare my potential conflict of interests and biases to participants. In order to navigate my biases and real and perceived conflict and bolster the validity of the evaluation I prioritized the use of direct quotes to limit inferences, shared transcripts generated from interviews back with participants for member checking, and recruited reviewers external to the Ginsberg
Center to check my assumptions, summary reports, and draft findings, and intentionally reflected and sought counsel on how my identities and roles may shape my interpretation of the data (Creswell, 2014).

**Research approval.** On June 13, 2019, I received approval from my dissertation committee to proceed with this evaluation research. After gaining this permission, I requested approval or verification of exemption from the Institutional Review Boards of William and Mary and UM. The College of William and Mary’s Education Internal Review Committee (EDIRC) determined that my study, EDIRC-2019-06-18-13711-mfdipa entitled “An Examination of Benefit and Equity in Community-University Service Learning Partnerships,” is exempted from formal review as it falls under DHHS Federal Regulation 45CFR46.104.d.2. The UM eResearch system issued a notice of exemption from IRB review for eResearch Study ID HUM00166259 entitled “An Examination of Benefit and Equity in Community-University Service Learning Partnerships” under 45CFR46,104.d.2. Both of these exemption notifications are included as Appendix F.
CHAPTER 4

FINDINGS

The purpose of conducting this mixed methods evaluation research study was to increase understanding of the benefits of and equity within supported service learning partnerships for community organizations and university faculty and staff partners as perceived by these partners. Additionally, the study sought to illuminate community and university partner perceptions about equity in service learning partnerships. Chapter 4 includes quantitative results from open-ended questions in an extant survey distributed to university and community partners and qualitative results from the extant survey and semi-structured interviews. The results of the study are organized by evaluation question, using both quantitative and qualitative data to contribute to understanding the answer to each.

Evaluation Question One

To what extent and in what ways is there perceived benefit for community partners from service learning partnerships supported by the Ginsberg Center?

Understanding community benefit. In order to examine community benefit, the study looked at the types of products or services that partners expected to result from service learning partnerships, whether those products or services were actually delivered, and whether they were helpful to the community partner. We also examined the extent to which community partner expectations about the partnership were met and other types of benefits community partners derived from their partnership with UM.
Types of deliverables expected. Providing direct service to community partner constituents or clients such as tutoring and various health screening activities was the most frequently identified type of partnership. Producing or applying knowledge such as building or service design activities or consulting on topics such as marketing or strategic planning was the second most frequent type of partnership. These deliverables were followed by sharing knowledge through workshops and event planning such as health fairs, and fundraisers. Partnerships that focused on obtaining resources, such as grant writing, applying physical skills such as landscaping or painting, and other projects were also identified, though these were identified less frequently by participants in this study. Table 14 provides data about the expected deliverables of partnerships between community partners and UM and the frequency of those deliverables included in this evaluation.

Table 14

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type of Expected Deliverables</td>
<td>Providing Direct Service</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Planning Event</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Obtaining Resources</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Applying Physical Skills</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Producing/Applying Knowledge</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sharing Knowledge</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Some respondents selected more than one category of expected deliverable

Actual deliverables. The products and services expected as a part of community and UM partnerships were almost always delivered in whole or in part. There was general alignment in answers among both UM and community partner groups with all but four of the 64 participating partners indicating that expected deliverables were delivered.
Three participants indicated partial delivery, and one participant indicated that the expected deliverable was not delivered in whole or part.

All partners were asked about how helpful the delivered product or service was for the community partner. There was general agreement that deliverables were helpful with the aggregate mean score of 8.50, based on a 10-point scale, with 1 representing unhelpful and 10 representing helpful. By conducting an independent samples t-test, we identified statistically significant differences between community and UM partners in perceptions about whether deliverables were helpful to the community partner, with community partners perceiving that expected deliverables or services were more helpful ($M = 8.93, SD = 1.67$) than UM partners perceived them to be ($M = 7.92, SD = 1.5$; $t(54) = 2.350, p < .022$). Despite this difference, and even when factoring in the standard deviation in responses, the data indicate that both partner groups perceive the deliverables to be helpful to the community partner. Figure 6 provides a histogram and detailed data about the perceived helpfulness of partnership deliverables by partner group and in aggregate.
Expectations of the partnership. Both university and community partner survey participants were asked about the degree to which community partners’ expectations were met. The analysis used descriptive statistics to determine that the overall group had a mean score of 4.11 based on a 5-point scale, with 1 representing strong disagreement with the statement “community partner expectations for this partnership were met” and a 5 representing strong agreement with the same statement. Using an independent sample t-test, we determined that the aggregate score indicates agreement that both community and university partners perceived that community partners’ expectations in the partnerships were met, but that community partners reported higher ratings for expectations being met ($M = 4.35, SD = .824$) than UM partners ($M = 3.78, SD = .847$; $t(62) = 2.718, p < .009$). In other words, compared to community partners, university partners were less certain that the expectations of their community partners were met through the partnership. When factoring in the standard deviations, the mean scores
indicate less certainty for both partner groups that the expectations of the community partners were met. Figure 7 represents data about the degree to which participants perceive community partners’ expectations are being met, in aggregate and by sub-group.

![Histogram of Community Partner Expectations Met Ratings](image)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community partner expectations were met (1-5)</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td></td>
<td>.824</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td></td>
<td>.847</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggregate</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td></td>
<td>.875</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 7.** Community partner expectations met ratings with sub-group detail.

**Community partner benefits.** To get a more contextualized understanding of helpfulness in deliverables as a part of benefits for community partners in partnerships with the university, we used data gathered during partner interviews to identify the categories of benefits derived from service learning partnerships. Adapting framing developed by Gelmon et al. (2001) and James and Logan (2016), we asked partners about the types of benefits community partners derived as a result of the partnership and resulting deliverables. The following categories focus on positive impacts that community organizations accrue to advance their mission as a result of partnering with universities. The first three benefit categories were adapted from Gelmon et al. (2001, pp. 83-106), and the fourth benefit category was adapted from James and Logan (2016, pp. 24-32). Each of these is presented in Table 15, which provides the categories of benefits.
for community partners in partnerships with UM, including examples of each as drawn from university and community partner interview data. The categories of benefit include:

- **organizational capacity benefit**, including increasing the types or quality of services offered, the number of clients served or reached, or increased knowledge about the assets or needs of the organization or its clients;
- **economic benefit**, including identifying and acquiring new funding, identifying and hiring new staff, and completion of projects for which the organization would typically have to pay;
- **social or community benefit**, such as identification of new networks for the organization, increase in the number of volunteers after the project ends, and tangible improvements on community issues; and
- **personal or professional benefit**, including contributions to the education of students, professional growth or new knowledge, or new connections for personal or professional network.
Table 15
Community Partner Benefits in Partnerships with the University of Michigan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benefit</th>
<th>Excerpts from Partner Interviews</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Capacity:</td>
<td>And then also the benefit of just having, especially with [program name], an extra person that can work one-on-one with a student. So when I’ve observed the classrooms, the teacher is able to say, Hey, [program name] volunteers, go and work with these five students, you know, do some one-on-one reading with them, do something a little bit more concrete. And while there are certainly supports in our schools for students that are most in need, like paid teacher assistants, you know, the students aren’t necessarily trying to serve that role, but they’re actually being able to challenge students more. The benefits of partnering with U of M is that we get access to expertise and skills that folks affiliated with the University of Michigan have, and without necessarily needing that in-house here.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(increase in types of service offered, increased number of clients served, increased knowledge of assets &amp; needs)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic/Financial:</td>
<td>The product was helpful because it really helped [community organization] to articulate their value, the value of their program to the community that they’re working with, to potential future partners and also potential funders. I think that... economic/financial because as part of our relationship we’ve also asked them you know, with our funding from Ginsberg Center, kind of what would they need and what could we help provide. So we’ve provided them with some Chromebooks for their residents, something, you know, where they didn’t have Internet access or ways to find out health information or look up, you know, enter into their patient portal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(identification and hiring of new staff, identification of Funding opportunities, acquisition of new funding, completion of project typically purchased)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social or Community:</td>
<td>I have a tenant who is definitely afraid of needles, and we were able to talk him into getting his blood sugar checked, which required him to get a shot. And… that’s huge because prior to that—as a matter of fact, I think these are the only people in the medical field that he’s probably seen in the last 15 to 20 years. And then the other big piece too for us is we have a very large Mandarin-speaking population to coordinate with University of Michigan volunteers for the translation piece for that. So they provide services to our residents that often have lots of barriers and difficulties, especially some fear with accessing services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(new connections or networks for the organization, increase in volunteers after the project, improvement on community issues)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal or Professional:</td>
<td>We’re helping the students get training for going into the work world where they will be working with our clientele. The experiences that these students are getting are extremely beneficial and extremely helpful to learn how to deal with our clientele and how to communicate with our clientele. And they enjoyed, you know, helping to foster the development of my students as well.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(professional growth, new skill or knowledge, educating students for future community impact, new connections for personal or professional network)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
All benefits categories were identified by each partner subgroup, but there were differences in the frequency with which each category was identified. Only personal or professional growth was identified with similar frequency between partner sub-groups, and all but two responses in this category centered on educating UM students. Organizational capacity and social or community benefits were identified with significantly more frequency by community partners compared to faculty partners. Economic/financial benefit was identified with significantly more frequency by UM partners than by community partners, with five faculty/staff participants citing grant funding they received from the Ginsberg Center as a community benefit of partnership. Lastly, community partners were 50% more likely to identify their own collective benefits than faculty/staff partners did, mentioning benefits 56 compared to 36 times. Our current data do not reveal the causes of these differences. Figure 8 provides a graphic representation of partner responses about the types of beneficial impacts for community partners in partnerships with UM and the frequency with which those impacts were identified by partner sub-group.
Community partner challenges. In order to more fully understand partner benefit, it is important also to understand the challenges identified since the significance and prevalence of these two concepts are both important when considering benefits in community-university partnerships. The following data represent themes from interview and qualitative survey data from community partners about the challenges of the partnership process or impact when partnering with UM, including:

- **access** to university partners, particularly their inability to navigate through the large size of UM, perceived exclusivity, and the lack of coordination within it;
- a lack of certainty around the UM’s **responsiveness** in and toward community partnerships, with unclear or deficient communication, and discordant expectations between community and university partners factoring in; and
- lack of student **preparation** for the partnership, such as lack of specific skills for working with a community partner, lack of awareness of the impacts of social
identities, and lack of awareness about the larger context and constraints for partners.

Table 16 provides additional detail about these thematic categories of challenges for community partners in partnerships with community organizations, including the number of community partners represented in each theme, and examples of each, drawn from interview data.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Challenge</th>
<th>Excerpts from Community Partner Interviews</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Theme:</strong> Access, including size, lack of coordination, perceived exclusivity. (identified by 8 of 11 community partners)</td>
<td>But it’s like, it’s the whole size thing. It’s so big that you don’t even, you’re like, oh, I can’t even begin to think of where I might look. I don’t know that outside of you guys and various kinds of splinter groups that there has seemed to be an active effort to partner. Public schools as well as University of Michigan are these like octopus-like creatures, and I guess silo at the same time because they are, they’re all kind of doing things in separate places and sometimes not talking to each other. And then sometimes initiating things without realizing that something else is happening. And so it’s sometimes hard to figure out like, who do you talk to, to get something done. I think that there’s this kind of sense that it’s a bit of a fortress and it doesn’t feel accessible to a lot of our community. That there is a sense of maybe exclusivity, and it isn’t as accessible. The community often sees U of M as this huge kingdom into itself that doesn’t pay taxes and takes up a lot of space.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Theme:</strong> Responsiveness, including communication deficits, unclear expectations, academic calendar. (identified by 7 of 11 community partners)</td>
<td>More often than not, UM partners aren't even interested in taking on projects. I’m not sure they’d want to partner with us because we might not be their target audience and that’s okay. But I wish that we could have a conversation about ... if you’re interested or not. One opportunity was with an instructor, [instructor name], who we thought was going to do a whole kind of course on hunger and homelessness, and was gonna use us as a, as a source and organization that the students can work with. And then that really fell through. We never really heard back on why they told us, or why they decided not to choose us. And so one of the challenges that I get there is just that...we get a ton of people who just don’t follow up, a really good amount of people who just don’t follow up. Well, I think the challenges are just related to the nature of college classes, and that is that they’re very time-limited.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Theme:</strong> Student preparedness, including lack of skills, lack of social ID awareness, and lack of context awareness. (identified by 5 of 11 community partners)</td>
<td>Oftentimes the students who come in, it might be their first experience working with youth in trauma. And so a challenge is when you have a group of well-intentioned people coming in who aren't necessarily aware of how trauma affects the brain and how trauma may affect behaviors. So they might not be fully aware of some things that would be like a positive way to respond to a situation. And they wanted to come in and...they gave two days’ notice. And they didn’t realize that it was actually gonna take a lot of coordination on my part and a lot of resources for something that I don't even know if we have the capability to do it. So we had a lengthy conversation about, although this might not seem like a lot to ask from us, you know, we’re really resource starved, and we need your support in that area. You know, you’ve got the, more of the time available to do this sort of thing.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Community partner benefits compared to challenges. Finally, to evaluate benefit for community partners in community-university partnerships, we examined community partner perceptions of challenges compared with benefits. This examination is important as it provides additional context to understand not just what the benefits of partnership are, but also whether those benefits outweigh the challenges to get at the overall worth or value of partnering with UM (Lincoln & Guba, 1980). In the extant survey, community partner participants were asked to rate the statement, “To what extent do the benefits of working with university partners outweigh the challenges?” We used descriptive statistics to determine that community partners had a mean score of 8.57, based on a 10-point scale, with 1 representing “challenges outweigh benefits” and a 10 representing “benefits outweigh challenges.” Figure 9 represents survey data shared by community partners indicating their collective perception that the benefits of partnering with UM outweighed challenges ($M = 8.57$, $SD = 1.85$). Even when factoring in the standard deviations of more than 1.8, the mean score indicates that community partners perceive benefits in partnering with UM to outweigh the challenges.
Figure 9. Community partner perceptions of benefits compared to challenges.

Summary. Using survey and interview data, we determined that community partners derive important benefits in their partnerships with UM, including benefits that contribute to organizational capacity, resources, and connections to fulfill their respective missions. It is important to note that these benefits do not come without perceived challenges related to accessing UM, and constraints to the university’s responsiveness and preparedness in partnerships with community organizations. Despite the important challenges identified, community partners perceive that the benefits of partnering with UM outweigh the challenges.

Evaluation Question Two

To what extent and in what ways is there perceived benefit for university partners, particularly faculty and staff, from service learning partnerships supported by the Ginsberg Center?

Types of benefits for university partners. University and community partners identified several types of benefits resulting from community partnerships. Patterns that
emerged from our interviews with partners included two focus areas of benefits: those accruing to students and those accruing to faculty.

**Benefits for students.** Benefits for students were identified by both university and community partners. These student benefits, as identified by interview participants, included deepening and applying course content and theory, learning new skills, ‘real world’ experience, building their resumes for future employment, and making connections to future employers and professional networks.

**Benefits for faculty.** In addition to benefits for students, benefits accruing to faculty were identified by both university and community partners. Faculty benefits, as identified by interview participants, included providing and facilitating meaningful education for their students, expanding faculty awareness and perspectives, developing them in their field or discipline, developing research projects or a pipeline for future projects, and personal reward. Table 17 provides additional detail about the categories of benefits for university partners in partnerships with community organizations, including examples of each as drawn from UM partner interview data.
Table 17

*University Partner Benefit Themes Reflected in Interviews with University Partners*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benefits</th>
<th>Excerpts from Partner Interviews</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Theme: Student Benefits (Including “real world” experience, applying course content, learning new skills, resume building, and future employer connections) | Students learn a lot about designing for real people. So in the classroom we have very kind of theoretical or this is the way you should design, but we package things very nicely in a classroom. By working with a community partner, students see how messy real-world projects are.

I would say it’s a great way to encourage your students and motivate them to become really invested and inspired and passionate about a project….. and it’s a learning experience too, in that they’re working with real people, so they’re applying their skills out into the world and they’re getting critique and feedback. It’s a hard lesson for them and a good lesson. So they’re practicing those real world skills.

It was good to kind of contextualize a learning opportunity for students at the university, where they were actually working on a real-world problem.

This allows our students an opportunity to practice skills, work on communication….working with diverse populations…..So there’s a lot of educational benefits and experience for students that doesn’t happen every day.

It could be that this partner ends up being, you know, part of their professional network, could be a potential future employer or other, you know, professional contact….And so it really, it changes the whole dynamic of how the students approach the work.

I think one of the most valuable things this class provides is real experience to learn something in a relatively safe environment but one that…provides real issue opportunities to work on a team and deal with conflict management and team-building skills, the ability to work with a consulting client who, you know, sometimes they get back to you, sometimes they don’t. So it provides, you know, a very realistic learning experience for student for students to learn and develop a wide range of life skills. |

| Theme: Faculty Benefits (educating their students, faculty development in their field or discipline, research projects or research development, personal reward) | The benefits for, from the faculty side, are immense. Like the students learn so much more from engaging with real people and real projects and having an impact in the community versus having an in-class problem or assignment.

