

Appendix D
Best Practices Research
Telephone Interview Summaries

Table of Contents

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY.....	2
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN.....	4
UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA.....	6
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA – SAN FRANCISCO.....	9
UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA – CHAPEL HILL.....	11
STANFORD UNIVERSITY.....	14

Princeton University

Contact: Trisha Thorne, Assistant Director, 609.258.6986, tthorne@princeton.edu

Interview: Conducted by Peter Sheras on September 25, 2007

Mission: The Community-Based Learning Initiative recognizes that students learn in many different ways and that experiences outside of the classroom can enrich and reinforce academic learning while also contributing to the community. Community-based learning allows students to complement learning that occurs in the classroom with experiences in the community. Examples might include collaboration with community organizations to perform much-needed research, volunteer experiences that enrich classroom and textbook learning, and other creative methods for sharing the university's depth of knowledge with the community.

To this end, the CBLI seeks to promote meaningful partnerships between community organizations and Princeton University faculty and students. Community-based learning partnerships value: The limited time and resources available to community organizations; The expertise of faculty members and community leaders in their respective fields; The desire of students to engage real-world problems in the community and to deepen their understanding of material learned in class; The full participation of faculty members and community leaders in planning courses or components of courses. The Initiative seeks to identify and support faculty members interested in this new pedagogy.

1. Describe the structure of your center (i.e., leadership, decision-making, where it's located in the University, etc.)?

a. Describe community input/leadership/etc.

b. Is this an effective structure for your center; if not, what would you change?

CBLI is a small academic program located in the Office of the Dean of the College. The program began 10 years ago from student input to the associate dean about community based projects students had designed. The Associate Dean (who left two years ago) championed the program and found some funding through a Princeton alumnae association. Although the Associate Dean is responsible for the CBLI, it is run primarily by one full-time employee, Trisha Thorne, who holds the rank of Assistant Dean. She has been with the program for 8 years. They have some staff time and a summer intern in addition. Recently they received a Learn and Serve Grant from the Corp for National and Community Service (a division of Americorps). Of the \$500,000 they received \$250,000 goes for subgrants to other universities. They have 31 partners or sub-grantees on the project to develop instrumentation to evaluate community-based research. The program does not specifically include any direct service-learning component but rather is designed to create and evaluate community based research opportunities.

Each summer, community programs are invited to a meeting to work on designing research questions for the following year. About 40 groups attend and 15 are described as "big" players at the table. The group generates about 200 research questions that are then circulated to the instructors of the 12 or so courses which allow students to meet some or all of the course requirements through a community based research project. About 1/3 of students in these courses opt for this assignment. Students can also use these questions for Junior Paper or Senior Thesis projects. All this work is at the undergraduate level. The projects are developed by the

Assistant Director of CBLI and each student. The number range for 200 – 300 per year with an average about 300. Community groups are recruited by word of mouth by other community participant agencies or groups.

The Assistant Director believes this structure to be workable although it is a great deal of work for her and she does feel understaffed.

2. *Are there evaluation/outcome procedures in place for the overall model, and if so, what are the outcomes you measure?*

There are no current evaluation instruments. Part of the grant they received is to develop such evaluation tools. They are now in the first year of that three year grant.

3. *What are the incentives for involving faculty?*

Faculty receive help for their students to work on assignments. Also, written in the grant is travel money for faculty to present research finding. The 12 service learning courses are in a variety of disciplines from sociology to anthropology. Faculty also report that these projects and papers tend to be the best in the class and reflect well on the instructors. There is a web template that has been created for reporting results.

4. *What are the incentives involving the community?*

Community participants get information they can use for grant writing or fund-raising. Also, many of the students bring enthusiasm and additional volunteer time (not required by the courses) to the agencies.

5. *What do you like about your Center (i.e. What are the strengths?)*

There are lots of partners and many students involved. Trisha reports that as many as 600 students are interested in a given year.

6. *What do you wish could be changed (i.e. What are the weaknesses?)*

They need more staff; most staff are used to work on helping students with projects. There are not enough “big picture” thinkers working on the CBLI.

7. *How is the Center funded?*

a. Is this a workable or effective arrangement? Is the funding stable?

This Assistant Director is a full-time position funded through the College Dean’s office (they also fund travel abroad, writing center, etc.) Additional funds have come in through the current grant. Some of the original seed money 10 years ago came from the Princeton 55 and Alumnae Group. There is some money for interns from the Learn and Serve grant as well. One project is to write a CBLI Handbook.

