>> Time for Q and A.
^M00:00:03
[Pause]
^M00:00:19
>> I want to remind everyone that we are recording this event and so if you are uncomfortable being recorded, please be sure not to answer questions. We will be saving this webinar for posterity on the National Service-Learning Clearinghouse website. So again, this is Liberty Smith from Learn and Serve America's National Service-Learning Clearinghouse. I'm delighted to have you all here today for this webinar co-sponsored by the Clearinghouse and Community-Campus Partnership for Health. This topic is near and dear to our hearts maximizing the long-term sustainability of service learning lessons from the study of earlier adopters. We are delighted to be the discussing, as we know this is an issue of great interest both our beloved funder, Learn and Serve America and throughout the country as we all experience more investments from the federal government and more need from local communities to see that our community efforts are really paying off. So thank you for joining us. Because we are also eager to hear what our panelists have to say I'm going to turn this over to our moderator, Kevin Days. He is the adviser for higher ed special initiative at Learn and Serve America. So Kevin if you'll unmute your phone and take us away, that will be fantastic. Thank you so much.
^M00:01:56
[Pause]
^M00:02:17
>> Kevin, if you would press star 7.
>> Hi, can you hear me?
>> Yeah.
>> Okay, go ahead.
>> I apologize we're having a little bit technical difficulty. I want to apologize for joining the call late but again I want to echo the words of my colleague Liberty Smith and say how excited we are that we are able to have this webinar, to talk about maximizing your long term sustainability of service learning. At the preparation, primarily what we're interested in doing is getting to see service learning, we see our funds as those funds that help get the effort off the ground and then we try to move those funds to other places. So we are really interested in learning the lessons learned that we had about 15 to 16 years of experience of achieving and 15 to 16 years of seeing what works. We're just so happy to be able to co-host this webinar to talk about those lessons learned and to figure out what some of the earlier adopters were able to do to maximize their service learning sustainability and we were very, very impressed earlier this spring when Amanda was able to come through the corporation and share the fruits of her research into that study and that we thought this is something that needs to be shared broadly and we've done that and up to this first attempt to the webinar and so I don't want to take up too much of your time. I already wasted a bunch of your time by struggling to get on line. So I want to turn this over to my colleague Amanda and Sarena to talk about this session and then once they've completed their presentation we'll have some time for question and answer. So Amanda and Sarena, would you please take over?
>> Hi, this is Liberty stepping in one more time. For any of our speakers and once we do open up the line for questions and answers, please try to do what you can to use a handset rather than a speakerphone when presenting or asking questions. We really want to be sure that this webinar serves both in this moment for all of us on the line and for future folks who weren't able to attend today so sound quality is very important to us. So please do what you can around sound quality as you're speaking. Thank you very much.
>> Hi everyone this is Amanda Vogel. Just to reiterate what Kevin and Liberty have said, we're thrilled that so many people could join us today and we're very much looking forward to sharing findings from

the study. I wanted to just let you know a little bit about how we plan for the call to go. The representation will run about 45 minutes to an hour and then we'll have about 30 to 45 minutes for question and answer and discussion. And since we have such a big crowd, we're going to hold Q and A for the end. But feel free to use that Q and A box on the bottom right corner of your screen to type in any questions that occur to you. And then at the beginning of the discussion, which Kevin will moderate, we'll have the opportunity to go through those questions in addition to the verbal conversation that we're hoping to have. I'm gonna start with some learning objectives and then turn it over to Sarena who's gonna give some background about the cohort of schools that participated in this study. There are three learning objectives for this talk. The first is to learn about key facilitating factors, challenges, and strategies for success that have influence to the long term sustainability of service learning in one group of early adapters, the schools that participated in the HPSISN program which Sarena will tell you about. The second is to identify concrete strategies that both academic institutions and funding agencies can use to support the long term sustainability of service learning. And the third is to be able to discuss these findings with your colleagues to enable you to learn from your own experiences as a group with sustaining service learning. Sarena's now gonna provide a little bit of background. And Sarena, if you want me to move the slides for you, I'm happy to do that.
>> That would be great. Can everyone hear me okay?
>> Yes. We can hear you.
>> Okay, just want to make sure I wasn't on mute. Well, thank you so much to the clearinghouse and the corporation for helping us put this webinar on today. And as Amanda said I'm going to give a little bit of background about the program that is the basis of this study. It's a 10-year followup study that Amanda completed of this cohort health professional school that we're funded to do service learning. And the program we keep referring to the acronym HPSIN--HPSISN. It's the Health Professions Schools in Service to the Nation program. So it had a long name and we call it HPSISN. And in the next slide there are some bullet points that just give an overview of what this program was all about when it was initially funded 1994 to 1998. We believe it's the first and only national demonstration program for service learning in health professions education. And there were some components to the program that all of the sites participated in. First of all there was a subgrant component. Each of these institutions received about 75,000 dollars over a 3-year period. And it had to be matched 100 percent in cash or in kind by the institution. And they were funded to integrate service learning into their core curriculum. They could start out perhaps with an extra curricular or elective kind of experience but the goal was over the 3-year period of funding to integrate service learning into core courses in the curriculum and to develop community-academic partnerships for service learning. All of the sites also participated in training and technical assistant. During every year of this program we brought the grantees together for conferences, workshop, that sort of thing, professional development. We also have webinars like we're having today. So there was a program that these institutions participated in over that 3-year period. And the funding was from a corporation for at the time was called the Corporation for National Service, now it's the Corporation for National Community Service. The Pew Charitable Trust was the other major funder and the Health Resources and Services Administration which is part of the US Department of Health and Human Services provided some technical assistance and support to the program. And it was administered out of the University of California-San Francisco, the Center for the Health Profession based there and the National Fund for Medical Education which was also based there. And I served as the project director for this program so I was involved from writing the grant to get the funding to do this initiative all the way through. The next slide shows you the diverse set of institutions that were funded under HPSISN. And I know that the disciplines and professions aren't listed explicitly here but they represented schools and programs in medicine, nursing, public health, pharmacy, dentistry and allied health. And in some cases there were multiple health professions involved.
^M00:09:56