I think it’s fulfilling as an instructor just on a personal level. I would also say I enjoy kind of team teaching and collaborative effort. So to not be the sole voice….It takes some of the pressure off of a teacher cause you’re, you know, you’re tag-teaming efforts, and I like bouncing ideas off of other people and hearing different opinions….And it kind of inspires me to build off of it. So working with community partners enables that.

But when I started teaching [course name], I really had to broaden my knowledge of the field…. I really had to broaden my whole area of knowledge. You know, one thing I would say ever since I started teaching engagement courses, my whole understanding of (discipline) has really expanded.

We do have long-term plans for the partnership that do involve, I would describe it more as research and I think there’s benefits for people in faculty positions.

So it’s really expanded my perception of my own field and awareness of what’s happening out there.

And so it’s given me a real opportunity to get a sense of what is going on and isn’t going on in the (community redacted) around issues and concerns of older people. |
Regarding university benefits, those accruing to students were identified more frequently by each partner sub-group than those accruing to faculty. Like in identifying community partner benefits, described previously, there were differences in the frequency with which each benefit theme or category was identified, community partners indicating student benefit five times more frequently than faculty benefits. Additionally, faculty/staff partners were more likely to identify their own collective benefits than community partners identified benefit for faculty, mentioning university benefits more than three times more than community partners, at 37 mentions compared to community partners’ 13 mentions. Figure 10 provides a graphic summary of partner responses about the types of beneficial impacts for UM partners, and the frequency with which those impacts were identified by partner sub-group.

![Figure 10. Frequency of type of UM partner benefit identified by partner group.](image)

**University partner challenges.** Like the examination of community partner perceptions, it is important to understand university partner challenges in order to more fully understand their benefit since the nature and prevalence of these two concepts are both important when considering benefits in community-university partnerships. The
following data represents interview and qualitative survey data shared by UM partners about the challenges and barriers in process or outcomes in community partnerships.

UM partners identified several types of challenges resulting from community partnerships. Patterns that emerged as challenges from the interviews included several thematic areas of focus. These included:

- timing misalignment caused by the academic calendar and the increased time it takes to engage in partnerships with community organizations;
- increased need for faculty to be adaptable in their expectations and preparedness;
- logistics, such as finding partners, transportation, project planning, funding; partnership liaising and communication; and
- lack of support in the university tenure and promotion process for faculty.

Table 18 provides additional detail about these thematic categories of challenges for university partners in partnerships with community organizations, including the number of university partners represented in each theme and examples of each drawn from UM partner interview data.

Table 18

*University Partner Challenges, Reflected in Interviews with University Partners*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Challenge</th>
<th>Excerpts from UM Partner Interviews</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Theme: Timing and time constraints (identified by 6 of 11 partners) | One of the challenges...I don't feel like there's enough time sometimes, too, when you think about the amount of time you have in a semester and the project that you're trying to solve or the work that you're trying to do.  
So perfect example is we're on a very different academic schedule and it doesn't always line up with what the community partners are thinking.  
It takes more time than some of the other types of learning activities we might do. So if I have students that are coming to an established outpatient doctor's office to see patients, there's all of the structural aspects already in place. So there's development of the, in our case of the service that needed to happen and continues to happen in order for the organization and for the students to find benefit.  
When you are just working with a dataset, then that data set always has time for |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Challenge</th>
<th>Excerpts from UM Partner Interviews</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>you. That data set is always available. That dataset is, is always there. Right? Whereas community partners, they're real people with real lives....They may disappear and be unavailable for certain periods of time. They may they may lose their job, they may quit their job, they may you know, change their priorities. The fact that, you know, we have to exit the community, and then, you know, one of my struggles is that this class doesn't continue over the summer. I did work with a faculty member here to attempt to offer independent study, if there were any students that wanted to carry on the work over the summer because it really was so obvious to everyone that, you know, we were withdrawing our resources and at a time where it would have been beneficial to, to continue. And we actually didn't have any students that ended up being able to take that on. But you know, that was something that was just, you know, acknowledged as being a challenge, and you know, just the time-limited piece of this work was just the challenge.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Theme: Faculty expectations and preparedness (identified by 6 of 11 partners)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I didn't think I would really have to talk as much as I do about privilege. And you know, we had a situation with race and you know, I'm teaching, I'm not a social worker. I think that has been one of the challenges that I have had to like, ahhh, dive deep. And you won't, I will say, you won't know what to say for everything and so reminding the students that we're learning together. And that's tricky too because a lot of faculty want to know everything.... In a classroom. Like, I think you feel confident because you're, you know everything, and you're teaching the students the wisdom you have, but in a lot of these cases, you won't know. So the unknowingness of what might arise. It's tricky, and I have to say, I have been disheartened at times because situations blow up, and I haven't known how to handle them correctly. If you're working on a dataset or in archives or something like that those, you know, you're really only wrestling with your own emotions or your own issues not working through other people's. And so I think those are the real challenges. I would describe that, - not underestimate how long it takes to build a relationship and also to have that, the reciprocal trust with your community partner and knowing that it may, you may either need to implement something without, you know, going through many schemes of, you know, research or like developing something and that you need to be more flexible than you would expect.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Theme: Tenure and promotion (identified by 4 of 11 partners)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>So I think, I mean, when I think about this partnership, it's still super unclear to me how I'm going to benefit in terms of my academic job.... So in terms of like what my tenure and promotion committee want to see from me, I don't know what they're going to see, see from this partnership yet. And so it's really about developing those relationships and partnerships that in the end will serve you well. It's just, I think for a new assistant professor who's on this very speedy treadmill in terms of trying to get work completed and published, this kind of an effort you know, may take them two years before they really, you know, see any sort of fruits from their labors. And unfortunately, many young faculty don't feel they have the time to do that. Operating as a faculty member makes it to some extent ...you are disincentivized to do this, or you're not incentivized to do it. My other comment would be on the tenure/promotion process... a community org's evaluation of a faculty member should be part of the tenure promotion process (for those who want it). I should be incentivized to build lasting/ethical partnerships in my community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Theme: Logistics (identified by 4 of</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I really feel that if you're going to teach these courses, there should be either just funding, more funding available for you so that your students can engage in these...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Challenge</th>
<th>Excerpts from UM Partner Interviews</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 11 partners) | *projects and that, you know, not worry about trying to, and you can do things in very creative ways as far as getting materials and things like that, but it would just be really helpful to not have to worry so much about the money side of it.*  
*Having staff support for, specifically for these courses and someone that can really help faculty...do the nuts and bolts part and having someone who can assist with those nuts and bolts.*  
*I didn't know the first thing about, you know, who in the community to reach out to.*  
*Students like may or may not have transportation.* |

**University partner benefits compared to challenges.** To evaluate benefit for university partners in community-university partnerships, we examined UM partner perceptions of challenges compared with benefits. Consistent with Lincoln and Guba’s (1980) discussion of value and worth in evaluation, this examination is important as it provides additional context to understand not just what the benefits of partnership are, but whether those benefits outweigh the challenges to get at the overall worth or value for university faculty and staff in partnering with community organizations. In the extant survey, UM partner participants were asked to rate “To what extent do the benefits of working with community partners outweigh the challenges?” We used descriptive statistics to determine that UM partners had a mean score of 8.74, based on a 10-point scale, with 1 representing “challenges outweigh benefits” and 10 representing “benefits outweigh challenges.” Figure 11 represents survey data shared by UM partners, indicating their collective perception that the benefits of partnering with the community outweighed challenges ($M = 8.74, SD = 1.32$). Even when factoring in the standard deviation of 1.39, the mean score indicates that UM partners perceive benefits in partnering with community organizations to outweigh the challenges.
Figure 11. University partner benefits compared to challenges in partnerships.

Summary. Using survey and interview data, we determined that, like their community counterparts, UM partners derive important benefits from their community-university partnerships, including benefits for students and faculty. However, these benefits do not come without perceived challenges related to the academic calendar and faculty time constraints, faculty expectations and preparedness, tenure and promotion, logistics, and community partner capacity constraints in partnerships with community organizations. Despite the important challenges identified, our data indicate that UM partners perceive that the benefits of partnering with community partners outweigh the challenges.

Evaluation Question Three

To what extent do partners perceive equity in university and community partnerships supported by the Ginsberg Center?
Alignment with equity. In order to examine partner perceptions of equity in partnerships, we asked survey and interview questions related to alignment with equity. To deepen our understanding of partners’ perceptions of how their partnership aligned with equity, we asked them to respond to our definition of equity and share their own operating concept or definition of equity.

Alignment with Ginsberg Center’s definition of equity. The Ginsberg Center uses an operational definition of equity in partnerships as “each partner getting a fair share of benefit and burden, based on considerations such as need, effort, and ability to contribute” (UM Edward Ginsberg Center, n.d.). This definition was shared with survey participants, along with the question asking them to rate, “To what extent was your partnership aligned with equity?” We used descriptive statistics to determine that, overall, community and university partners had a mean score of 7.76, based on a 10-point scale, with 1 representing “not aligned” and 10 representing “aligned.” Using an independent sample t-test, we determined that both community and UM partners perceive that their partnerships are aligned with equity. Community partners reported slightly higher levels of equity alignment ($M = 7.86, SD = 2.33$) than UM partners ($M = 7.63, SD = 2.42; t (61) = .384, p = .785$). Additionally, when factoring in the standard deviations of more than 2.3, the mean scores indicate less certainty about whether partners perceive community-university partnerships as aligned with equity. Figure 12 represents survey data shared by community and UM partners indicating their perceptions about the extent to which partnerships were aligned with Ginsberg Center’s operating definition of equity by partner group and in aggregate.
Figure 1.2. Partners’ perceptions of their partnership aligning with equity in aggregate and with details by sub-group.

**Partner-defined equity.** Our interview protocol included the question, “How would you define or describe equity in a partnership?” Participant answers provided additional insight into how partners are conceptualizing, approaching, and assessing equity in partnerships, and offering potential contributions to Ginsberg Center’s current operating definition. Participant responses tightly aligned with Regens and Rycroft’s (1986) description of procedural or substantive equity, with all but two partners offering descriptions aligned with procedural equity. As discussed in Considerations of Equity in Chapter 1 of this study, Regens and Rycroft (1986) described procedural equity as process elements or characteristics, such as fairness, access, inclusion, and respect. This is contrasted with substantive equity, which examines the actual distribution of tangible benefits resulting from the process. Procedural equity was represented in nearly all definitions offered, with 19 of the 21 partners describing this form of equity in their responses; four participants offered their description of equity as both procedural and and
substantive, and substantive equity alone was offered by only two interview participants.

Table 19 provides summary data by partner subgroup with illustrative quotes related to partners’ definitions of equity in partnership, categorized into procedural and substantive equity (Regens & Rycroft, 1986).

Table 19

Partner Definitions of Equity by Sub-group, Equity-type, and Frequency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partner subgroup</th>
<th>Type of Equity</th>
<th>No. of partners</th>
<th>Excerpts from Interviews</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Procedural</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Ensuring that our partners are aware of the biases that they may have...so that we’re not causing any more students to feel excluded because of who they are by any of the partners that we bring in. You know, we really want to build those relationships where they’re longstanding. It’s just not like a one-hit-wonder type of thing. Well, equity in partnership to me is all being included, being just inclusive in terms of welcoming all inputs, all thought processes around a problem, and then weighing each of them on their own merits.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substantive</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>I think equity to me is about people getting what they need regardless of whatever their status is.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>I think everybody gains. You know, it’s equal effort, equal output.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>Procedural</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>So understanding, defining the goals from each...from our end and their end, just defining those goals upfront. It is a mutually beneficial relationship, and are we both coming through what we’ve promised each other and treating each other with respect and communicating clearly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substantive</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>I think of it where no one group is benefiting more than the other.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>That there will be things that we can leave behind that will have strengthened the community in some way that...advanced the goal that they identified. You know that we are sharing in leadership, and sharing in the benefits as well.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Alignment with partner-defined equity.* After asking interview participants to share their definition of equity, we asked, “Using your definition or description of equity,
in what ways was your partnership equitable? In what ways did it miss opportunities to achieve equity?” Responses from partners provided a more nuanced picture of how they perceive equity. The responses from both community and university partners reflect a nuanced understanding of equity in partnerships, with almost all responses reflecting on a mix of where the partnership aligned and where it did not. Similar to participants’ definitions of equity, partners’ discussion of alignment with and gaps in equity in the partnerships can be mapped to procedural and substantive equity (Regens & Rycroft, 1986). Like in their definitions of equity, the process elements of partnership emerge as primary, with more than 70% of responses referencing elements of procedural equity. Table 20 provides data by partner subgroup with illustrative quotes related to partners’ reflections on alignment with equity in partnership categorized into procedural and substantive equity (Regens & Rycroft, 1986).

Table 20

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partner sub-group</th>
<th>Equity type (No. of responses)</th>
<th>Excerpts from Interviews</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Procedural (7)</td>
<td>“And I will bring up one other partner that I’ve been talking to….When I talked to them, I think when they were founded, the idea was working with the students most in need. But over time they’ve also sort of split into this, let’s just do what’s convenient. And so I think that they have a lot that they’re doing as well because it’s right next to the University of Michigan. And I think that they want to get back to where can we actually make the most impact versus where is it easiest for us to go because it’s right around the corner.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“Some of them are pretty equitable, depending on the partnership….I would say where some of the partnerships fall into a little bit of trouble with the students particularly is often the students don’t understand the lack of resources you have.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“I think that it was equitable in that, you know, we had students come in with a different set of skills…and we thought about things differently, and so we valued that they certainly seemed to listen to the issues that we were facing on a weekly basis….I felt that there was pretty clear communication and that they were hearing what we were saying and we were understanding where they were coming from.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner sub-group</td>
<td>Equity type (No. of responses)</td>
<td>Excerpts from Interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substantive (3)</td>
<td>“I don’t think it missed any opportunity to achieve equity...it’s completely equitable in that I got... these wonderful presentations, you know, literally Power Points, pictures, the whole nine. And they all had to talk and present on what they’d learned to me. And I came back, you know, to participate in that. And so you know,... I learned new things. And I would say that I hope that they got as much out of it that I did.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both (1)</td>
<td>“My agency got a lot of benefit out of it, although not as much as students probably because we’re not complete with the project. I think that the faculty probably accomplished most of their goals because their goal was to really set up their students with a real life project in the community.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>Procedural (8)</td>
<td>“Because our students know about it and because some of our faculty are becoming familiar with it, I think making sure that we don’t abuse the relationship and take advantage of it is something that I’m very protective of. And so I’m actually working with [community partner] to meet with the student directly and try to help figure out a better location and a better fit cause there’s a lot of reasons that it doesn’t fit. So kind of being able to have her say, eh... We’re both very protective of our residents at this point.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both (3)</td>
<td>“So I think that it’s equitable with regards to like say [community partners] helping us develop and frame our activities that we do and help the students with regards to their skills. But I think that there’s room, and it’ll be interesting as we develop this over the next year to get more resident feedback.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both (3)</td>
<td>“I mean I don’t really know how to answer that other than I don’t feel as though it’s been, I think it’s been a very equitable relationship....I mean, I think that they feel that I contribute to issues and challenges that they as a community are working on. And I also think though that, I mean, I have gotten so much out of running these focus groups, just getting to know these older people.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Both (3)          | “I think it was a mutually beneficial...relationship. I feel like the (community partner), got something from the students, and the students got something from their partners at (community partner). I think that because it was my, this was my first rollout of the program, I wasn’t clear
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partner sub-group</th>
<th>Equity type (No. of responses)</th>
<th>Excerpts from Interviews</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>enough in my communication about, for example the timeline the expectation, what possible things could go wrong. So I think like there were some missed opportunities on my end that I could have been a better partner and more clear in my communication...I mean they are getting something at no cost, so but it's, it's quite slow. So I guess there's a kind of a tradeoff there. They're getting this product, but it takes four months to develop. And so I think it was overall a pretty equitable relationship though in the end.</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Equity and benefit as connected concepts.** This evaluation focuses on benefits and equity in community-university service learning partnerships. In order to provide additional insight into our evaluation questions, some of the ways in which participants in this study might perceive benefit and equity as connected concepts were examined. In the discussion section *Evaluation Question One* of this chapter, we examined the degree to which the deliverables (products or services) that resulted from community-university partnerships were helpful to the community partner. In examining equity in partnerships, we examined potential relationships between perceived helpfulness of deliverables and alignment with equity.

A Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient was computed to assess the relationship between perceptions of partnership alignment with equity and the helpfulness of deliverables. A moderate positive correlation between the two variables was found when examining partners in aggregate, \( r = .443, n = 53, p = .001 \). This illustrates a relationship between partners’ perceptions of alignment with equity and the helpfulness of the deliverables in aggregate with increases in the helpfulness of deliverable correlated with increases in perceived equity. We also found a correlation between these two variables when examining only community partners’ perceptions of helpfulness and equity, \( r = .528, n = 31, p = .002 \), indicating a moderate positive correlation between
community partners’ perceptions of alignment with equity and the helpfulness of the deliverables. However, we found no correlation between the perceptions about equity in partnership and helpfulness of the delivered product or service when examining only UM partners, \( r = .290, \ n = 22, \ p = .190 \). Table 21 provides a summary of the results of partners’ perceptions of alignment with equity and the helpfulness of the deliverables in aggregate and by partner sub-group.

Table 21

*Summary of Pearson’s Correlation Coefficient of the Relationship between UM and Community Partner Perceptions of Deliverable Helpfulness and Alignment with Equity*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Statistical Test</th>
<th>Helpfulness of Deliverable</th>
<th>Alignment with Equity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aggregate Partner Data</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helpfulness of Deliverable</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.443**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2 tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( \text{N} )</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Equity Alignment</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.443**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2 tailed)</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( \text{N} )</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community Partners</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Partner Perceptions of Helpfulness</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.528**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2 tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( \text{N} )</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Partner Perceived Equity Alignment</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.528**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2 tailed)</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( \text{N} )</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Faculty/Staff Partners</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty/Staff Partner Perceptions of Helpfulness</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2 tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( \text{N} )</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty/Staff Partner Perceived Equity Alignment</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.290</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2 tailed)</td>
<td>.190</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( \text{N} )</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)**

**Equity and expectations.** As another way to deepen our understanding of equity in partnerships, we examined potential connections between how partners perceive equity compared to their perceived fulfillment of expectations for community partners. We found that, overall, partners who believed that their community partners’ expectations
were met also perceived the partnerships to be more equitable. A Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient was computed to assess the relationship between partners’ perceptions of their partnership’s alignment with equity and the degree to which expectations of the community partner were met.

There was a correlation between perceptions that community partner expectations were met and perceived equity variables when examining partners in aggregate, \( r = .388, n = 61, p = .002 \). This indicates a moderate positive correlation between all partners’ perceptions of alignment with equity and the perceptions that community partner expectations were met, with increases in community partner expectations met correlated with increases in perceived equity. There was also a correlation between the two variables when examining only community partners, \( r = .602, n = 36, p = .000 \), indicating a moderate positive correlation between community partners’ perceptions of alignment with equity and the helpfulness of the deliverables, with increases in deliverable helpfulness correlated with increases in perceived equity. However, we found no correlation between perceptions of community partner expectations met and perceived equity when examining only university partners, \( r = .104, n = 25, p = .620 \). Table 22 provides a summary of these results.
Perceptions that benefits outweigh challenges and equity. Finally, in seeking to understand more about equity in partnerships, we examined the connection between perceptions of equity and the benefits of partnership outweighing the challenges. We conducted a Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient computation to assess this relationship.

We found a moderate positive correlation between perceptions of alignment with equity and perceptions about the benefits outweighing the challenges in partnerships when examining the aggregate data, $r = .575$, $n = 61$, $p = .000$. We also found a correlation when isolating community partners’ perceived feelings of equity and their perception that the benefits of working with UM outweigh the challenges, $r = .690$. **
Overall, there was a relatively strong positive correlation between community partners’ perceived feelings of equity and their belief that the benefits of working with UM outweigh the challenges. Increases in feeling that benefits of working with UM outweigh the challenges were correlated with increases in perceived equity. However, we found no correlation between the perceptions of alignment with equity and perceptions about benefits of working with the community outweighing the challenges when isolating faculty partners, $r = .298, n = 25, p = .148$. Table 23 provides a summary of these results.

Table 23

**Summary of Pearson’s Correlation Coefficient of the Relationship between Perceptions that Partnership was Aligned with Equity and Perceptions that Benefits of Partnerships Outweigh Challenges**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Statistical Test</th>
<th>Benefits of partnership outweigh challenges</th>
<th>Alignment with Equity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aggregate Partner Data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits of community-university partnership outweigh challenges</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.575**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2 tailed)</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Equity Alignment</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.575**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2 tailed)</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Partners</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits of community-university partnership outweigh challenges</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.690**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2 tailed)</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Partner Perceived Equity Alignment</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.690**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2 tailed)</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Partners</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits of community-university partnership outweigh challenges</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2 tailed)</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Partner Perceived Equity Alignment</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.298</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2 tailed)</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)**

**Summary of findings for equity in partnerships.** Using survey and interview data from study participants, we found that there is perceived equity in community-
university partnerships. Similar to the findings above recognizing that benefits do not come without challenges, both university and community partners indicated perceptions that their partnerships were aligned with equity, despite some equity incongruences or gaps within their partnerships. For partners overall, we also found correlations between perceptions of equity and helpfulness of partnership deliverables, as well as equity and community partner expectations being met. These correlations were also present when isolating data from community partners, but disappeared when isolating faculty partners. Finally, we found that, overall, there was a relationship between partners who perceived that the benefits of partnership outweigh benefits and their perception that those partnerships were aligned with equity.

**Ginsberg Center as a Factor for Benefit and Equity.**

This evaluation research specifically examines benefits and equity in community, and UM partnerships supported by the Ginsberg Center. Findings presented to this point have focused on benefits and equity for both community and university partners without data specific to the effect that the Ginsberg Center might have on these partnerships. This section explores the potential mediating effect that the Ginsberg Center has on benefits and equity in community and university service learning partnerships.

**Benefits of working with the Ginsberg Center.** As a part of this study, we examined community and UM partners’ perceptions about their experience working with the Ginsberg Center as a part of their partnerships. Partners were asked quantitative and qualitative questions to increase understanding of ways and the extent to which the Ginsberg Center, directly and indirectly, factored into benefit.
**Benefits outweigh challenges.** We asked both partner groups, “To what extent do the benefits of working with the Ginsberg Center outweigh the challenges?” We used descriptive statistics to determine that, overall, community and UM partners had a mean score of 8.89, based on a 10-point scale, with 1 representing “benefits do not outweigh challenges” and a 10 representing “benefits outweigh challenges.” Using an independent sample t-test, we determined that both community and UM partners perceive that benefits outweigh the challenges of working with the Ginsberg Center. Even when factoring in the standard deviation of more than 1.50, both partner groups stably perceive the benefits of working with the Ginsberg Center to outweigh the challenges. Faculty partners reported slightly higher levels of perception that the benefits of working with the Ginsberg Center outweigh the challenges ($M = 9.00, SD = 1.24$) than community partners ($M = 8.81, SD = 1.80$), though the difference is not statistically significant, $t(61) = -.481, p = .632$.

Figure 13 represents aggregate a histogram of survey data shared by community and UM partners, indicating their perceptions about the extent to which working with the Ginsberg Center outweighed the challenges with sub-group detail.
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Figure 13. Partners’ perceptions of the benefits of working with Ginsberg Center outweighing challenges in aggregate and with detail by sub-group.

Connecting perceptions of the Ginsberg Center with UM. We looked at potential connections between how partners perceive working with the Ginsberg Center and their broader perceptions of their community-university partnerships. Specifically, we examined whether partners’ perceptions of benefits outweighing challenges in working with the Ginsberg Center correlated to perceptions of benefits outweighing challenges in their community-university partnerships overall.

We ran a Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient to assess this potential relationship. When examining the partners in aggregate, we found a correlation between the two variables, $r = .677$, $n = 61$, $p = .000$, indicating a relatively strong positive correlation between university and community partners’ belief that benefits of partnerships outweigh the challenges and their belief that benefits of working with the Ginsberg center outweigh the challenges. We also found a correlation between these two variables when isolating community partner perceptions, using a Pearson product-
moment correlation coefficient to assess the relationship between community partners’ belief that benefits of partnering with UM outweigh the challenges and community partners’ belief that benefits of working with the Ginsberg center outweigh the challenges. There was a strong positive correlation between the two variables, $r = .833$, $n = 36$, $p = .000$, indicating that increases in feeling the benefits of working with the Ginsberg center outweigh the challenges were correlated with increases in community partners’ belief that benefits of working with the UM outweigh the challenges. However, we found no correlation between the perceptions about the benefits outweighing the challenges in community-university partnerships and perceptions about the benefits outweighing the challenges in working with the Ginsberg center when examining only faculty partners, $r = .203$, $n = 25$, $p = .330]$. Table 24 represents these results.
Summary of Pearson’s Correlation Coefficient of Partners’ Perceptions of the Benefits of Working with Ginsberg Center Outweighing Challenges Correlated with Perception that the Benefits of Community-University Partnership also Outweigh Challenges

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Statistical Test</th>
<th>Benefits of partnership outweigh challenges</th>
<th>Work with Ginsberg Benefits&gt;Challenges</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aggregate Partner Data</td>
<td></td>
<td>Benefits of partnership outweigh challenges</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.677**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2 tailed)</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits of working w/ Ginsberg outweigh challenges</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.677**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2 tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Partners</td>
<td></td>
<td>Benefits of partnership outweigh challenges</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.833**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2 tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits of working w/ Ginsberg outweigh challenges</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.833**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2 tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Partners</td>
<td></td>
<td>Benefits of partnership outweigh challenges</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2 tailed)</td>
<td>.330</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits of working w/ Ginsberg outweigh challenges</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.203</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2 tailed)</td>
<td>.330</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comparing Ginsberg Center involvement to non-involvement. All partners were asked about the degree to which UM partners were prepared for the partnership, and then the degree to which they were more prepared when the Ginsberg Center was involved. For the first of these, we asked both partner groups to rate the extent to which UM partners were “well prepared,” without mention of Ginsberg Center’s involvement. We used descriptive statistics to determine that, in aggregate, community and university partners had a mean score of 4.41, based on a 5-point scale, with 1 representing “strongly disagree” and 5 representing “strongly agree.” Using an independent sample t-test, we also determined that both partner groups perceive UM partners to be generally well
prepared for the service learning partnerships. When factoring in the standard deviation, there is less certainty in perceptions about the extent to which UM partners are prepared. Figure 14 represents survey data shared by community and UM partners, indicating their perceptions about the extent to which UM partners were prepared for partnerships.

![Aggregate Results](chart.png)

**Figure 14.** Partners’ perceptions of UM partner preparation in aggregate and with detail by partner sub-group.

In addition to being asked about UM partner preparation, all partners were asked about whether UM partners were more prepared when Ginsberg Center was involved. Partners had an aggregate mean score of 3.31 based on a 4-point scale, with 1 representing “when Ginsberg Center was not involved,” and 4 representing “when Ginsberg Center was involved.” Using an independent sample t-test, we determined that both partner sub-groups perceive UM partners to be more prepared for the partnerships when Ginsberg Center was involved; however, when factoring in the standard deviation, the mediating effect of Ginsberg Center is uncertain. When compared to community partners ($M = 3.14, SD = .822$), UM partners perceived themselves to be more prepared when working with Ginsberg Center ($M = 3.56, SD = .801; t(62) = -.204, p = .045$).
Figure 15 represents a histogram of survey data for both partner groups indicating their perceptions about the extent to which UM partners were more prepared for partnerships when working with Ginsberg Center with detail provided by partner group.

![Histogram of survey data](image)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perceptions of UM partner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>being more prepared with</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ginsberg Center (1-4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>.822</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>.801</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggregate</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>.833</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 15.** Perceived UM partner preparation when Ginsberg Center was involved in aggregate and with partner sub-group detail.

We examined the relationship between partner perceptions about the Ginsberg Center and their perceptions of equity in their community-university partnership. To do this, we conducted a Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient test to assess the relationship between community and university partners’ perceptions of equity in their partnership and their belief that the benefits of working with the Ginsberg Center outweigh the challenges. There is evidence of a relationship between these two variables when examining partners in aggregate and when isolating each partner sub-group. In aggregate, there was a relatively strong positive correlation between partners’ perceived feelings of equity and partners’ belief that benefits of working with the Ginsberg Center outweigh the challenges, $r = .549$, $n = 63$, $p = .000$. There was also a moderate positive
correlation between the two variables when isolating community partner perceptions, \( r = .633, n = 36, p = .000 \). When isolating faculty partners, we found that a moderate positive correlation between these two variables also exists, \( r = .436, n = 27, p = .023 \).

Table 25 summarizes findings that increase in perceptions that the benefits of working with the Ginsberg center outweigh the challenges were correlated with increases in perceived alignment with equity in aggregate and by each partner sub-group.

Table 25

**Summary of Pearson’s Correlations Coefficient of Data Indicating that Partners’ Perceptions of the Benefits of Working with Ginsberg Center Outweighing Challenges Correlates to Perception that the Partnership Aligns with Equity**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Statistical Test</th>
<th>Aligned with Equity</th>
<th>Work with Ginsberg Benefits&gt;Challenges</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aggregate Partner Data</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnership aligned with equity</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.549**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2 tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits of working w/ Ginsberg</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.549**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>outweighing challenges</td>
<td>Sig. (2 tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community Partners</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnership aligned with equity</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.633**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2 tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits of working w/ Ginsberg</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.633**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>outweighing challenges</td>
<td>Sig. (2 tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Faculty Partners</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnership aligned with equity</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.436**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2 tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits of working w/ Ginsberg</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.436**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>outweighing challenges</td>
<td>Sig. (2 tailed)</td>
<td>.023</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)**

**Ginsberg Center and identified challenges.** As discussed in Chapter 1, the service design model for the Ginsberg Center is intended to support partnerships between
community organizations and UM in large part by preventing or mitigating existing challenges for community and university partners such as those identified in the Community Partner Challenges section of this chapter. We analyzed these challenges and compared them to data from the qualitative survey and interview questions related to the Ginsberg Center. The most centrally related question we asked was, “How did the Ginsberg Center contribute to or detract from your partnership?” A central, and centrally important, theme within participant responses illustrated the ways in which the Ginsberg Center counteracted challenges for partners in community-university partnerships, although not equally across the challenges identified. Table 26 provides examples of the ways in which elements of Ginsberg Center’s work is identified as counteracting the challenges to community-university partnerships identified in the University Partner Challenges section of this chapter, with exemplar quotes drawn from partner interview data.

Table 26

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Partner Challenge</th>
<th>Examples of Ginsberg Center Addressing the Challenge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Theme: Access to UM partners, including size, coordination</td>
<td>“But it's like, it's the whole size thing. It's so big that you don't even, you're like, oh, I can't even begin to think of where I might look for that information. So having kind of an &quot;in,&quot; like, I feel like I have an &quot;in&quot; now to U of M. That's really helpful.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“And so that, and then the other way that we've received services is that we, for the first time ever that I am aware of, we had this meeting with all of the different U of M programs at the Ginsberg Center. And that was really useful because some of them-- none of them had ever really talked to each other. They could start to see, oh wait, I'm...my program, I'm not making decisions based on where I can make the most impact.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“You guys have primarily played like a matchmaking role for us on our most recent projects. And so I think it was helpful.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Ginsberg helped match us kind of with a couple of programs this, from this last school year. But I feel like that was helpful. We got matched to something that was...”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Partner Challenge</td>
<td>Examples of Ginsberg Center Addressing the Challenge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>relevant to what would be helpful to us.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“There was a question to the effect of &quot;was the Ginsberg connection more useful than a regular UM connection...&quot; The answer I gave was &quot;about the same,&quot; which I think is generally true. However, many connections would not have been possible without Ginsberg. That's the crucial part. Ginsberg has connected a lot of dots and expanded opportunities, whether they all work out or not.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“I reached out to the Ginsberg Center looking for a group to provide blood pressure checks to our residents here.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“I think you're trying to be a conduit. I like that model cause it, you know, in some ways it'd be really hard for every department at U of M to think in that way, you know what I mean?”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme: UM lack of responsiveness or interest in partnering</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“I think that, as I was kind of saying, that one of the strengths of a partnership where you've had an organization like Ginsberg involved to help serve as broker to make sure that needs of those organizations are being met.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“I've also just been able to interact with other staff members who are always willing to provide resources. And so that's also been really helpful, and I think what my relationship with the Ginsberg Center has been more systematic and strategic.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“In the beginning it was really helpful to have that sit down interview with Ginsberg and the person that will kind of be taking the lead with our partnership to discuss schedules and kind of thoughts and expectations from each side of us. That was just really helpful to have a clear roadmap for each of us so that way we kind of knew and had an understanding of the needs that each of us would have in the partnership.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“They (Ginsberg) played a huge role because for me, I pretty much said, hey, this is a need that we are having. I don't, I don't even know. I was thinking maybe even (UM school) students, I wasn't for sure who would be the proper department to kind of take that over. And I think it did bounce around for a little until they realized that (UM school) would be a good fit for that need. And then when it comes to (student group), Ginsberg was also the one that introduced me to that project and let me know about these students. Knowing already from our meeting..., kind of our community, our needs our population. And how (student group) kind of fit perfectly with that.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme: Lack of student preparation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“We worked with Ginsberg to create a presentation that we offered to U of M student groups who may want to be involved in [school name] that both talked about what we're looking for and brought in that issue of equity and put it front and center.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“They go through the Ginsberg Center's you know, 'entering and exiting communities' presentation.... So the students are getting support around being aware of their biases and ensuring that they are creating a welcoming environment.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme: Timing and time constraints</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| “My community partnership relationships have always been multifaceted, but I could see how there could be members on the team who could like plug in for one
Community Partner Challenge | Examples of Ginsberg Center Addressing the Challenge
--- | ---
Community Partner Challenge | "I don't know that the partnership would have existed, to be honest. They were, Ginsberg Center was key. ...And then, you know, at the beginning we had some meetings to help build our services and our partnership and Ginsberg also had some trainings for students...Without the facilitation of that partnership connection through the Ginsberg Center, it wouldn't have happened. I'm a new community member here and I, I really I, yeah, I benefited greatly from having this connection."
| "So, Ginsberg has been really helpful with, you know, I didn't think I would really have to talk as much as I do about privilege. And you know, we had a situation with race and you know, I'm teaching, I'm not a social worker."
| "They provided me with lots of information, materials to read on service learning. So that was so valuable to my education and knowledge of the field. And workshops assisting with the student learning, the entering...Entering, Engaging, Exiting workshop. Very valuable....And it takes the pressure off of me to address those issues, you know...having an expert who really knows that piece of the puzzle is very helpful. And then I would say they've also mentored me when I've gotten in, when I've had some situations arise. That has been really helpful."
| "And any questions I've had you know, (Ginsberg staff) has been extremely helpful. She came over last year and did a whole session for I think three or four of the classes that we were involved with around how to enter and exit a community, which was great, we're going to do it again this year. So no, I mean it's, you guys are just from my point of view, a great link to the community for me who doesn't know much about the community."