8. *Do you have a business plan, set of recommendations, or other report that led to the development of your center? If so, would you be willing to share it with us?*

There is no business plan.

University of Michigan

Contact: Margaret Dewar, Ginsberg Center Director, 734.936.6287, medwar@umich.edu

Interview: Conducted by Gordon Walker on October 4, 2007

Mission: Provide students with resources and opportunities to address serious social issues through community service and social action. This is advanced by linking individual students to community organizations to co-curricular programs (eg Americorps and America Reads) or to service-learning courses through the university and supporting student organizations working toward service and activist missions in the community.

1. ***Describe the structure of your center (i.e., leadership, decision-making, where it's located in the University, etc.)?***
 - a. ***Describe community input/leadership/etc.***
 - b. ***Is this an effective structure for your center; if not, what would you change?***

The Ginsberg Center is located in an old house, on a decentralized, sprawling campus. It is perceived as a focal point for student engagement in the community. The Center is administratively housed within the Division of Student Affairs. While students make significant usage of the Center (an estimated 17,000 of UM's 40,000 students are involved in meaningful public service activity), local agencies access community service interests via a centralized website. For instance, there are 339 community involvement courses and 167 student organizations, most are posted on the Center's website.

There is a faculty council and a Community Advisory Council (which is somewhat less active) advising Center staff (there is minimal interaction between the two councils). More significantly, a National board, with 17 members, shapes and directs the "big picture" framework for the Center. This board, composed of Alumni, business and non-profit representatives (most from local community), and they handle such questions as "What should we do better to engage students in meaningful activity?" and "What message should our communication materials project?"

2. ***Are there evaluation/outcome procedures in place for the overall model, and if so, what are the outcomes you measure?***

One outcome measure is the number of students and faculty involved in "meaningful" community service. Of 5,000 faculty, only a couple hundred are engaged, thus a lower percentage of faculty are engaged than students (student engagement is close to 40%). There is a strategic plan that has other overall goals. Each of the five programs, however (e.g. Americorps) has specific measurable goals.

3. ***What are the incentives for involving faculty?***

Students give awards to the best teachers. An "Arts of Citizenship" initiative, total of \$50,000 per year, is given to advance faculty research projects; and from an endowment, a few community based research grants, ranging from \$5,000 to \$7,000 targeted to high priority areas.

The Center is starting a training program for faculty to improve skills regarding: “How do you interact effectively with a community agency?”

Additionally, Margaret underscored the intrinsic value to faculty of community engagement as an important contributor toward improved teaching and research. She believes this is a substantial incentive for those already engaged and that it “really enriches” teaching well. As she described it, the School of Urban Planning and Architecture is out front when it comes to providing incentives and recognizing the benefits of engaged scholarship.

4. *What are the incentives involving the community?*

There is existing community recognition of the high caliber of socially motivated students available to assist with agency work. They are preparing a manual for agencies to promote and achieve better utilization of student skills and time. The expectation is that this publication, when coupled with greater community Advisory Committee activity, will bolster agency interest in participating. They have recently designated these activities/collaboration to one staff person.

5. *What do you like about your Center (i.e. What are the strengths?)*

Many highly committed staff, wanting to make a genuine difference, and strong orientation towards “social justice.” Students can take a community service-learning course in almost every department at the University, plus there is a community service work-study program. University administration put very high value on student involvement.

6. *What do you wish could be changed (i.e. What are the weaknesses?)*

There is a need for much greater coordination between faculty council and Community Advisory Committee. There is a need to better organize community partners to garner heightened collaboration and thus be better able to demonstrate the value of faculty and student service to the community.

7. *How is the Center funded?*

a. Is this a workable or effective arrangement? Is the funding stable?

The annual budget is \$1.9 million, and it has enjoyed steady growth. In relatively equal parts, funding comes from a \$10 million endowment, general university funds, and grants (largest one is \$250,000 per year - Americorps).

8. *Do you have a business plan, set of recommendations, or other report that led to the development of your center? If so, would you be willing to share it with us?*

They do not have a business plan per se, but a strategic plan that Margaret will share. She is most willing (except during exam time) to host a site visit.

