

Community-Engaged Learning Designation Program Individual Course Design Rubric

SL Course Attributes	Low Intensity	Medium Intensity	High Intensity
1) Integration of experiential service and community-based activities into the course.	The instructor includes community-based activities or service as an added component of the course, but service may not be integrated with academic content. The syllabus may not address the purposes of the community activities.	The instructor utilizes community-based activities, or the service provides additional insight into academic content. The syllabus describes the relationship of the community activities to learning outcomes. Students may learn about at least two ways to serve.	The instructor integrates the community-based activities, and the service is crucial to helping students understand academic content. The syllabus provides a strong rationale for the relationship of the community activities to learning outcomes. Students may learn about multiple ways to serve.
2) Fostering reciprocal partnerships. Course content is co-created in collaboration with community partners, usually nonprofit, government, or educational institutions. Meeting a community need is addressed.	The instructor or student contacts community organizations to arrange service during the current semester. Students may have little guidance on how to find partners or communicate with them. Students may or may not receive a brief overview of community activities and their relation to the course.	The instructor meets with the community partners in advance to discuss the course (e.g., learning outcomes), and to identify how the community activities can enrich student learning and benefit the organization. Meeting a community need is discussed. Utilization of official Thayne Center community partners occurs, or an affiliate agreement or contract exists.	The instructor collaborates with and learns from the community partners as coeducators during course planning and design (e.g., sharing learning outcomes, assignments, preparation/orientation of students, reflection, and assessment). Together, instructors and partners identify how community activities can enrich student learning AND add to the capacity of the organization. Meeting a community need is prioritized. Utilization of official Thayne Center community partners occurs, or an affiliate agreement or contract exists.
3) Incorporation of civic learning. Students learn about the political, historical, economic, or sociological aspects of social change, as well as	The instructor focuses on discipline-based content with little or no attention or priority given to civic learning or social issues. Students may learn little about the	The instructor focuses on discipline- based content and connections to civic learning, and social issues are made when relevant to community activities. Students can gain knowledge of surface-	The instructor integrates discipline-based content, making multiple connections to civic learning, and learning about social issues that are pertinent to the discipline. Students can compare and contrast

power structures, privilege/ oppression, or systems when trying to address a social issue.	organization where they are serving. Assignments give little attention to the role of power, privilege/oppression, systems, anticolonialism, or antiracism.	level characteristics of organizations that address social issues. Assignments help students identify or describe power, privilege/oppression, systems, anticolonialism, or antiracism.	different perspectives and ideas about relevant social issues. Students gain significant knowledge of organizations and the social issues they address. Assignments help students analyze power structures, privilege/oppression, systems, anticolonialism, or antiracism.
4) Integration of critical reflection. Reflection happens throughout the course and is key to student learning and personal growth.	Students' reflections occur sporadically (or not at all) and may loosely connect the service experience to course learning outcomes. No reflection prompts are provided.	Students' critical reflection occurs periodically throughout the experience and links service to learning. Some critical reflection prompts are included to guide students. Assignments help students become aware of personal values, attitudes, and beliefs in relation to others	Students' critical reflection occurs often throughout the experience and links service to student learning outcomes. Multiple critical reflection prompts are included to guide students. Partners and students may help co-create prompts. Assignments help students critically examine personal values, attitudes, and beliefs in relation to others.
5) Diversity of interactions or perspectives. The course helps students analyze multiple perspectives for points of commonalities and differences and/or helps them learn how to work with others.	The instructor, the course, and community activities offer students limited opportunities for interaction and dialogue with diverse people or multiple perspectives. Students may have the chance to investigate their perspective.	The instructor, the course, and community activities engage students in periodic interactions and dialogue with diverse people or multiple perspectives. Students can explain their perspective and identify the perspectives of others	The instructor and community partner(s) engage students in frequent interactions and dialogue with diverse people or multiple perspectives. Students can analyze multiple perspectives for points of commonalities and differences.
6) Assessment of student learning.	No measurement tool is in place for assessing the community-engaged learning components of the course and student learning outcomes. Students may be graded for the hours of service, not the learning demonstrated.	Measurement tools are somewhat defined for assessing student learning outcomes and the community-engaged learning components of the course. Some student grades are based on the demonstration of knowledge.	Measurement tools are clearly articulated for assessing student learning outcomes and the community-engaged learning components of the course. A significant portion of student grades is based on the demonstration of knowledge. A grading rubric is included.

7) Mutually beneficial relationships are fostered through feedback loops.

The instructor does not seek feedback from community partners or community members on student projects or how students' presence in the community affected the communities or organizations.

The instructor seeks informal feedback from the community partners or community members on student projects and how students' presence in the community made an impact (or not). Instructor periodically implements feedback.

The instructor seeks formal, systematic feedback from the community partner and community members on student projects and how students' presence in the community made an impact (or not). There is an ongoing conversation between faculty and community partner(s) about implementing feedback while also achieving course learning outcomes.

Guiding Resources

- Bradley, B. (1995). America's challenge. Revitalizing our national community. National Civic Review, 84(2), 94-100.
- Bringle, R. G. & Hatcher, J. A. (2009). Innovative practices in service-learning and curricular engagement. In Sandmann, L. R., Thornton, C. H., & Jaeger, A. J. (Eds.), *Institutionalizing community engagement in higher education: The first wave of Carnegie classified institutions. New Directions for Higher Education* (pp. 37-46). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass/Wiley Publishing.
- Bringle, R. G., & Clayton, P. H. (2012). Civic education through service-learning: What, how, and why? In L. McIlraith, A. Lyons, & R. Munck (Eds). Higher education and civic engagement: Comparative perspectives (pp. 101-124). New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Bringle, R. G., Clayton, P., & Bringle, K. E. (2015). From teaching democratic thinking to developing democratic civic identity. *Partnerships: A Journal of Service-Learning and Civic Engagement*, *6*(1), 51-76.
- Gazley, B., Littlepage, L., & Bennett, T. A. (2012). What about the host agency? Nonprofit perspectives on community-based student learning and volunteering. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 41(6), 1029-1050.
- Giles, D. E., & Eyler, J. (2013). Review Essay: The endless quest for scholarly respectability in service-learning research. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 20(1), 53-64.
- Jacoby, B. (2015). Service-learning essentials. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Hahn, T. W., & Hatcher, J. A. (2015, September 30). What about service-learning matters? Using a taxonomy to identify variables to improve research and practice [Webinar]. In IARSLCE Webinar Series. Retrieved from https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=O3W27s3-XTw.

- IUPUI Taxonomy for Service Learning Courses- Course Design Centric for Institutional Assessment and Research, 2016
- Mabry, J. B. (1998). Pedagogical variations in service-learning and student outcomes: How time, contact and reflection matter. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 5, 32-47.
- Mitchell, T. D. (2015). Using a critical service-learning approach to facilitate civic identity development. *Theory Into Practice.* 54, 20-28.
- Pigza, J., & Troppe, M. (2003). Developing an infrastructure for service-learning and community engagement. In B. Jacoby & Associates, *Building* partnerships for service-learning (pp. 106-130). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Smith, M. B., Nowacek, R. S., & Bernstein, J. L. (Eds.). (2010). Citizenship across the curriculum. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.
- Stokamer, S. T. (2011). Pedagogical catalysts of civic competence: The development of a critical epistemological model for community-based learning. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement, 17,* 113-121.

Updated 11/17/22