Theme: Faculty expectations and student preparedness | "aspect. So say if somebody wanted to do more teaching or students wanted to have opportunities to volunteer or, you know, so I think that depending on the faculty member or the needs of (community partner) at any given time, it could be one thing. But I think that it's important to have kind of a group that knows what all is going on and I think that's been really helpful with our relationship with Ginsberg Center so that it's not one person comes in for this or that it's kind of more coordinated.”
| "We had in-person meetings set up at the Ginsberg Center, and so (Ginsberg staff) helped facilitate those meetings. And you know, so that was really great. I think she brought up some things during each of those meetings that maybe hadn't like occurred to me. And so obviously her training and experience was really valuable in that way. And then she, you know, went the extra step of saying, if anything comes up throughout this process and you have questions or concerns, you know, definitely feel free to reach out to me. So my hope would be even if the two partners or I worked with couldn't reach out to me, that they felt weird about that, but they would've felt comfortable reaching out to (Ginsberg staff) if they had any major problems with you know, what we did or how we delivered it, so. So yeah, it was great."

Theme: Tenure and promotion | "But what I felt like was kind of implicit in the support I got from Ginsberg on my project was that it was ok and I was in a way empowered to let this project run in a way that was primarily benefiting the community. And that I was able to not stress about, oh my gosh, do I have an academic paper to show at the end of this, which I am going to have an academic paper but...that felt like such in a way a relief and allowed us to center what was happening in the community."
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Partner Challenge</th>
<th>Examples of Ginsberg Center Addressing the Challenge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Theme: Logistics</td>
<td>“If I know one of my service learning sites isn't really a good fit for it, where can we go? And then that's our first call is always Ginsberg....”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Ginsberg Center was very helpful in identifying the partnership for the class.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“(Ginsberg staff) provided some good help processing stuff along the way that was coming up. I think, I really think this work, this work wouldn't have happened without the Ginsberg Center. I don’t think there’s anywhere else on campus that would fund this kind of work. And without a pot of money we wouldn't have pursued this work.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“We approached the Ginsberg Center to find out if there was a community partner that would be willing to partner with the [name of UM college], potentially...both students and then also faculty. And so through the Ginsberg Center, we were introduced to the (community partner), and we have been working to provide...events and/or address resident needs.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As reflected above, the Ginsberg Center provides support to both community and university partners to counteract challenges related to community-university partnerships. For community partners, the access and responsiveness challenges addressed by the Ginsberg Center through matchmaking seem to be most salient while the work the center does to prepare students was noted with less frequency. University partners seem to view their interactions with the Ginsberg Center as most helpful in counteracting challenges related to faculty expectations and student preparedness and logistics, including coordination and matchmaking. University partners identified important but less direct or frequent examples of ways in which Ginsberg Center is addressing challenges related to the academic calendar, faculty tenure and promotion, and community partner capacity constraints.

**Summary of findings related to the role of the Ginsberg Center.** The Ginsberg Center seems to play some role in fostering elements of benefit and equity in community-university partnerships. Our findings indicate that partners perceive benefits outweighing challenges in working with Ginsberg Center, that there is a relationship
between working with the center and perceptions of equity, connections between working with Ginsberg and meeting community partner expectations, and helpfulness of deliverables. We found that the perception that the benefits of working with Ginsberg Center outweigh the challenges is correlated to the same sentiment for UM overall. Additionally, data indicate that the Ginsberg Center plays a preventative or ameliorative role in addressing challenges to community and university partnerships.

**Summary Findings for Study**

Through mixed methods data collection and analysis, we were able to formulate findings to address each of our three evaluation questions. These questions and the data presented above help us to understand benefits and equity in community and university partnerships.

Through this study, we answered our first evaluation question centering on the extent to which and ways that community partners benefit from partnerships with the university. We found that community partners perceive benefits and challenges in their partnerships with UM, and that, overall, they perceive the benefits to outweigh the challenges. Additionally, we found that community partners benefitted in ways that contributed to their ability to fulfill their missions including those related to organizational capacity, organizational finance or economic gains, contributions to social networks or community conditions, and personal or professional rewards for community partner staff. Challenges were also identified for community partners.

We answered our second evaluation question, which focused on university benefits in community-university partnerships, finding that university partners perceive benefits and challenges in their community partnerships, and, like their community
counterparts, university partners perceive that the benefits outweigh the challenges. We found that university partners benefitted in ways that contributed to student learning and future employment and in ways that contribute to faculty development, research development, and personal reward.

We answered our third evaluation question, which sought to understand more about perceived equity in community-university service learning partnerships. We found that there is perceived equity in partnerships between community organizations and UM. Similar to the findings above, recognizing that benefits do not come without challenges, community and university partners perceive equity in partnerships despite some equity incongruences or gaps. We also found important relationships between perceptions of equity and helpfulness of partnership deliverables and between perceived equity and meeting community partner expectations.

Finally, we examined the role that the Ginsberg Center may have as a mediating factor in community-university partnership benefit and equity. We found some important relationships between positive perceptions of working the Ginsberg Center and partner benefits, counterbalances of challenges, and increased perceptions of equity.
CHAPTER 5

IMPLICATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This evaluation research adds to our limited understanding of equity and mutuality of benefit in service learning partnerships between UM and community partners, supported by the Ginsberg Center. At its foundation, service learning deploys students, faculty, and staff into partnerships with community organizations and institutions. For faculty members and institutions, it fits within Boyer’s (1996) scholarship of engagement, which called on universities to strengthen connections between their academic missions and practical social concerns. As theorized, by engaging with community partners around real-world concerns and challenges, service learning benefits students through enhanced learning, while benefitting community partners through the service provided (Bringle & Hatcher, 1999; Giles & Eyler, 1994; Kendall, 1990). Despite this promise of mutuality in benefit, there is limited empirical evidence that service learning holds benefit for community partners, or that the partnerships through which engagement happens are equitable. Additionally, there is a dearth of empirical examination focused on equity in service learning partnerships between universities and communities.

This study provided an evaluation and explication of how university and community partner benefit and equity manifested within one localized setting, with potentially broader implications and learnings.
Discussion of Major Findings

The findings provide detail about perceptions of community partners, university faculty, and staff partners regarding key benefits and challenges involved in identifying, executing, and stewarding partnerships. Findings point to important benefits for both community and university partners and show that benefits outweigh challenges for both partner groups. Findings also illuminate a relationship between equity and benefits and point to Ginsberg Center playing an important mediating role in fostering this relationship.

This chapter provides a discussion of major findings from this evaluation research and the resulting implications and recommendations for future practice and research. The chapter is organized by presenting a discussion of the findings for each of the study’s three evaluation research questions. The role of the Ginsberg Center is integrated into each question, as relevant. The chapter continues with recommendations for practice, followed by implications for future research. The chapter ends with an overall summary of findings and recommendations, contained in Table 27, which lists key findings and six related recommendations.

Evaluation Question One

To what extent and in what ways is there perceived benefit for community partners from service learning partnerships supported by the Ginsberg Center?

Benefits vary. Findings indicate that community partners benefit from community and university partnerships. These findings are consistent with other studies that have examined community partner experiences in service learning partnerships with universities (Blouin & Perry, 2009; Miron & Moely, 2006; Sandy & Holland, 2006).
However, even though participants overall found community partner benefits in these partnerships, there were some differences in the types of benefits identified by each partner group. Also, university partners seem to have less certainty about whether they were delivering benefits to community partners. These variances may point to a deficit in the feedback loop during and after the project or service, leaving university partners unaware of what actual impacts there are for their community partners. A few university partners indicated that they developed clear expectations and followed up with their partner to explore outcomes and satisfaction, but most did not. For example, one university partner shared, “I assume they found the product helpful, since they asked for it.” This points to the need to incorporate expectation setting, goals, follow-up, and similar scaffolding into the partnerships process.

It may also be that the discrepancy in how community partners assessed benefit compared to university partners’ assessment of it is related to the practicality with which community partners approach partnerships with UM. Several partners described their process for deciding whether to partner with UM, including making intuitive judgments about the potential value compared to the challenges or costs and then adjusting their expectations accordingly. In other words, it is possible that community partners found that deliverables met their expectations because those expectations were tempered. For example, one community partner indicated that expectations for the partnership were met and rated the expected product as helpful but not fully delivered. The partner offered, “We were, you know, pretty eyes wide open about what the challenges would be about engaging around this project…so my expectations were met.”
The lack of clear understanding of community partner benefit among UM partners is consistent with literature that points out the lack of intentional focus on community partner experience and outcomes in community-university partnerships (Bloomgarden, 2017; Butin, 2003; 2006; Cruz & Giles, 2000; Geller et al., 2016; Soria et al., 2016; Stoecker, 2016; Stoecker & Tryon, 2009). Further, both of the potential reasons described above for the discrepancy between partner groups point to insufficiencies in setting clear expectations and establishing feasible accountability agreements for the partnership. These foundational elements have been described as important components for mutual benefit and balancing power in the existing literature on community and university partnerships (Blouin & Perry, 2009; Miron & Moely, 2006; Sandy & Holland, 2006; Schultz et al., 2003).

**Persistent and systemic challenges.** Although data largely indicated that community partners find a variety of benefits through partnerships with UM, partners also shared more mixed qualifiers and nuances about the entirety of the partnership experience. Indeed, every partner interviewed identified several challenges in working with UM, with substantial consistency in many of their responses. Most of the challenges identified, especially those within the major themes of access and responsiveness (and their related sub-themes of size, lack of coordination, perceived exclusivity, communication, academic calendar, and unclear expectations) point to longstanding, persistent systemic and cultural challenges to community engagement within UM and throughout higher education (Fisher et al., 2004; Saltmarsh & Hartley, 2016; Sandy & Holland, 2006; Weerts & Freed, 2016; Weerts & Sandmann, 2008).
In addition to the consistency with existing research, the challenges identified through this study are aligned with feedback provided during the Ginsberg Center’s 2016 strategic planning process (UM Ginsberg Center, 2016). Specifically, that process illuminated concerns related to the lack of clarity about how and where to engage, under-coordinated efforts on campus, and a lack of emphasis on continuity in relationships with community partners as three of four universal themes identified. In response to that strategic planning process, the Ginsberg Center was largely redesigned to address persistent challenges shared by stakeholders. Findings presented in Chapter 4 indicate that the center is helpful in addressing identified challenges around access and responsiveness and, in the process, is contributing to perceived benefits for community partners. For example, a community partner commented, “Many connections would not have been possible without Ginsberg. That's the crucial part. Ginsberg has connected a lot of dots and expanded opportunities.” Another added, “I wouldn't know how to navigate the huge U of M system and certainly wouldn't have known a professor who would be willing to engage in this project. So, Ginsberg was that vital link.” Another partner shared, “In the beginning, it was really helpful to have that sit-down interview with Ginsberg…to discuss schedules and kind of thoughts and expectations from each side.” Findings indicate that Ginsberg Center’s matchmaking and partnership support model is having a beneficial effect on counteracting challenges described above.

**Cultural and competency mismatches.** Several community partners identified challenges related to inadequate student preparation for their engagement, such as a lack of competency to work with youth who have experienced trauma, or lack of awareness of resource and time constraints at many nonprofits. This theme involving a deficit in
preparing students to engage with community partners was also one of four universal themes that emerged as a part of Ginsberg Center’s 2016 strategic planning process (UM Ginsberg Center, 2016).

Respondents consistently identified that Ginsberg Center plays an important role in mitigating the lack of student preparation, with interviewees specifically identifying Ginsberg Center workshops and course sessions offered to students, focused on social identities, power, privilege, and oppression. However, partners also identified student preparation as a continuing challenge. This points to the possibility that expanding the reach of these offerings holds promise in improving the preparation of university students who engage with community partners. UM students come from households with median incomes of $154,000, nearly three times the State of Michigan’s median household income of $52,492 (Theut, 2017). The student body is majority White, with 55% of student identifying as White, compared to only 15% of students who identify as an underrepresented minority. Additionally, 69% of faculty and 65% of staff also identify as White (UM Office of Budget and Planning, n.d.). At the same time, the community partners, and especially their constituents, with whom UM students and faculty engage are predominantly lower-income, people of color, or people with other marginalized identities. Beyond the mere identity and demographic mismatches, like most universities, UM is a setting where faculty and student autonomy and agency are prized. In other words, faculty and students can engage wherever they wish, even when that engagement is not optimal. This set of conditions reinforces the need for providing robust educational offerings to maximize student, faculty, and staff’s awareness of themselves; their assumptions and abilities; and the people and issues they seek to impact.
Evaluation Question Two

To what extent and in what ways is there perceived benefit for university partners, particularly faculty and staff, from service learning partnerships supported by the Ginsberg Center?

**Benefits to teaching and reflective practice.** Findings indicate that university partners readily identified both benefits and challenges in partnerships with community and that the benefits of engagement outweighed the challenges. Almost every university respondent identified student learning as a motivation and major benefit of service learning partnerships. For example, a faculty partner shared that community-engaged partnerships, “allow our students an opportunity to practice skills, work on communication…work with diverse populations…. So there's a lot of educational benefits and experience for students.” Focus and passion for contributing to student development and learning is an essential driver for faculty and staff participants at UM and is consistent with existing literature about faculty motivations for community-engaged practice more broadly (Butin, 2012; Driscoll, 2014; Hou & Wilder, 2010). University partners also referenced their own learning and development as important benefits of engaging with community partners, including feeling personally rewarded and enhancing knowledge of their own discipline or field as well as the larger community. This finding, which provides insight into the intrinsic rewards of community and university partnership work, is also consistent with existing research about the central motivations of faculty who engage with community partners (Abes et al., 2002; Bloomgarden & O’Meara, 2007; Cooper, 2014; Pribbenow, 2005). Further, it points to a potentially important vehicle through which UM administrators could develop and
reward faculty and build satisfaction and morale, all while advancing UM’s stated priorities of public engagement and diversity, equity, and inclusion (UM Office of the President, n.d.).

**Challenges to workload and advancement.** “Operating as a faculty member makes it to some extent...you are disincentivized to do this, or you're not incentivized to do it.” This quote from a faculty participant provides helpful framing to understand key challenges to service learning partnerships. Indeed, even though faculty and staff partners found benefit in their partnerships with community organizations, they shared important insights into the significant, mostly structural challenges associated with the ways in which the institution regards service learning partnerships for faculty.

**Workload.** Challenges for faculty include increased planning, logistics, time, funding, and preparation needed and the lack of recognition or reward for taking on this type of work. These challenges get to heart of and reinforce what numerous scholars have already identified (Abes et al., 2002; Bloomgarden & O’Meara, 2007; Butin, 2006; Cooper, 2014; Hou & Wilder, 2010; Sobrero & Jayaratne, 2014), and are consistent with the key themes identified during Ginsberg Center’s 2016 strategic planning process (UM Ginsberg Center, 2016). That is, the university lacks robust and connected infrastructure for cultivating and maintaining university and community partnerships, including providing needed coordination, preparation, logistical support to faculty and instructional staff who engage, and support for stewarding partnerships beyond a time-limited project or course. Our findings indicate that faculty and staff feel burdened by this lack of infrastructure to support their engagement, which points to challenges to the
sustainability of partnerships. For example, one faculty partner answered our question about the challenges of service learning partnerships by sharing,

Logistics. Figuring that all out, how you're going to get students there? When? Who's going to meet with them? How long are the site visits? How many times should they meet with people? So that, that's a lot of extra, like, the logistics, it doesn't seem like a lot of extra work, but it is. And then figuring out communication. How are you, how are the students communicating with your community partners or in what modes?