University of Pennsylvania

Contact: Dr. Ira Harkavy, Associate Vice President and Founding Director
215.898.0240

Interview: Conducted by Megan Raymond on October 3, 2007

Mission: Founded in 1992, the Barbara and Edward Netter Center for Community Partnerships is Penn's primary vehicle for bringing to bear the broad range of human knowledge needed to solve the complex, comprehensive, and interconnected problems of the American city so that West Philadelphia (Penn's local geographic community), Philadelphia, the University itself, and society benefit. The Netter Center is based on three core propositions: Penn's future and the future of West Philadelphia/Philadelphia are intertwined; Penn can make a significant contribution to improving the quality of life in West Philadelphia/Philadelphia; Penn can enhance its overall mission of advancing and transmitting knowledge by helping to improve the quality of life in West Philadelphia/Philadelphia. The Netter Center works to achieve the following objectives: Improve the internal coordination and collaboration of all university-wide community service programs; Create new and effective partnerships between the University and the community; Create and strengthen local, national and international networks of institutions of higher education committed to engagement with their local communities.

1. Describe the structure of your center (i.e., leadership, decision-making, where it's located in the University, etc.)?

a. Describe community input/leadership/etc.

b. Is this an effective structure for your center; if not, what would you change?

The Center has a director who is also an Associate Vice President. Reports to Government Relations, Dean of the College, and a dotted line report to the Provost. The director has been with UPenn for 40 years (first as student then as professor and administrator), is a tenured faculty member, and is a national leader in the field. Center has four associate directors each focusing on a topic/function: K12, student learning, volunteer management, non-profits, and business management/administration of center. Primary motivator was to become a better neighbor in the Philadelphia community.

The center has four advisory boards: students, faculty/administrators, community members, and a national board. They are currently undergoing a strategic planning process to review effectiveness of the 4 boards and are seeking ways to integrate their work more effectively. They have formed Faculty Steering Committees focusing on topic areas (health, environment, STEM, etc.) and each has a faculty project director. This committees help with content development, faculty engagement, research projects.

This model is mostly effective for the center. It has been an evolutionary process over several years. It initially started as a service learning program in their College of Arts and Sciences. They refer requests for volunteers to their equivalent of Charlottesville's Madison House, Penn Volunteers in Public Service (VIPS).

2. *Are there evaluation/outcome procedures in place for the overall model, and if so, what are the outcomes you measure?*

Most outcomes are anecdotal. They know they need to be more systematic. They count the number of courses, the number of students, and the number of agencies, funding increases. They feel it is hard to evaluate effectiveness of work since most of it is susceptible to larger national and global social and economic forces

3. *What are the incentives for involving faculty?*

- The Center works to connect faculty teaching which to faculty research. It is ideal when the course experience feeds the faculty member's research and teaching.
- The opportunity to focus on solving real world problems.
- A method for emphasize the academic components of engaged scholarship. That is why they chose the term "academically based courses" (ABCS) instead of service learning.
- To help bring the gap between faculty being thematic or content-driven and the community, which is project driven.

4. *What are the incentives for involving the community?*

Incentives to the community are shared resources, grant assistance, staff on site in the local schools

5. *What to you like about your center (i.e., what are the strengths)?*

The academic focus, partnering with the local schools, collaborating with other service and volunteer units on campus. They recently purchased a van to transport students to sites, also funding to use public transit. They recently hired a fulltime technical assistance position to support development of ABCS courses. This position brokers relationships between faculty and community organizations.

6. *What do you wish could be changes (i.e., what are the weaknesses)?*

They need more funding and time for program evaluation.. Maybe some kind of MOU with organizations when starting partnerships.

7. *How is the center funded?*

a. Is this a workable or effective arrangement? Is the funding stable?

They have some central university funding, grants, gifts, foundation support. The day before this call they received a \$10 million endowment gift from Barbara and Edward Netter ('51 alumni) to support the Center's core operations; a 5% return the endowment will yield about \$500K per year. The donors are expecting to see some more specific programs in outreach to K12 schools which is one of the Center's focus areas.

8. *Do you have a business plan, set of recommendations, or other report that led to the development of your center? If so, would you be willing to share it with us?*

They have a case statement from the late 1980's, early 90's that they are happy to share. They are undergoing a strategic planning process and have offered to send it once it is completed.

9. *Lessons Learned? If you were to do it all again?*

Manage growth carefully! Do not get stretched too thin or over-commit to the community or the faculty; pay attention to maintaining quality instead of offering more and more programs; stay focused on your mission (for them it is the ABCS courses and K12 outreach with some outreach training programs for local non-profits). Work to best inhabit three worlds simultaneously: faculty research, student learning, and community needs – as all are primary drivers.