Findings related to the role of the Ginsberg Center indicate that the center is making headway in effectively addressing some of the challenges identified by university partners related to community-university service learning partnerships, and it can be an important resource in supporting UM’s research and teaching core. The center was consistently identified as a resource in cultivating partnerships, with several UM participants contributing comments like the faculty member who said, “Without the facilitation of that partnership connection through the Ginsberg Center, it wouldn't have happened.” Another added, “Ginsberg Center was key... at the beginning. We had some meetings to help build our services and our partnership and Ginsberg also had some trainings for students.” Other faculty and staff identified the important instructional and research support provided by Ginsberg stating, “They provided me with lots of information, materials to read on service learning. So that was so valuable to my education and knowledge of the field.” Another added that Ginsberg staff, “provided some good help processing stuff along the way that was coming up.”
**Recognition and advancement.** Central to the more than 1,600 tenure-track assistant and associate professors at UM (UM Office of Budget and Planning, n.d.), the university lacks consistency related to how community-engaged teaching and research policies—and cultural norms and practices in applying those policies—factors into tenure, promotion, and related forms of recognition. More than 20 year after Boyer’s (1996) call for universities to integrate public engagement into their academic missions, the prevalent practice at UM and other high research universities continues to regard community engagement and community-engaged partnership work as service. Hence, requiring more traditional notions of scholarship for tenure and promotion (Driscoll, 2008). This creates ongoing concerns for faculty, especially junior faculty engaged in community partnerships, and constrains the number of faculty who will engage in equitable community partnerships.

Considerations of tenure and promotion are core for many faculty, and Ginsberg Center currently has only a peripheral role as an influencer for related policies and procedures. However, while the Ginsberg Center cannot address challenges related to tenure and promotion fully, findings indicate that the center does provide important support to junior faculty who want to engage with community partners. As an example of this, a junior faculty member who received grant funding and research support from Ginsberg Center shared, “But what I felt like was kind of implicit in the support I got from Ginsberg on my project was that it was ok, and I was in a way empowered to let this project run.”

Additionally, as illustrated by one research faculty participant’s comment, most faculty and staff are unaware of the Ginsberg Center and the support it provides. He
shared, “I think there are a lot of other faculty here who need to have more information about the Ginsberg Center and what it provides and how we begin to do that, I think is a challenge.”

**Evaluation Question Three**

To what extent do partners perceive equity in university and community partnerships supported by the Ginsberg Center?

**Partners perceive equity in their partnerships.** As shared in Chapter 4, our findings indicate that, overall, community and university partners perceive equity in their partnerships, especially when they perceive that community partner expectations were met and the resulting product or service helpful. Partners seemed to grasp the concept of equity instinctively, and every participant offered important and nuanced contributions to Ginsberg Center’s existing functional definition of partnership equity. Nearly all of the definitions offered by participants closely aligned with aspects of literature discussed in Chapter 2 defining and explicating equity (Blanchard, 1986; Frederickson, 2010; Gooden, 2015; Guy & McCandless, 2012; Regens & Rycroft, 1986; Woolridge & Gooden, 2009). It is important to consider that the partners connected to the Ginsberg Center, and the resulting partnerships brokered, may have already been predisposed to focus on and orient toward equity.

**Process—and relationships—matter most.** As reflected in the findings in Chapter 4, a significant majority (70%) of participants offered conceptualizations of equity related to Regens and Rycroft’s (1986) procedural equity framing. Partners’ responses focused largely on the process of partnerships, sharing the importance of elements such as the genesis of the partnership, partner responsiveness, consistent
communication, preparation, respect, voice, effort, follow-through, commitment, and longevity. For example, one community partner shared her definition of equity in partnership as “trust, constructive feedback, openness to new ideas, responsiveness, clear, thoughtful engagement.” Another shared, “You know, we really want to build those relationships where they're longstanding. It's just not like a one-hit-wonder type of thing.” These statements and our overall findings are consistent with existing research about the importance of the engagement process in service learning partnerships included in Chapter 2 (Bennett et al., 2016; Blouin & Perry, 2009; Cruz & Giles, 2000; Miron & Moely, 2006; Sandy & Holland, 2006; Stoecker, 2016; Stoecker & Tryon, 2009). The centrality of these relational elements points to partnerships as more than only transactions or technical engagements. Instead, procedural equity has relationships at the core; and our findings indicate that partners are factoring in the fitness of the relationship in assessing the benefits derived from the partnership. A faculty respondent offered an illustrative take, capturing the importance of relationship as a driver of equity:

I guess I look at it like any other relationship, in that I may feel I'm in an inequitable situation at different times in that relationships. And other times I feel I'm in a more equitable, I'm getting more than I'm, you know, putting in. So, I think you have to look at equity over time and that you can't just look at it today. You have to look at the history of our interactions and relationship. So, I guess that's how I would look at it. It's a longitudinal thing. But I think when the inequities over time outweigh the equity and what you're getting, you'll just sever those relationships. And so that's the challenge I think is try to balance that equity over time.
This statement is important because it speaks to the central role of relationships in community-university service learning partnerships. It is also resonant because it could apply to any relationship, in which connection and reciprocity are understood beyond one interaction and in which equity over time determines the value of the relationship to each party.

Our findings indicate that, consistent with its design, the Ginsberg Center is playing an important role in developing, nurturing, and institutionalizing relationships within and beyond the university. Community and UM partners consistently identified the Ginsberg Center as an institutional partner, beyond a single staff or faculty member. One community partner shared, “this is why the Ginsberg Center has been so useful because they're, you know, I can always talk to [staff name] or somebody at Ginsberg.”

Through an approach that institutionalizes helpful and sustainable relationships, the Ginsberg Center is regarded as an asset in advancing procedural equity in community-university partnerships, including facilitating goal- and expectation-setting, predicting and planning for challenges that may arise, being available for ongoing consultation and problem-solving. A faculty partner shared,

We had in-person meetings…at the Ginsberg Center and [a Ginsberg staff member] helped facilitate those meetings. I think she brought up some things during each of those meetings that hadn't like occurred to me. And so obviously her training and experience was really valuable in that way. And then she, you know, went the extra step of saying, if anything comes up throughout this process and you have questions or concerns, you know, definitely feel free to reach out to me.
Ginsberg Center is also advancing procedural equity by providing coordination of multiple university partners to clarify roles and amplify community impact over time. A faculty partner summarized this by saying,

I think that it's important to have kind of a group that knows what all is going on and I think that our relationship with Ginsberg Center has been really helpful so that it's not one person comes in for this or that it's kind of more coordinated…I like the model because it, you know, in some ways it’d be really hard for every department at U of M to think in that way.

However, although the Ginsberg Center can play an important role in advancing elements associated with procedural equity, the center’s visibility and saturation with university and community partners are limited.

**Impact matters too.** Our findings indicate the importance of outcomes in understanding equity in partnerships. Although process factors loomed large in partners’ understanding of equity, outcomes and impacts of the partnership also factored in, and were included in participants’ definitions of equity. For example, one university partner described equity in partnership as “there will be things that we can leave behind that will have strengthened the community in some way that will have, you know, accomplished or advanced the goal that they identified.” Our survey data also reinforces that outcomes are an important consideration in partnership equity, with findings that there is a relationship between partners’ perceptions of the helpfulness of the deliverable and the partnership’s alignment with equity. These findings are consistent with literature discussed in Chapter 2 which supports the idea that partnerships are a process-oriented enterprise, but also stresses that it is important for those processes to generate tangible
outputs and outcomes and changes for community partners and communities (Gelmon et al., 2001; Rosing, 2015; Stoecker, 2016; Stoecker, Beckman, & Min, 2010). Taken together, existing research and this study’s findings point to a need for an increased focus and capacity in attending to Regens and Rycroft’s (1986) framing of substantive equity in relation to UM’s community engagement efforts. This finding calls for continued development and refinement of the student and faculty preparation process components reflected in the center’s logic model in Figure 2 of Chapter 1.

**Recommendations for Policy and Practice**

As discussed above, this evaluation has produced important findings and implications for policy and practice. This section puts forth a set of seven recommendations for policy and practice that follow from these findings, all aimed at advancing benefits and equity in service learning partnerships between UM and community organizations. The section ends with Table 27, which summarizes these recommendations.

**Recommendation one.** Highlight the importance of and mechanisms for stewardship of long-term relationships in service to equity and future partnerships. Build on Ginsberg Center’s capacity to institutionalize matchmaking infrastructure to advance beneficial and equitable partnerships, including coordinating access to broader networks and assets, and leveraging and developing aligned human and technological resources within UM.

Sustained, long-term partnerships require commitment and capacity, elements often challenged by faculty and staff time-constraints and workload (Abes et al., 2002; Ostrander, 2004). Additionally, long-term partnerships are constrained by dynamics
related to academic capitalism such that university partners engage with community organizations as a means to secure grants and philanthropic funding, and to produce scholarship or resume accomplishments that lead to private gains for the university, its faculty, or its students (Brackman, 2015; Slaughter & Rhoads, 2004). While these types of engagement can be equitable and produce benefits for both community and university partners in the short-term, they are most often not maintained beyond the duration of a grant, research study, or similar discrete engagement.

As discussed previously, long-term relationships are most aligned with equity and community partner benefit. They are also important in building trusting relationships over time and setting the stage for future research and other mutually beneficial engagement activities (Jagosh et al., 2015; McKnight, 2003). Maintenance and sustainability should thus be more consistently encouraged and supported in partnerships between UM and community partners. With a mission that includes stewarding partnerships as a key component, the Ginsberg Center can serve as a resource for UM faculty, staff, and students who are not able to sustain partnerships beyond a discreet timeframe or project. As an endowed center within UM, the Ginsberg Center is much less reliant on grants or similar revenue models to accomplish this mission. Additionally, because the Ginsberg Center has an extensive network of UM partners, it is well-positioned to provide continuation or adaptation of a project by finding additional faculty, staff, or student partners to enter the partnership when the original UM partner must exit.

**Continue to build capacity and visibility of the Ginsberg Center.** The Ginsberg Center should continue to invest in the use of a CRM to enable matchmaking with community development and community-identified interests as a primary focus. Using
this CRM, the center has cataloged hundreds of priorities and needs from nearly 300 community partners and has brokered an increased number of matches with UM partners and resources since adopting the matchmaking model and CRM system three years ago (2019 Ginsberg Center Annual Report, n.d.). However, even though the center has successfully brokered hundreds of partnerships, the Ginsberg Center’s capacity to identify UM partners to come to bear on community partners’ needs continues to be imbalanced, with far more community needs cataloged than UM partners to match to those needs. Therefore, the Ginsberg Center should invest additional resources in engaging and expanding its network and pool of faculty, staff, and student organization partners and potential partners through outreach and engagement, faculty learning communities, and communication and marketing efforts across UM (Furco & Moely, 2012; Welch & Saltmarsh, 2013).

One recommended avenue for engaging UM partners toward matching them with community partners is through targeted convenings of UM and community partners, focused on specific issues and topics. For example, a recent convening spotlighted housing affordability and brought together community partners who shared their expertise about causes and effects of the decreasing housing affordability in the local community (Preece, 2016) and UM partners from an array of disciplines and roles who had previously expressed interest in community-engaged teaching, research, or service around this issue. Multiple ideas were developed at the convening for potential partnerships, and several of those ideas have been implemented.

Marketing and storytelling is another recommended strategy for building visibility and capacity of the center. Specifically, the Ginsberg Center should continue to capture
and disseminate what the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching (2016) calls “bright spots,” or unusual and positive practices, focused on ways in which UM partners, especially including those who are known and respected, are engaging in equitable and beneficial UM-community partnerships. These bright spots serve as exemplars, and potential signals to others across UM that engaging in equitable and beneficial ways with community partners is valued (Welch & Saltmarsh, 2013).

**Develop and coordinate access to broader networks across UM.** The Ginsberg Center is an essential part of UM’s community engagement infrastructure. As an established conduit between UM and community organizations, and with its position outside of a specific school or college, it serves as a neutral convener, bridge builder, and a door into UM (Harkavy & Hartley, 2012; Welch & Saltmarsh, 2013). However, even as the Ginsberg Center continues to build matchmaking infrastructure, it must work collectively with the many other centers, offices, and assets at UM that also facilitate community engaged teaching, research, and service to discover and cultivate the literally thousands of potential partners and resources across UM. Only by engaging and supporting larger segments of UM faculty and staff will norms, practices, and commitment to more equitable and beneficial community engagement be institutionalized and sustained (Harkavy & Hartley, 2012).

Therefore, the Ginsberg Center should continue to invest in and leverage support for Connecting Michigan, which is a fledgling initiative to explore the development of “a coordinated, broadly accessible, technology-enabled infrastructure for community and civic engagement, which builds upon, and coordinates where appropriate, existing decentralized inventories in order to advance U-M’s mission and amplify its
contributions to the public good” (UM Engaged Michigan, n.d., Connecting Michigan). This initiative acknowledges the decentralized, complex, and often siloed nature of a large research university where autonomy is highly valued. Rather than seeking to coordinate efforts through centralization, which will almost certainly fail, it strives to develop tools and pathways to find those who are willing and interested in engaging with others toward curated and collective engagement opportunities (Birnbaum, 1988; Norris-Tirrell & Clay, 2010; Watson-Thompson, 2015). The development of a more coordinated technological infrastructure such as Connecting Michigan would enable UM to realize a more coordinated future, as expressed in part by a faculty interviewee. She said, “I'm not sure it’s feasible, but I would love it if there was a searchable database of UM people already working with an organization. I think that would substantially take burden off of organizations.”

**Recommendation two.** The Ginsberg Center should contribute to building stronger, more equitable partnerships by enhancing, disseminating, and utilizing partnership principles and guidelines; expectation-setting; follow-up; and assessment protocols through enhanced tool kits and related scaffolding (Schultz, Israel & Lance, 2003; Preece, 2016; Saltmarsh & Hartley, 2011).

Ginsberg Center should continue to focus on procedural equity, including elements such as fairness, treatment, access, inclusion, respect (Regens & Rycroft, 1986) by developing or enhancing existing facilitation, as well as providing easily-accessible templates and tools that guide the early, middle, and end stages of each partnership. This facilitation and related tools should attend to differences in needs, power, and resources in establishing equity goals or standards such as what resources or burdens should be
shared, between or among whom, and the principles by which the resources and burdens will be shared (Osterle, 2002; Preece, 2016). More specifically, the center should support partners in attending to key elements, such as how partners understand the purpose, goals, and timeframe of the partnership; what the expectations are for communication between partners; how the partnership might change over time, predicting potential problems and discussing how they will be resolved; what expectations are for gaining closure to the partnership; and what support might be needed for any of these elements (Holland, 2009).

Additionally, as a means to parley procedural equity into substantive equity, the Ginsberg Center should promote an increased focus on how the partnership will be assessed. Consistent with Regens and Rycroft’s (1986) framing of substantive equity, assessing outcomes in UM’s community partnership efforts is needed to understand and, hopefully, maximize the actual distribution or outcomes related to costs and benefits that resulted from the community-university partnership.

Lastly, as discussed previously, the Ginsberg Center should also continue to frame and publicize its role in stewarding community partnerships for the long-term, while engaging other UM resources to join the partnership, as they are able. This will continue to support movement toward sustaining UM’s partnerships with community organizations and reinforcing the importance of process, equity, and mutuality in every stage of the community-UM relationships, potentially moving university engagements with community partners away from a charity approach that supports continued power imbalances and the status quo (Marullo & Edwards, 2000).

**Recommendation three.** Through increased investments, marketing, and partnerships, the Ginsberg Center should expand the scope and reach of educational
support for students, staff, and faculty to improve awareness of social identities, cultural humility, and equitable engagement principles and practices (Butin, 2003; Mitchell et al., 2012). In addition to filling a gap in UM partner preparation, this recommendation is critical to maximizing intended learning outcomes for students engaged in service learning (Butin, 2003; Mitchell et al., 2012). This recommendation calls for continued development and refinement of the student and faculty preparation processes reflected in the center’s logic model in Figure 2 of Chapter 1.

The Ginsberg Center should add professional and student staff capacity to deliver more workshops, training, consultation, and advising to students engaged in service learning partnerships and to faculty and staff who sponsor those partnerships. In addition to building internal staff capacity, the center should pursue more formalized partnerships with schools and colleges, and other units at UM to provide training and education to their faculty, staff, and offer credit-bearing opportunities to students. Modifications should be made to the center’s existing curriculum for students, and its training, consultation offerings, and materials for faculty and staff, to incorporate more content that explicitly centers potential social identity and skills mismatches.