University of California – San Francisco

Contact: Elba Sanchez, 415.502.4966

Interview: Conducted by Maryfrances Porter on October 15, 2007

Mission: To build collaborative relationships between UCSF and the community, promoting civic engagement, fostering community health and well-being and enhancing the environment for education, research, employment and patient care at UCSF. The UCPP serves as a bridge between UCSF and the community, emphasizing partnerships that value and respect the assets and diversity of both.

1. Describe the structure of your center (i.e., leadership, decision-making, where it's located in the University, etc.)?

a. Describe community input/leadership/etc.

b. Is this an effective structure for your center; if not, what would you change?

In 2005 the Executive Vice Chancellor (Eugene Washington) put together a Task Force to identify best practices and look at the model that would work for UCSF. He wanted to change culture of university to one more civically engaged. The Task Force met for over a year and made recommendations. They noted a need for some centralized office where requests could come in from the community and the university, as well as a need for administrative support for these partnerships. They do not have a building, but they do have an office in the University. Elba is the Director, and was hired in April 2006; she is both a faculty person and community member (she was faculty for over 10 years at UCSF/and also worked in the community in education and health). She does not a faculty appointment, she has a staff appointment.

They function with a 20-member, volunteer council, which is given decision making powers and charged with making policy recommendations (i.e., tenure issues, budget issues) by the Vice Chancellor's office. There are university and community co-chairs (the university participants were selected first and then they identified community participants to invite, the council is 50% community members). There are University representatives from each school, plus someone from the graduate division. The community representatives are directors of community-based organizations from the Southeast sector of San Francisco, with a history of partnerships with the University; they are focused on programming for youth and families. The council identified by-laws, and are charged by the Vice Chancellor to have 2-year, staggered terms (one-third of council turns over every two years). The council broke out into five work groups looking at various issues (i.e., service learning, economic development [which is a focus for their community], evaluation and research [organize research forums with question and answer sessions for educators, i.e., translate the research at UCSF for the community], etc.). They meet with faculty and gather information about what is being done and what could be done, plan events, etc. Currently, there is no one assigned from the Chancellor's office to champion them; although, clearly the Vice Chancellor himself is very invested.

They currently focus on community-based, participatory research. Currently there is not a system or structure for reviewing the products of this research or supporting it for publication in academic journals.

The partnerships, so far, have been focused on an exchange of services and have not required an IRB process. They do, however, have to go through the legal services office to approve the memorandum of understandings for each partnership. This can take up to 9 months, and it puts partnerships on stand still. Elba is struggling to figure out how to facilitate this process.

2. *Are there evaluation/outcome procedures in place for the overall model, and if so, what are the outcomes you measure?*

This is one of the things they will pick up in their upcoming retreat.

3. *What are the incentives for involving faculty?*

There are no formal incentives at this time, other than looking at community service as part of the overall tenure-application record. Tenure issues are difficult because each school has its own policies for counting community service at this time.

4. *What are the incentives for involving the community?*

There are no specific incentives for the community at this time, other than the products of the work.

5. *What to you like about your center (i.e., what are the strengths)?*

So far, this center has greatly improved the relationship between the university and the community by setting up partnerships and relationships that are honest and direct, and which look realistically at what can be provided and produced. The council has been able to work in a very trusting and committed way with each other.

6. *What do you wish could be changes (i.e., what are the weaknesses)?*

Staffing – it has been a challenge and struggle to have only one administrative assistant to support the five work groups, in addition to managing all the partnership requests.

7. *How is the center funded?*

1. *Is this a workable or effective arrangement? Is the funding stable?*

Operations are supported by the Vice Chancellor's discretionary funds; support for work shops and funding for work groups all go into their budget request to him. They are now looking forward to going to foundations, donors, and corporations to match funds and expand their impact. The University Development Office has someone who works closely with them to write letters and strategize how to leverage funds. Each year the Vice Chancellor gives \$100,000 to fund partnerships (i.e., mini-grants, etc.). The University has a CTSI grant, supporting bringing research to practice, which is being used to develop a tool for evaluating a community-based organization's efforts towards violence prevention.

8. *Do you have a business plan, set of recommendations, or other report that led to the development of your center? If so, would you be willing to share it with us?*

See website.

University of North Carolina – Chapel Hill

Contact: Lynn Blanchard, Director, 919.843.7568, blanchard@unc.edu

Interview: Conducted by Maryfrances Porter on October 2, 2007

Mission: The Carolina Center for Public Service engages and supports the faculty, students, and staff of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill in meeting the needs of North Carolina. The Center strengthens the University's public service commitment by promoting scholarship and service that are responsive to the concerns of the state and contribute to the common good.