To expand the reach with faculty, the center should build on and formalize past successful partnerships with influential centers and units at UM. Specifically, Ginsberg Center should expand partnerships with the Center for Research, Learning, and Teaching; the Center for Academic Innovation; and the National Center for Institutional Diversity to deliver workshops, publications, and related offerings focused on community-engaged teaching and research. Storytelling and bright spots, as discussed in recommendation one, are also paths to expand interest and reach in these offerings.
For students, the center currently mandates that student staff and fellows participate in community engagement workshops to prepare them to enter, engage, and exit community partnerships. These workshops should also be mandated for all student grants recipients and more heavily marketed and encouraged for first-year students and all of the UM student organizations that engage in communities. Additionally, the center should pursue partnerships with schools and colleges to offer credit-bearing opportunities that provide a deeper dive into equitable engagement practices such as social identities, power, privilege, color-blind racism and White racial identity. Lastly, the center should incorporate prompts about social identities and related characteristics of their constituents so that this knowledge can factor into the matchmaking and preparation process.

**Recommendation four.** Expand support for community partners by bolstering support for UM faculty/staff partners, including pedagogical, logistical, scoping, and coordination support to faculty and staff who are engaging in community-UM partnerships (Welch & Saltmarsh, 2013).

To expand support for faculty/staff partners, the Ginsberg Center should pursue increased professional or student staff to serve as partnership coordinators to faculty and staff across the university. Through co-funding models, these relationship coordinators could be supported by the Ginsberg Center, but be embedded within schools and colleges or located within the Ginsberg Center and deployed based on their skills and experience. They could provide support throughout the course of a partnership project and be assigned once a service learning partnership is matched. Important supports could include project scoping, establishing expectations and parameters of the partnership, communications, logistics such as scheduling workshops to prepare students,
transportation and project supplies, background checks, and related components through the wrap-up and assessment of the project. Additionally, these relationship coordinators, together with other professional staff at the Ginsberg Center could play an important role in supporting university partners by helping them gain more context to understand where the partnership fits within the larger university or community context (Eddy, 2010).

**Recommendation five.** Continue to deepen connections with academic partners to make the Ginsberg Center’s alignment with UM’s academic mission and promote a reconsideration of how equitable community engagement is factored into faculty tenure, promotion, and reward. All of the recommendations above can lead to important advancements in UM and community partnerships, but none are more central to engaging faculty in the practice of community-engaged scholarship than how it is factored into the academic mission and faculty reward, tenure, and promotion process (Fitzgerald et al., 2012; Sandmann, 2007).

The Ginsberg Center should collaborate to clarify how community-engaged teaching and research, including that which involves service learning, is formally considered in UM’s reward, tenure, and promotion processes. To do this, the center should work with the Office of the Provost, positional leadership within UM schools and colleges, department chairs, and others on campus who are interested in this process. Through it, we will catalog, analyze, and report on what “counts” as scholarship and the ways in which different forms of community-engaged scholarship are factored into existing tenure and promotion policies across UM. This effort could serve to illuminate actual policies, to begin to compare them to real or perceived gaps in the implementation of those policies across a decentralized institution with numerous cultures, disciplinary
traditions, and organizational norms. While acknowledging the challenges to incorporating equitable community engagement practices within a high research institution (Weerts & Sandmann, 2008; Welch & Saltmarsh, 2013), future work should focus on promoting alignment in tenure and promotion practices with policies, increasing consistency in practices across the university, and interrogating traditional tenure and promotion practices that have unclear alignment with UM’s diversity, equity, and inclusion, and public engagement initiatives, both of which reinforce the practice of community-engaged teaching and research. Additionally, while changes to tenure may be more difficult to achieve at a high research institution, more than two-thirds of faculty at UM are non-tenure-track (UM Office of Budget and Planning, n.d.). Thus, focusing on equitable community-engaged teaching and service as a part of promotion and reward holds promise as a high-yield strategy.

In addition to tenure and promotion, faculty rewards come in many forms, including recognition, funding, and administrative support (Welch & Saltmarsh, 2013). The Ginsberg Center should continue to share information and evidence with UM administrators about the benefits and scholarly legitimacy of community-engaged teaching and research, toward encouraging them to acknowledge their philosophical and political support for the practice (Welch & Saltmarsh, 2013). Further, the center should continue to partner with the Office of Research, the Office of the Provost, and other academic units to offer community-engaged teaching and research grants for faculty to reward them and signal that UM values this form of scholarship. Consistent with recommendations one and five, Ginsberg Center should partner to provide increased administrative and coordination support for faculty engaging in service learning.
partnerships, as well as create, publish, and disseminate stories and related forms of recognition for faculty engaged in the practice. Finally, the Ginsberg Center should work with UM’s president and other administrative leadership to offer Ginsberg Center awards for equitable community engagement and partnership. These could expand and complement the range of awards currently provided for public engagement.

Lastly, community partners connect with the center in part because the center’s work transcends constraints such as the academic calendar and disciplinary parochialism. Yet, a significant portion of the center’s work is academic, supporting and advancing university research and teaching. Instituting all of the previous recommendations will be bolstered by continuing to expand and strengthening partnerships between the Ginsberg Center and units within Academic Affairs, such as the center’s partnership with the Office of the Provost. As reflected on the organizational chart in Chapter 1, the Ginsberg Center’s administrative home is within Student Affairs, and it shares a senior counsel to the provost on faculty civic engagement with the Office of the Provost. This important strategic partnership serves as a signal and resource to faculty that community and civic engagement is a sanctioned activity. Additional formalized partnerships with schools, colleges, and other academic units can create deepened symbolic signaling about the standing of community-engaged scholarship to the core of the academic mission of the university (Weerts & Sandmann, 2008; Welch & Saltmarsh, 2013).
**Table 27**

*Summary of Study Findings with Policy and Practice Recommendations to Advance Benefit and Equity in UM and Community Partnerships*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Findings</th>
<th>Related Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Overall, community and university partners benefit from partnerships brokered by the Ginsberg Center. However, persistent and systemic challenges to partnerships remain for community and UM partners, including a lack of clarity for how to engage with one another, deficits in coordination within UM, and discontinuity in UM-community relationships. | **Recommendation 1**: Expand Ginsberg Center’s visibility and capacity to provide matchmaking support to UM and community partners to increase beneficial and equitable partnerships, including accessing broader networks within UM, leveraging, and developing aligned human and technological resources.  
---*Additionally*, highlight the importance of and mechanisms for stewarding long-term relationships in service to equity and future partnerships. |
| Understanding of community partner benefit varies by partner group.                                                                                                                                                  | **Recommendation 2**: Ginsberg Center should enhance, publicize, disseminate, and utilize a partnership toolkit, with scaffolding and protocols for setting and documenting expectations for entering, engaging, exiting, and assessing a UM-community partnership. |
| Some UM student, faculty, and staff partners lack intercultural awareness or preparation to effectively engage with community partners.                                                                            | **Recommendation 3**: Expand Ginsberg Center’s educational support for students, staff, and faculty to improve awareness of social identities, cultural humility, and equitable engagement principles and practices. |
| Student learning and faculty personal and professional development benefit from community-engaged partnerships, but inadequate infrastructure constrains the use and sustainability of the practice. | **Recommendation 4**: Expand Ginsberg Center’s pedagogy and research consultation, project scoping, partnership development and coordination, funding, and related support to faculty and staff who are interested in engaging with community organizations in equitable and beneficial service learning partnerships. |
| UM does not consistently encourage community engagement in the reward, tenure, and promotion of faculty.                                                                                                           | **Recommendation 5**: Partner to examine UM’s faculty reward, tenure, and promotion processes, toward the inclusion of equitable community-engaged teaching and research, consistent with UM’s diversity, equity, and inclusion, and public engagement initiatives.  
---*Additionally*, continue to deepen connections with academic partners to make the Ginsberg Center’s alignment with UM’s academic mission more transparent. |
Recommendations for Future Research

This examination of equity and benefit in UM and community service learning partnerships has provided important insights, but there are additional areas of inquiry that can further advance understanding of these and similar partnerships. Recommendations for this future research are described below.

Examining students' perceptions of benefit and equity. This examination does not include students as evaluation participants, but they are at the center of UM and community service learning partnerships. As such, future evaluation research should focus on the experiences and perceptions of UM students engaged in these partnerships.

In addition to increasing understanding about benefits, challenges, and perceptions of equity for students specifically, we can learn more about how these perceptions reveal alignment or gaps when compared to community and faculty and staff partners. Further, once we understand the ways in which UM and community service learning partnerships benefit students, we can analyze these benefits to understand the ways and extent to which there are alignments and gaps with existing research.

Given UM’s predominantly White student, faculty, and staff bodies, and Ginsberg Center’s focus on equity in partnerships with social sector partners, two particularly important areas to examine are student learning outcomes related to social responsibility and intercultural learning (Finley, 2011; Kilgo, 2015; Mitchell, 2013; Moely et al., 2002). Taken together, potential findings from an examination of students’ perceptions of their experiences can provide us with a more robust understanding of benefits and equity in UM partnerships with community organizations, and additional context and factors that can further inform policy and practice at UM.
Continue to examine equity and benefits in UM-community partnerships.

The Ginsberg Center should continue to collect and analyze quantitative and qualitative data focused on benefit and equity in partnerships it brokers between UM and community organizations. Continuing to disseminate the extant survey will provide us with a more robust data pool for analysis. An expanded pool of data, representing a larger sample size of UM and community partners, can improve our understanding of the presence and strength of relationships between multiple variables for each partner group (Creswell, 2014; Patton, 2009).

Collecting and analyzing additional data may deepen our understanding of some of the findings, and non-findings, in this evaluation. For example, the relationships between key variables in this evaluation were different for community partners than for faculty/staff partners. The relationships to equity, in particular, illuminated important differences to be explored through future research. Specifically, whether project deliverables were delivered as expected and the degree to which they were helpful to the community partner was related to perceptions of equity for community partners, but not for faculty and staff partners. For faculty and staff, expectations around project deliverables was correlated with most other positive or beneficial variables, but not with equity. In fact, the only variable that correlated with equity for faculty was their perceptions that the benefits of partnering outweigh challenges. Additional research can provide important insight into factors that contribute to discrepancies between experiences and perceptions of community and UM partners and in their perception of how procedural and substantive equity elements impact perceptions of equity, and also
how community and UM partners’ expectations and perceptions of their own needs factor into perceptions of equity.

An additional area to explore in this vein of future research involves concerns raised by two community partners about a mismatch in the social identities between UM students and community partner constituents. For example, one partner stated,

And then also just the diversity issue of the, and I mean you’re very aware of this, of University students. You know, we have almost half of our students are students of color, and we certainly know that some of the students facing barriers to achievement are you know, are students that may be African American, may have a disability. And so to have [University] students coming in and being able to represent the population and serve as that role model even more strongly because they are of a certain ethnicity or gender or whatever it is you know, that that’s been, you know, it's a hard nut to crack.

Although this was not included as a finding in the study, it is consistent with concerns raised by existing research (Blouin & Perry, 2009; Butin, 2003; Green, 2003; Mitchell et al., 2012; Stoecker & Tryon, 2009). As discussed in the literature, this dynamic creates added work and worry for community partners, in part because it requires them to make unanticipated adjustments to compensate for the ineffectiveness of a resource they thought they could rely on for support, and thus it is important to examine through future research with an expanded participant sample.

Also, continuing to disseminate the extant Ginsberg Center Partnership Survey to build the pool of data can also improve understanding of how perceptions of benefits and equity may change over time. This may help to understand more about the center’s
impact over time. It can also add to our understanding of the role of additional variables in advancing or detracting from benefit and equity in UM and community partnerships. Variables of particular importance are

- the type and dosage of partnership support provided through the Ginsberg Center;
- community partner characteristics such as sector, budget and staff size, and the number of past and present matched partnerships;
- UM partners characteristics such as role (faculty, staff, or student organization), type of engagement (teaching, research, or service); and
- partnership characteristics like the type of expected deliverable (e.g., providing direct service, sharing knowledge, event planning), and longevity of the partnership.

Lastly, additional related research could focus on partnerships brokered through centers and offices at UM beyond the Ginsberg Center. The assessment instruments, especially including the extant partnership survey and interview protocol, could be adapted for use by others who are engaging in UM and community partnerships. By engaging others at UM, we can begin to build upon our understanding of institutional outcomes related to benefit and equity in UM’s partnerships with community organizations (Bowers, 2018).

**Broaden our understanding of community impact.** Increasing our understanding of the benefits of partnership for community partners is an important step forward. However, future research should also focus on understanding the extent to which benefits for community partners translates into benefits for the communities and
constituencies served by those community partners. For example, do student tutoring partnerships actually move the needle on literacy for elementary students? Do partnerships that support fundraising efforts for nonprofits translate to benefits for those served by the nonprofit? As discussed in Chapter 2 of this study, apart from a few small studies, examining community impact remains largely uncharted territory in our understanding of university and community partnerships (Blouin & Perry, 2009; Driscoll, 2014; Gelmon et al., 2001; Miron & Moely, 2006; Sandy & Holland, 2006).

Additionally, examining community impact is one important strategy for building on procedural equity, toward substantive equity (Regens & Rycroft, 1986).

**Summary**

Based on the findings detailed in Chapter 4, this chapter included implications and related recommendations related to benefit and equity in service learning partnerships between the University of Michigan and community partners. The research findings overall indicate that both UM and community partners benefit from and perceive equity in service learning partnerships; however, there are also some persistent constraints and challenges. The recommendations seek to build on the policies and practices found to result in benefits or equity for one or both partner groups, address identified challenges that inhibit benefit or equity for one or both partner groups, and build on the efficacy of the Ginsberg Center in advancing mutually beneficial and equitable partnerships. These recommendations focus on building capacity at Ginsberg Center and UM to better catalyze, scaffold, and sustain these partnerships through increasing investments in matchmaking, coordination, and marketing infrastructure; expanding education and development for UM partners; and encouraging faculty reward
structures such as tenure and promotion, funding, and related recognition for the importance of equitable community-engaged teaching and research.

This chapter also provides recommendations for further research that can provide additional understanding of how to advance benefit and equity in UM and community partnerships, including for service learning partnerships. Areas for future research include expanding our evaluation research to include students, continuing to build a base of evidence through expanded data collection and analysis at UM, and broadening our focus to examine how community members and constituencies of community partners are impacted as a result of partnerships with UM.

This evaluation research provides promising empirical evidence that UM and community service learning partnerships are beneficial and equitable for all partners and provide evidence of the worth and value of the Ginsberg Center. The evaluation is important to the work of the Ginsberg Center and to UM overall as it examines alignment between rhetoric and action, and intent and impact in service learning partnerships. Thus, it contributes to UM’s integrity in educating students through service learning, a pedagogy that explicitly promises mutual benefit for students and community partners. It also advances our understanding of how UM, as a public institution, can more fully align its policies and practices related to community engagement with equity, which is a central pillar of public administration (Osterle, 2002). Finally, if implemented, the recommendations resulting from this evaluation more effectively institutionalize equitable community-engaged partnerships—especially service learning partnerships—and reinforce what faculty, staff, and community partners are striving to demonstrate; that is, we can do better together.
APPENDIX A

GINSBERG CENTER PARTNERSHIP SURVEY

Start of Block: Survey Intro: All Ginsberg Partners

Q1.1 The Ginsberg Center cultivates equitable partnerships between community organizations and the University of Michigan as part of our mission to advance social change for the public good.

This survey is intended to help us to assess the extent to which the Ginsberg Center is effective in carrying out our mission. We value your willingness to share your experiences and encourage you to give an honest assessment so that we can continue to improve.

The survey contains approximately 20 questions and typically takes 5-8 minutes to complete.

Q1.2 For the purpose of this survey, community partner is defined as a community organization or institution external to UM. A University partner is defined as any UM faculty, staff, or student group.

I am a:
☐ Community Partner (1)
☐ University Partner: Faculty Member, Staff, GSI/GSRA (2)
☐ University Partner: Student Group (3)

Skip To: End of Block If For the purpose of this survey, community partner is defined as any community organization external... = University Partner: Student Group

End of Block: Survey Intro: All Ginsberg Partners

Start of Block: Community Partner - Partnership Feedback

Q2.1 Your organization is a:
☐ Non-profit (1)
☐ School (2)
☐ Governmental organization (3)
☐ Other type of community organization or group (4)

Q2.2 What is your organization size?
☐ Less than 10 paid staff (1)
☐ 10 -50 paid staff (3)
☐ 51-250 paid staff (4)
☐ Over 250 paid staff (5)

Q2.3 This next set of questions refers to your experience with university partners you connected with through the Ginsberg Center.
We define university partners as any UM faculty, staff, or student group. For this survey, we are primarily interested in your assessment of your most recent partnership(s) with any university partner you connected with through the Ginsberg Center.

Q2.4 As part of your campus-community partnership(s), who did you work with? Check all that apply.
- UofM Students (1)
- UofM Faculty/Staff (2)

Q2.5 Please indicate any deliverables (products or services) expected as a result of your partnership connected through the Ginsberg Center:
- Providing engaging directly with clients or community stakeholders (4)
- Planning/organizing an event (5)
- Obtaining resources (financial, food, clothing) (6)
- Applying physical skills (construction, transportation, sorting items at a food bank) (7)
- Exchange/apply/produce knowledge (research, evaluation, grant writing, or other) (8)
- Sharing knowledge (training, technical assistance or information sharing) (9)
- Other (briefly describe): (11) ________________________________________________

Q2.6 Were the expected products or services delivered?
- Yes (1)
- No (2)
- Partially (3)

Skip To: Q2.7 If Were the expected products or services delivered? = Partially
Skip To: Q2.8 If Were the expected products or services delivered? = No

Q2.7 Thinking about your answer about partnership deliverables you listed in the previous question, to what extent were the product(s) or service(s) helpful?

Not helpful | Helpful
--- | ---
0 | 10
1 | 9
2 | 8
3 | 7
4 | 6
5 |
6 |
7 |
8 |
9 |
10 |
Q2.8 - Think about your **most recent** partnership/engagement with UM partners (faculty, staff, and/or students) you were connected with through or because of the Ginsberg Center, and please rate the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree (1)</th>
<th>Disagree (2)</th>
<th>Not sure (3)</th>
<th>Agree (4)</th>
<th>Strongly Agree (5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University partners were well prepared to work with us. (4)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our expectations for this partnership were met. (6)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q2.9 - Now think about your partnerships/engagement with UM partners (faculty, staff, and/or students) overall, compared to those connected through the Ginsberg Center:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>When Ginsberg wasn't involved (2)</th>
<th>Uncertain (9)</th>
<th>About the same (8)</th>
<th>When Ginsberg was involved (1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University partners were MORE prepared to work with us. (4)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our expectations for this partnership were MORE fully met. (6)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q2.10 **Overall**, to what extent do the benefits of working with the University of Michigan outweigh the challenges?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benefits do not outweigh challenges</th>
<th>Benefits outweigh challenges</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q2.11 Please feel free to elaborate on any of your previous answers.
Q3.1 Please identify your role at University of Michigan
☐ Faculty (lecturer, clinical, tenure track) (1)
☐ Staff (2)
☐ GSI/GSRA (3)

Q3.2 Please select your UM School/College. If you have a dual appointment, select the one most relevant to this partnership.

▼ Architecture and Urban Planning (5) ... Other (Please specify below) (24)

Display This Question: If Please select your UM School/College. If you have a dual appointment, select the one most relevant... = Other (Please specify below)

Q3.3 Please specify UM Center or Office:__________________________________________________________

Q3.4 Have you been connected to a community partner through the Ginsberg Center?
☐ Yes (1)
☐ No (2)
☐ Unsure (3)

Skip To: End of Block If Have you been connected to a community partner/partnership through the Ginsberg Center? = No
Skip To: End of Block If Have you been connected to a community partner/partnership through the Ginsberg Center? = Unsure

Q3.5 As a university partner, you have had the opportunity to work alongside community partners with shared interests. We define community partners as any community organization not affiliated with UM.

For this next set of questions, we are primarily interested in your assessment of your most recent partnership(s) with community partner(s) you were connected with through the Ginsberg Center.

Q3.6 My engagement with this community partner/partnership has occurred through (select all that apply):
☐ Teaching (1)
☐ Research (2)
☐ Service (4)
☐ Other (5) ____________________________________________
Q3.7 Please indicate any deliverables (products or services) expected as a result of your partnership connected through the Ginsberg Center:
- Providing service/engaging directly with clients or community stakeholders (4)
- Planning/organizing an event (5)
- Obtaining resources (financial, food, clothing) (6)
- Applying physical skills (construction, transportation, sorting items at a food bank) (7)
- Exchange/apply/produce knowledge (research, grant writing, or other project) (8)
- Sharing knowledge (training, technical assistance or information sharing) (9)
- Other (briefly describe): (11) ____________________________________________

Q3.8 Was the expected product(s) or service(s) delivered?
- Yes (1)
- No (2)
- Partially (3)

Skip To: Q3.10 If Was the expected product(s) or service(s) delivered? = No

Q3.9 Thinking about your answers to the previous question about partnership deliverables you listed in the previous questions, to what extent were the product(s) or service(s) helpful?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not helpful</th>
<th>Helpful</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q3.10 Think about your most recent partnership with community partner(s) connected through or supported by the Ginsberg Center, and please rate the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree (1)</th>
<th>Disagree (2)</th>
<th>Not sure (3)</th>
<th>Agree (4)</th>
<th>Strongly Agree (5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I/We felt well prepared to work with our community partner.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I/We feel confident we met our community partner’s expectations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q3.11 Now think about your partnerships/engagement with community partners overall, compared to those connected through the Ginsberg Center:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>When Ginsberg wasn't involved (2)</th>
<th>Uncertain (9)</th>
<th>About the same (8)</th>
<th>When Ginsberg was involved (1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I/We felt MORE prepared to work with our community partner.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I/We feel MORE confident we met our community partner’s expectations.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q3.12 **Overall**, to what extent do the benefits of working with community partners outweigh the challenges?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benefits do not outweigh challenges</th>
<th>Benefits outweigh challenges</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>6 7 8 9 10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q3.13 Please feel free to elaborate on any of your previous answers.

______________________________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________________________

End of Block: University Partner: Faculty - Partnership Feedback

Start of Block: University Partner: Faculty/Staff - Received Funding?

Q4.1 Have you ever received funding through the Ginsberg Center for your community-engaged teaching, research, or service?

☐ Yes (1)
☐ No (3)

End of Block: University Partner: Faculty/Staff - Received Funding?
Q5.1 To what extent did you find support provided with the grant funding (such as meetings, forums, resources) helpful?

Not helpful | Helpful
---|---
0 | 10
1 | 9
2 | 8
3 | 7
4 | 6
5 | 5
6 | 4
7 | 3
8 | 2
9 | 1
10 | 0

Q5.2 To the extent you found the support provided with the grant funding helpful, please let us know more about why. Please select all that apply

- I gained new insights into my teaching, research, or service (2)
- I learned specific strategies to improve my teaching, research, or service (3)
- I gained confidence in my teaching, research, or service (4)
- I increased my awareness of UM or community resources relevant to my teaching, research, or service (7)
- Other (Please briefly describe): (7) _______________________________________

Q6.1 Have you ever consulted with Ginsberg Center about community-engaged teaching, research, or service?

- Yes (1)
- No (3)

Skip To: End of Block If Have you ever consulted with Ginsberg Center about community-engaged teaching, research, or service... = No

Q7.1 To what extent did you find the consultation helpful?

Not helpful | Helpful
---|---
0 | 10
1 | 9
2 | 8
3 | 7
4 | 6
5 | 5
6 | 4
7 | 3
8 | 2
9 | 1
10 | 0

Q7.2 To the extent you found the consultation helpful, please let us know more about why. Please select all that apply

- I gained new insights into my teaching, research, or service (2)
I learned specific strategies to improve my teaching, research, or service (3)
I gained confidence in my teaching, research, or service (4)
I increased my awareness of UM or community resources relevant to my teaching, research, or service
Other (Please briefly describe): (7) ________________________________

End of Block: University Partner: Faculty/Staff - Ginsberg Consultation Feedback

Start of Block: University Partner: Faculty Member - Previous Workshop?

Q8.1 The Ginsberg Center offers workshops to students, faculty, and staff on a range of topics.

Thinking about our work with students, which of the following workshops has the Ginsberg Center facilitated for any of your community-engaged courses, service learning projects, etc.?

- Entering, Engaging, and Exiting Communities (1)
- Applying Principles of Community Engagement (11)
- Best Practices for Community-Engaged Research (4)
- Social Identity, Power, and Privilege (12)
- Collaborative Leadership in Community Engagement (6)
- Other (8) ________________________________
- None of the above (10)

Skip To: End of Block If The Ginsberg Center offers workshops to students, faculty, and staff on a range of topics.

Q8.2 To what extent did participation in these workshops contribute to preparing your students to engage with community partners?

Not at all
A great deal

End of Block: University Partner: Faculty Member - Previous Workshop?

Start of Block: University Partner: Student or Student Group - Partnership Feedback

Q9.1 For the following question, please select the answer that best describes your student group affiliation.

- Alternative Spring Break (1)
- America Reads (2)
- Ginsberg Fellows (3)
- None of the above (5)

Q9.2 As a student or student group, you have had the opportunity to work alongside community partners with shared interests. We define community partners as any community organization not affiliated with
UM. For this survey, we are primarily interested in your assessment of your most recent partnership(s) with community partner(s) you were connected with through the Ginsberg Center.

Q9.3 The members of your student group are primarily:

- Undergraduates (1)
- Graduate: Master’s Degree Students (2)
- Graduate: Doctoral Students (3)
- Mixed (4)

Q9.4 Which UM School/College or unit is your student group primarily sponsored by or affiliated with?

- Architecture and Urban Planning (5)
- N/A (24)

Q9.5 Please indicate any deliverables (products or services) expected as a result of your partnership through the Ginsberg Center:

- Engaging directly with clients or community stakeholders (4)
- Planning/organizing an event (5)
- Obtaining resources (financial, food, clothing) (6)
- Applying physical skills (construction, landscaping, transportation, sorting items) (7)
- Exchange/apply/produce knowledge (research, evaluation, grant writing, or related) (9)
- Sharing knowledge (training, technical assistance or information sharing) (9)
- Other (briefly describe): (11) ________________________________

Q9.6 Was the expected product(s) or service(s) delivered?

- Yes (1)
- No (2)
- Partially (3)

Skip To: Q9.8 If Was the expected product(s) or service(s) delivered? = No

Q9.7 Thinking about your answers to the previous question about partnership deliverables, to what extent were the product(s) or service(s) helpful?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not helpful</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Helpful</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Q9.8 Think about your most recent partnership with community partner(s) **connected through or supported by the Ginsberg Center**, and please rate the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree (1)</th>
<th>Disagree (2)</th>
<th>Not sure (3)</th>
<th>Agree (4)</th>
<th>Strongly Agree (5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I/We felt well prepared to work with our community partner.</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I/We feel confident we met our community partner's expectations.</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q9.9 Now think about your partnerships/engagement with community partners overall, compared to those connected through the Ginsberg Center:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>When Ginsberg wasn't involved (2)</th>
<th>When Ginsberg was involved (1)</th>
<th>About the same (8)</th>
<th>Not sure (9)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I/We felt MORE prepared to work with our community partner.</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I/We feel MORE confident we met our community partner's expectations.</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q9.10 Which of the following Ginsberg Center supports/resources has your student group utilized? Check all that apply:
- Advising or consultation (1)
- Workshops or training sessions (2)
- Funding (3)
- Transportation (4)

Q9.11 Through community partnership, you/your student group hoped to (select all that apply):
- Advance our learning (1)
- Inform our professional interests (2)
- Inform our personal interests (4)
- Make a positive impact in the community (6)
- Learn to work with people different from me (7)
- Apply learning outside the classroom (8)
- Develop new skills (9)
Q9.12 For the hopes identified above, please select the ones that were achieved:
☐ Advanced our learning (1)
☐ Informed our professional interests (2)
☐ Informed our personal interests (3)
☐ Made a positive impact in the community (4)
☐ Learned how to work with people who are different from me (5)
☐ Applied learning outside the classroom (6)
☐ Developed new skills (7)

Q9.13 To what extent do the benefits of working with community partners outweigh the challenges?

Benefits do not outweigh challenges
Benefits outweigh challenges

End of Block: University Partner: Student or Student Group - Partnership Feedback

Start of Block: Overall Experience Working with Ginsberg: All Ginsberg Partners

Q10.1 For this last set of questions, we would like to hear about your experience working with the Ginsberg Center.

Q10.2 To what extent do the benefits of working with the Ginsberg Center outweigh the challenges?

Benefits do not outweigh challenges
Benefits outweigh challenges

10.3 This question is about the benefits of your current or most recent community-university partnership(s) connected through/supported by the Ginsberg Center.
Please distribute 100 percentage points to reflect the benefit you feel each of the following stakeholder groups received from the UM-community partnership(s).

Community organization involved in the partnership : _______ (1)
UM student(s) involved in the partnership : _______ (2)
UM faculty or staff involved in the partnership : _______ (3)
UM overall : _______ (4)
Community overall : _______ (5)

Total : _______

Q10.4 The Ginsberg Center defines equity in partnerships as each partner getting a fair share of benefit and burden, based on considerations such as need, effort, and ability to contribute.

Thinking about your answer to the distribution of benefit question above, to what extent was your partnership(s) aligned with this definition of equity?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not aligned</th>
<th>Aligned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q10.5 Please feel free to elaborate on any of your previous answers to help us improve.

______________________________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________________________

Q10.6 Data gathered through this survey is intended to help us improve our services. Results will only be shared in aggregate. Please help us by sharing your contact information below, so that we can follow up to learn more about your experience.

______________________________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________________________

End of Block: Overall Experience Working with Ginsberg: All Ginsberg Partners
## APPENDIX B

### SURVEY AND INTERVIEW PARTICIPANT DATA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partner Type</th>
<th>Organization Type/Affiliation</th>
<th>Delivered</th>
<th>Helpful</th>
<th>Ben&gt;Chal</th>
<th>GCBen&gt; Chal</th>
<th>Aligned w/ Equity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community Partner</td>
<td>Non-profit</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Partner*</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Partner</td>
<td>Governmental</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Partner</td>
<td>Non-profit</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Partner</td>
<td>Non-profit</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Partner</td>
<td>Governmental</td>
<td>Partially</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Partner*</td>
<td>Non-profit</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Partner*</td>
<td>Governmental</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Partner</td>
<td>Non-profit</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Partner</td>
<td>Non-profit</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Partner*</td>
<td>Governmental</td>
<td>Partially</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Partner*</td>
<td>Non-profit</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Partner*</td>
<td>Non-profit</td>
<td>Partially</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Partner</td>
<td>Non-profit</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Partner*</td>
<td>Non-profit</td>
<td>Partially</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Partner</td>
<td>Governmental</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Partner</td>
<td>Non-profit</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Partner*</td>
<td>Non-profit</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Partner</td>
<td>Non-profit</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Partner*</td>
<td>Non-profit</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Partner*</td>
<td>Non-profit</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Partner</td>
<td>Non-profit</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Partner</td>
<td>Non-profit</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Partner</td>
<td>Non-profit</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Partner</td>
<td>Non-profit</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Partner</td>
<td>School</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Partner</td>
<td>School</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Partner</td>
<td>Non-profit</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Partner</td>
<td>School</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Partner</td>
<td>Non-profit</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Partner</td>
<td>Non-profit</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Partner</td>
<td>Non-profit</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Partner</td>
<td>Non-profit</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Partner</td>
<td>Non-profit</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Partner</td>
<td>School</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Partner</td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Partner</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Partner*</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Partner*</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Partner*</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Partner</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Partner*</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Partner</td>
<td>Role</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Partner</td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Partner*</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Partner</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Partner*</td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>Partially</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Partner*</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Partner</td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Partner</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Partner</td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Partner*</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Partner</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Partner*</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Partially</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Partner</td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Partner</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Partner</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Partner*</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Partner</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Partner*</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Partner</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX C

GINSBERG CENTER EVALUATION: INTERVIEW PROTOCOL

Project: An evaluation of Ginsberg Center outcomes, including benefit to community partners and UM partners, and the presence of equity in these partnerships.

Time of Interview:
Date:
Place:
Interviewer:
Interviewee:
Affiliation/Position of Interviewee:

[Describe here the project]

As part of our evaluation of Ginsberg Center outcomes, we are interviewing community partner representatives, students, and faculty/staff partners to learn more about their perceptions and experiences regarding UM and community partnerships, including the presence of equity in these partnerships. The data collected through this interview will be used in combination with data collected through the survey to help us understand these partnerships better.

[Explain to the participant that:

(a) we are seeking to understand the following guiding question for this evaluation. To what extent is service learning supported through the Ginsberg Center achieving intended outcomes?

(b) we are interviewing approximately 10 community partner representatives, and 10 faculty/staff partners to learn more about their perceptions and experiences regarding UM and community partnerships. Data collected through this interview will be used in combination with data collected through a more broadly disseminated survey to help us to understand the answers to our guiding evaluation question, and

(c) this interview will take approximately 30 minutes to complete.

[Explain that this is a voluntary, recorded interview and that the interviewee can end their participation at any time. Provide the written consent form to the interviewee, and ask that they sign and return it before beginning the interview. Offer to answer any questions they have about the contents of the consent or the use of data collected.]

[Remind the participant that the interview will be recorded, and begin recording prior to beginning the interview.]