1. Describe the structure of your center (i.e., leadership, decision-making, where it's located in the University, etc.)?

a. Describe community input/leadership/etc.

b. Is this an effective structure for your center; if not, what would you change?

UNC had a group in early-middle 1990's called the Public Service Roundtable (she does not know how it was formed) – the feeling of this group was that there was a lot of engaged scholarship going on at the University already, but no centralized support/organization. So, this was a support/networking group; they did apply for and receive some monies. Then the Chancellor's Intellectual Climate Task Force was appointed by the Chancellor (this was a whole campus effort and the undergraduate curriculum was revamped – this was not a direct result of the Public Service Roundtable). The Task Force started to going through models for campus-wide public service. The Chancellor's choice at that point was not to go with the Senior-Administrative type model; when the center was created it was located in the Provost's Office – in Health Affairs (which is arbitrary and probably resulted because a lot of the initial Public Service Roundtable participants were in Health Affairs).

Mike Smith is the new Vice Chancellor for Public Service and Engagement (created last November) and Dean of the School of Government (helped create this center and is on the Board – when the center was created there was a conscious decision not to have a senior administrator due to the preferences of the Chancellor at that time). Now, Mike Smith is the person that Lynn reports to – previously she had been reporting to the Provost through an Associate Provost. They are not in the Office of University Development. Therefore, the current model is of having senior administrative leadership and a campus-wide center. It is key having someone in the Deans' and Chancellor's office meeting on the behalf of the center.

The center was created to support and promote the engaged work – not do the work. They are really an administrative unit – so they do not directly build the partnerships, although they do facilitate them. In some ways the center is more of an internal university office – and she does not see it as even necessarily or important that the community even knows about the center – the center is really there to facilitate the university faculty and students connecting to the community. However, they are not a gateway – and she would be concerned that individual residents might call asking for help. However, at a community agency level, she thinks being a gateway would work – although there would have to have the resources to support the faculty (or even student) time/effort.

There are 1200 students involved in Public Service Scholar's program. An Evaluability Assessment was originally conducted with a Master's student when this was being developed.

There is community representation on board and committees. New Engaged Faculty Program has faculty and community director. The community director is a good liaison to the community, helping partners understand the university procedures and culture. No one person who is the community face at the Center. She feels this structure is effective for the work they do – that facilitating partnerships.

2. *Are there evaluation/outcome procedures in place for the overall model, and if so, what are the outcomes you measure?*

Outcomes are measured on the program level, i.e., Public Service Scholar's Program. She is about to undertake a project to develop measures of community perceptions of working with students. If at some time this office gives out minigrants, they expect outcomes on the individual grants. There is no explicit, system-wide evaluation of impact.

3. *What are the incentives for involving faculty?*

They provide competitive awards, minigrants, etc. (i.e., \$4,000) to support faculty work. Promotion and tenure is very much school and department based – so every school has their own set of guidelines. There are at least 3 schools that have guidelines for engagement/public service or “practice.” Lynn's faculty appointment is in Public Health, clinical track; the original director was a tenure-track person, but then there was perhaps some concern about what directed his work. The director of the student engaged scholar work is a tenured professor. One of the new things they are thinking about is having some faculty development program.

In the first few years, the center focused on putting structure on what was already going on at the University and on building student programs; more recently they have focused more on the development a faculty engaged scholar's program. The original endowment came from a donor with strong interests on the students, so historically there has not been a great deal of support fo faculty engagement. Lynn is working with Cathy Jordon at Arizona who is working on a toolkit for P&T in Engaged Scholarship which being presented in Tampa this weekend (see CCPH website. Lynn will share their faculty development handbook.

4. *What are the incentives for involving the community?*

The center does ask for formal commitments from community partners.

UNC does have a student philanthropy class (funded by a donor) where the students give out \$2,500 by issuing an RFP, getting applicants, and awarding grants to the community. Then the recipients come back to the class the next year and talk about the outcomes. This is a one-credit course. She says that the money has been really meaningful to the recipients.

Some departments have separate foundations or gift accounts which frees up how the money can be used.

5. *What do you like about your center (i.e., what are the strengths)?*

Their biggest strength is their incredibly amazing staff.

6. *What do you wish could be changes (i.e., what are the weaknesses)?*

She would like to see more emphasis on the scholarly aspects of engaged scholarship – scholarship and research tied to it. She would like a large pool of money to support faculty grants to further the work; buy outs of teaching and research assistants. She wishes she had more dedicated help with development.