[When all interview questions have been asked, thank the interviewee for their participation in this interview. Assure them that a draft report will be shared with them before finalizing the evaluation report.]
Interview Questions for Community Partners

1) Please describe some of your recent partnerships with UM. (Depending on what is shared, probe for: who they partnered with, such as students, faculty/staff, both, other; the nature of the partnership, such as planning an event, direct service to clients, conducting training; Ginsberg Center involvement, and how they knew about the Ginsberg Center)

2) What product or service did you expect to receive from this partnership? Describe how the expected product or service was delivered and how this compared to your expectations? (For cases where a product or service was delivered) How was the product or service helpful to your organization? How do you make that determination?

3) How would you describe the benefits of partnering with UM to a colleague or friend? How did the benefits of this partnership differ from other groups with whom you’ve partnered?

4) How would you explain the challenges of partnering with UM to a colleague or friend? How did the challenges of this partnership differ from other groups with whom you’ve partnered? (For example, have the challenges been different when undergraduate vs. graduate students are involved; or, when faculty are involved?)

(Prior to asking the next question, remind the participant that you previously sent the handout entitled, Sample Impacts for Community Partners in Partnerships with the University of Michigan, included below.)

5) How did partnering with UM impact your organization’s ability to fulfill its mission? (Refer to the handout with examples of potential capacity, economic, social/community, and professional/personal impacts)

6) How did your experience in this partnership change the way you think about engaging with UM in the future? In what ways do you think you might engage in the future?

This next set of questions are about equity in your partnership.

7) How would you define or describe equity in a partnership?

8) Using your definition or description of equity, in what ways was your partnership with UM equitable? In what ways did it miss opportunities to achieve equity? (Depending on what is shared, ask “can you give me an example?” or “why do you think that?”)

You may recall from the survey you completed that the Ginsberg Center defines equity in partnerships as each partner getting a fair share of benefit and burden, based on considerations such as need, effort, or ability to contribute.

9) In the survey you completed, you rated the equity in the partnership as a ____. Can you share some of your reasons why you gave it that score?

10) How would you describe the ways in which the Ginsberg Center contributed to, or detracted from, the partnership, particularly with respect to equity or benefit? How might you have approached this partnership without the Ginsberg Center’s help?

11) What suggestions do you have about how to improve UM’s partnerships with community partners? Did I miss anything that you would like to add about how the partnership with Ginsberg worked?
Interview Questions for University Partners

1) Please describe some of your recent community partnerships. (Depending on what is shared, probe for: who they partnered with; the nature of the partnership, such as planning an event, direct service to clients, conducting training; and Ginsberg Center involvement)

2) Describe the products or services expected to be delivered to your community partner? Describe how the product or service was delivered and how this compared to what was expected? How was the product or service helpful to the organization? How do you know?

3) How would you describe the benefits of working with community partners to a colleague or friend? Are benefits different for different types of partnership?

4) How would you describe the challenges of working with community partners to a colleague or friend? Are these challenges different for different types of partnerships? (For example, have the challenges been different for different types of projects?)

(Prior to asking the next question, remind the participant that you previously sent the handout entitled, Sample Impacts for Community Partners in Partnerships with the University of Michigan, included below.)

5) How do you think your partnership with the community organization impacted the organization’s ability to fulfill its mission? How do you know? (Refer to the handout with examples of potential capacity, economic, social, and personal impacts)

6) (For faculty/staff) - How did your experiences in this partnership change the way you think about community engagement in your teaching, research, or practice?

This next set of questions are about equity in your partnership

7) How would you define or describe equity in a partnership?

8) Using your definition or description of equity, in what ways was your partnership with your partner equitable? In what ways did it miss opportunities to achieve equity? (Depending on what is shared, ask “can you give me an example?” or “why do you think that?”)

*You may recall from the survey you completed that the Ginsberg Center defines equity in partnerships as each partner getting a fair share of benefit and burden, based on considerations such as need, effort, or ability to contribute.*

9) In the survey you completed, you rated the equity in the partnership as a _____. Can you share some of your reasons why you gave it that score?

10) How did the Ginsberg Center contribute to, or detract from, the partnership? How would you have approached this partnership without the Ginsberg Center’s help?

11) What suggestions do you have about how to improve UM’s partnerships with community partners? Did I miss anything that you would like to add about how the partnership with Ginsberg worked?
Sample Beneficial Impacts for Community Partners in Partnerships with the University of Michigan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Potential Impact</th>
<th>Examples might include...</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Capacity</td>
<td>• Types of service offered&lt;br&gt;• Increased number of clients served&lt;br&gt;• Increased understanding of assets and needs (for organization or its clients)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic/Financial</td>
<td>• Identification and hiring of new staff&lt;br&gt;• Identification of funding opportunities&lt;br&gt;• Acquisition of new funding&lt;br&gt;• Completion of projects that the organizations would typically have to purchase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social/Community</td>
<td>• Identification of new connections and networks&lt;br&gt;• Increase in number of volunteers after the project&lt;br&gt;• Tangible improvement on community issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal/Professional</td>
<td>• Professional growth, including new skill or knowledge&lt;br&gt;• Contributing to educating students toward future community impact&lt;br&gt;• New connections for personal or professional network</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

APPENDIX D

CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE IN EVALUATION RESEARCH INTERVIEW

Thank you for your recent participation in the Ginsberg Center’s Impact Assessment survey. As part of our evaluation of Ginsberg Center outcomes, we are interviewing community partner representatives, student partners, and faculty/staff partners to learn more about their perceptions and experiences regarding UM and community partnerships, including the presence of equity in these partnerships. The data collected through this interview will be used in combination with data collected through the survey to help us understand these partnerships better.

- I, ________________________, voluntarily agree to participate in this research study.
- I understand that participation involves an interview of approximately 30 minutes in duration.
- I understand that there is no known risk or discomfort directly involved with this research and that I am free to withdraw my consent and discontinue participation at any time. I agree that if I choose to withdraw my consent and discontinue participation in the study that I will notify the researcher listed below, in writing. A decision not to participate or to withdraw from the study will not affect my relationship with the researcher, the University of Michigan generally or the Ginsberg Center, specifically.
- I understand that the data will be collected using an audio recording device and then transcribed for analysis. Information from the audio recording and transcription will be safeguarded so my identity will never be disclosed.
- I understand that all information I provide for this study will be treated confidentially.
- I understand that in any report on the results of this research, my identity will remain anonymous. This will be done by changing my name and disguising any details of my interview which may reveal my identity or the identity of people I speak about.
- I understand that disguised extracts from my interview may be quoted in a final research report for use internally with Ginsberg Center staff as well as an academic dissertation.
- I understand that I am free to contact any of the people involved in the research to seek further clarification and information.
- I understand that if I have any questions about this study or problems that may arise as a result of my participation in the study, I should contact Mary Jo Callan, the researcher and director of the Ginsberg Center (734-647-8772; mjcallan@umich.edu), Dr. Michael DiPaola, research chair (757-221-2344; mfdipa@wm.edu), or Dr. Tom Ward, EDIRC Chair (757-221-2358; tom.ward@wm.edu).

My signature below signifies that I am at least 18 years of age, that I have received a copy of this consent form, and that I consent to participate in this research study.

__________________________________________________________
Signature of Participant

__________________________________________________________
Date
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## APPENDIX E

### CODEBOOK FOR QUALITATIVE ANALYSIS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code/Sub-code</th>
<th>Definition/Description</th>
<th>Examples (based on interview transcripts)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Mutual Benefit | Benefit accrued to both university partners (students or faculty) and community partner; reciprocal in benefit | - It’s clear that the students enjoy and are benefiting from their work with the children. The children are clearly benefiting from the attention they are receiving from the students  
  - We’re giving our time and we’re giving this so that we can learn, but we’re also providing a service |
| Challenge | For UM-community partnerships this includes experiences or perceptions of problems, barriers, or difficulties in the engagement.  
This code applies to all named problems or issues that arose within UM-Community partnerships | - I try to give students a heads up and let them know what kinds of issues they might anticipate and, and how to address those challenges. But yeah, definitely, it's messy. It's, it's the real world.  
  - More context about community partner’s goals would have been helpful  
  - One challenge with this model is the ability to maintain projects during semester transitions |
| Social Identity | Refers to UM students’ White racial identity, cultural or socio-economic backgrounds as misaligned with community partner’s client population. | - It’s a wonderful program but I would say like 90% of the volunteers are White women and they're coming into a school which is majority students of color. |
| Follow-through/Responsiveness | Generally refers to the lack of follow-through on commitments, or non-responsiveness to requests or communication by either community or University partner. | - We get a ton of people who just don’t follow up, a really good amount of people who just don’t follow up. |
| Capacity & Structural Constraints | Limitations caused by resource, policy, or other structural constraints. Key examples of these include:  
  - Time, including time available to devote to partnerships  
  - Timing of projects shaped by the academic calendar;  
  - Lack of support staff;  
  - Lack of project funding;  
  - Lack of transportation or inaccessible location;  
  - Lack of coordination or communication mechanisms | - It takes more time than some of the other types of learning activities we might do. So if I have students that are coming to an established doctor’s office to see patients, there’s all of the structural aspects already in place.  
  - The timing of things gets to be a challenge. The students timeline isn’t always comparable with the girls in the troupe. There is a mis-match of timing  
  - I feel that if you’re going to teach these courses, there should be more funding available for you so that your students can engage in these projects and I wouldn’t have to worry so much about the money side of it. |
| **Access** | A means of entering into a partnership. Use when interviewee describes success and challenges in access to partnership. | -I think that there's this kind of sense that it's a bit of a fortress and it doesn't feel accessible to a lot of our community. -We've never really felt like, and I think most organizations feel like this, they cracked the nut of U of M. I mean U of M is so incredibly large. |
| **Preparation** | Refers to University partners’ readiness for engagement with community partners and their client populations. Important elements of preparedness include cultural humility, and clarity of responsibilities. | -And they wanted to come in and like last weekend and they gave two days' notice and didn't realize that it was actually gonna take a lot of coordination on my part. -I think maybe just the preparation of the volunteers coming into the situation. I think just the training in general for the environment in which they were entering. |
| **T & P** | Refers to the tenure and promotion process, rewards, and incentives for University faculty partners. | -My experience at Michigan was that there was a whole lot of effort placed on, you know, getting published and bringing in money and you know, not necessarily on community-based work. -A community organization's evaluation of a faculty member should be part of the tenure promotion process (for those who want it). I should be incentivized to build lasting/ethical partnerships in my community. |
| **Benefit** | This code applies to any positive or helpful effect of a partnership, either for the university partner OR the community partner. This includes examples cited from the "Sample Benefits..." handout given to interviewees Do not use this or any sub-code to refer to mutual benefits (see 'mutual benefit' code) | - The biggest benefit is just helping a senior population feel connected to the community and feel respected and wanted and cared for. |
| **Community – Social or Comm** | -Identification of new connections and networks -Increase in number of volunteers after the project -Tangible improvement on community issues | -The students come in, and can talk to the tenants about the medicines, and it really helps the residents to understand, and make them feel better about taking them. |
| **Community – Org Capacity** | -Types of service offered -Number of clients served -Variety of activities offered -Increased understanding of assets and needs (for organization or its clients) | - To the best of my knowledge, they were not providing these types of health events prior to our collaboration. So I think that the services have increased. |
| Community – Personal or professional (adapted from Gelmon, et al., 2001; James & Logan, 2016) | - Professional growth, including new skill or knowledge  
- Contributing to educating students toward future community impact  
- Developed new connections for personal network | - They have met with our students to talk about the needs of their, the residents and communication strategies. And I think that, you know, they've had the ability to educate our students, too. |
| Community – Economic or Financial (adapted from Gelmon, et al., 2001; James & Logan, 2016) | - Identification and hiring of new staff  
- Identification of funding opportunities  
- Acquisition of new funding  
- Completion of projects that the organizations would typically have to purchase | - We delivered a lot of materials and items that they would normally have to purchase. |
| University – Faculty/Staff | Any benefit identified as accruing to a University faculty or staff member, or group. May also be applied to a named benefit accruing to the University more globally. | - I would describe it more as research and I think there's benefits for people in faculty positions.  
- I mean I think the students are getting the benefit. We're getting the benefit because it's helping me provide more opportunities. |
| University – Student | Any benefit identified as accruing to a student, groups of students, or students more globally. | - It was really nice to see that spark happen with some of the students where they completely got that they were helping with this social justice initiative and that they were doing this thing that would have real life impact. |
| Equity | The quality of being fair or just, especially in the distribution of resources, benefits, and burdens. This code applies to all answers to the interview question about how to define equity as well as equity as defined by the Ginsberg Center. Use sub-codes for additional categorization. | - I am not sure we are helping the clients as much as we should! I am concerned about our community partner not getting enough!!!  
- I worry at times, thinking back to the definition you shared to the effort piece, when we come, it takes time for the staff there to come and make sure we have everything. Like we come and we're prepared, but it's still, it's interfering in some ways with the things that they normally do on a daily basis and I know it takes time and they're very busy. |
<p>| Partner’s Definition | Partner response to interview question, “How would you define or describe equity in a partnership?” | |
| Fairness | Distribution or allocation of resource according to need, and free from favoritism, self-interest, bias, or deception. The | - I think when they were founded, the idea was working with the students most in need. But over time they've also sort of split into this, let's just do what's |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>resources can be time, effort, funding, learning, capacity-building, etc.</strong></th>
<th>convenient. And so I think that they have a lot that they're doing in schools within walking distance to the University of Michigan even though that's not where the biggest need is.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expectations</strong></td>
<td>Beliefs about what will/should happen, what actions will/should be taken, and who will/should do what.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Decision-making</strong></td>
<td>The action or process of identifying and choosing options and alternatives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sustainability or Stewardship</strong></td>
<td>Lasting or maintained over time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Deliverable</strong></td>
<td>A product or service provided to, for, or with a community partner by a university partner.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Communication</strong></td>
<td>The exchange of information; the successful conveying or sharing of ideas or feelings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ginsberg Center</strong></td>
<td>The Ginsberg Center is the community engagement center on campus that cultivates and stewards equitable partnerships between communities and the University of Michigan in order to advance the public good.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-We're both coming through what we've promised each other and and treating each other with respect and, and communicating clearly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-I think it's really that the community organization I think really has a voice and are able to articulate what is it, what are the problems, what are the needs, and what can be done to help them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-And so there's a sustainability and a consistency there that I would talk to other partners and other people about why it's so valuable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-So at this point I think the primary service that we're delivering are these monthly health events for residents. We delivered an annotated bibliography to them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-I think you have to have really good communication, open communication. I think like there were some missed opportunities on my end that I could have been a better partner and more clear in my communication.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Matchmaking</strong></td>
<td>Ginsberg’s partnership-building process that draws upon interests and priorities identified and shared by constituent groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Consultation</strong></td>
<td>Advice or guidance to community or university partners to improve the partnership/process. Focus may be pedagogical, research development, program design, project scoping, or trouble-shooting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Funding</strong></td>
<td>Ginsberg’s and related University partner grants to faculty and students, used to support community-engaged partnerships.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Preparing Students</strong></td>
<td>Workshops, advising, and other educational offerings to students engaging in partnerships through courses, co-curricular programs, and faculty research projects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Relationship</strong></td>
<td>The way in which groups or individuals are connected and interact with each other.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX F

PROTOCOL EXEMPTION VERIFICATIONS

STATUS OF PROTOCOL EDIRC-2019-06-18-13711-mfdipa set to active

WM Compliance <compli@wm.edu> Tue, Jul 9, 2019 at 7:42 AM
Reply-To: WM Compliance <compli@wm.edu>
To: mcallan@email.wm.edu, mfdipa@wm.edu, edirc-l@wm.edu
Cc: mcallan@email.wm.edu

This is to notify you on behalf of the Education Internal Review Committee (EDIRC) that protocol EDIRC-2019-06-18-13711-mfdipa titled An Examination of Benefit and Equity in Community-University Service Learning Partnerships has been EXEMPTED from formal review because it falls under the following category(ies) defined by DHHS Federal Regulations: 45CFR46.104.d.2.

Work on this protocol may begin on 2019-07-09.
This protocol must be submitted for annual renewal on 2020-07-09, at which time the PI will be asked to indicate whether the protocol will continue as active, will continue with changes, or should be set to inactive. Should there be any changes to this protocol, please submit these changes to the committee for determination of continuing exemption using the Protocol and Compliance Management application (https://compliance.wm.edu).

Please add the following statement to the footer of all consent forms, cover letters, etc.:

THIS PROJECT WAS FOUND TO COMPLY WITH APPROPRIATE ETHICAL STANDARDS AND WAS EXEMPTED FROM THE NEED FOR FORMAL REVIEW BY THE COLLEGE OF WILLIAM AND MARY PROTECTION OF HUMAN SUBJECTS COMMITTEE (Phone 757-221-3966) ON 2019-07-09 AND EXPIRES ON 2020-07-09.

You are required to notify Dr. Ward, chair of the EDIRC, at 757-221-2358 (EDIRC-L@wm.edu) and Dr. Jennifer Stevens, Chair of the PHSC at 757-221-3862 (jastev@wm.edu) if any issues arise during this study.
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