7. *How is the center funded?*

a. Is this a workable or effective arrangement? Is the funding stable?

The way that the center started off was with some money left over from a major donor gift to the Public Service Roundtable, and when the Task Force results were presented at a Board of Visitors meeting, one of the members said that she would fund the Center. She immediately gave substantial gift and designated a spend-down. She also committed to bequeath an extremely large endowment – this has engendered support for the continuation of the Center throughout her life. She has also given additional gifts with the condition that the University administration matches it.

Other grants sources: Kellogg for engaged activities that incorporate institutional change; Campus Compact, small grants; local foundation (got grant to start the Public Service Scholar's Program); Community-Campus Partnerships for Health (FIPSI); Kaufman Foundation for Entrepreneurship (\$3.5M, required 2:1 match, so the University fronted \$7 million). Students can now minor in entrepreneurship through the Economics Department; there are faculty grants/fellowships too.

8. *Do you have a business plan, set of recommendations, or other report that led to the development of your center? If so, would you be willing to share it with us?*

Lynn will share some documents, including the Center's Strategic Plan. There is no formal business plan or set of recommendations.

Stanford University

Contact: Gabe Garcia, Haas Center Director

Interview: Conducted by Madison Cummings on September 29, 2007

Mission: The Haas Center for Public Service at Stanford University connects academic study with community and public service to strengthen communities and develop effective public leaders. The Center aspires to develop aware, engaged and thoughtful citizens who contribute to the realization of a more just and humane world.

1. Describe the structure of your center (i.e., leadership, decision-making, where it's located in the University, etc.)?

a. Describe community input/leadership/etc.

b. Is this an effective structure for your center; if not, what would you change?

The Haas Center, established in 1983 and expanded in 1989 with a gift from the Haas family, is one of the more established public service/community involvement centers in the U.S. Its budget is in excess of \$2,000,000 - obtained through grants, contracts, donations, and University endowments and appropriations. There are 30 employees led by an Executive Director and Managing Director. Because of several concerns regarding minimal longevity of leadership employees this structure is in flux and may withstand significant change in 2008. The Center is a department under the auspices of Stanford's Vice-Provost for Student Affairs. There is significant information about the Haas Center previously obtained from the web site.

2. Are there evaluation/outcome procedures in place for the overall model, and if so, what are the outcomes you measure?

The Haas Center uses feedback from student, faculty, and "national advisory boards". They also used questions during fund raising to determine if their efforts were productive.

Measurements:

- a. How many new SU classes involving service are added to the curriculum?
- b. How many students at SU participate?
- c. Survey of alumni to see if experiences informed career choices and life.

Garcia noted that it is easier to measure numbers than the quality of the experience.

3. What are the incentives for involving faculty?

A full time service learning director meets with faculty members interested in doing service learning projects. The projects/research are supported with service learning grants. There are opportunities for overseas research projects and service learning. There are also community-based research funds available (mostly undergraduate) for local projects and research. As noted in the information collected online, the service learning courses are considered part of a faculty member's normal teaching load

4. What are the incentives for involving the community?

A national advisory board has visited the Center to study their teaching and research methods. Community input comes from groups established locally to become involved,

especially with the Medical Center where there are five locally oriented clinics. The local service programs are facilitated by the Haas Center but managed in the community by the Office of Community Health. The Medical Center also has a participating community board.

5. *What to you like about your center (i.e., what are the strengths)?*

There is a shared vision by all of the participants; all staff, students, and faculty are totally committed to the mission. Faculty members love being involved with their students in service learning. Even though the center does not run projects in-house, but rather, farms them out to the community, the size and commitment of the staff enhance the projects.

6. *What do you wish could be changes (i.e., what are the weaknesses)?*

The center is not always able to address all the needs partly because service learning commitment is not in all schools at SU nor are all faculty invested in service learning. If the university-community relationship is viable and well nurtured, the service and the research will be successful. There is also a concern, noted above, regarding retention of top leadership because of salary challenges for highly qualified individuals.

7. *How is the center funded?*

a. Is this a workable or effective arrangement? Is the funding stable?

The center is funded as follows: 30% from annual gifts, 20% from grants, 40% from endowments, and 10% from SU.

8. *Do you have a business plan, set of recommendations, or other report that led to the development of your center? If so, would you be willing to share it with us?*

The business plan of the center was described in the evolution of the center already obtained online. Mr. Garcia will provide the center's strategic plan.

•