>> And you see the range of private and public institutions, large and small, urban and also more suburban and rural communities as well. And that was an explicit design of the program was to support service learning in diverse settings and discipline. The next slide gives you a sense of--just some examples of community partners that these institutions developed and developed partnership and service learning projects around over the course of their participation in HPSISN. There were organizations that were very health focused, very clinically focused like health clinics. But also partnerships with organizations that provide various programs and services in the community but not necessarily in the classic sense of thinking about health and medical care, so just schools and churches, senior centers, youth centers, that sort of thing. In the next slide just, again, just to give you a sense of this group of institutions and the service learning they were involved in. These are some examples of the areas of focus of the service learning work that students were involved in in the community. School-based health, a whole variety of health promotion and disease prevention kinds of activities, case management, mentoring and tutoring in schools for example. So they were involved in a variety of community projects and programs. The next slide just shows CCPH and our mission statement. This is Community-Campus Partnerships for Health because one of the outcomes of the HPSISN program was the formation of CCPH which is a national membership organization that promotes community-academic partnerships as a strategy of improving health. Service learning is a core part of what we're about. And the grantees were core part of the membership that got the organization started. And then in the next slide, so why are we doing a followup study of this program 10 years later? Well, the real reason actually isn't even on the slide and that's that Amanda Vogel at the time a doctoral student at Johns Hopkins University approached me and a colleague of mine at the American Public Health Association Conference back in 2005. She came up to us, we were presenting a poster on a related project, it wasn't really about HPSISN but she wanted to talk about ideas for her doctoral dissertation to talk about some topics she was thinking about. And basically, out of that conversation grew this idea of what about doing a followup study of this cohort of schools. It was coming up on the 10 year anniversary of the initiative of HPSISN. We were very interested in looking at what happened in the long run with this school. We were aware anecdotally of a number of projects that have been sustained and partnerships that it continued because the grantees were involved in CCPH as member but it certainly wasn't a systematic analysis of that. And so over the course of months of discussions and back and forth proposals, Amanda proposed this for her doctoral dissertation and it was approved for her to pursue it. And so this group of schools presents a very interesting opportunity for this kind of followup study because they are a group of early adopters. This is pretty early on in the history of federal investment for service learning and higher education. It's still one of the few or only demonstration program in the health profession and one of the few in a single discipline or set of discipline. And also because there are some standardized factors across these grantees, the fact that they all received similar amounts of grant funding, they all have similar match, they all had similar technical assistance opportunities and so forth. It's really letting us look at some site-specific influences on sustainability such as the environment, the institutional environment, infrastructure, resources and the actual design of the service learning courses and programs within this site. So overall, it seems like an incredible fit in terms of Amanda's interest for her doctoral dissertation and our interest in really looking 10 years out to see what happened to this institution. And really for the field as a whole, I think, it's very unusual to be able to do this sort of followup study. It's not often possible to have the funds to be able to look long term out over a period of years. And we had CCPH continue to be supported by the Corporation for National Community Service for service learning initiatives. And through that funding was able to impart support Amanda to do this work. So let me turn it back over to Amanda and she's really going to take us through what she did and what she found.

>> Thank you so much, Sarena. So as Sarena said I conducted the HPSISN followup study for my doctoral dissertation work at Johns Hopkins School of Public Health. And now I'm a senior consultant with CCPH

and I'm a contractor at the National Institute of Health at the National Cancer Institute. Today, I'm gonna be sharing the design that we used for the HPSISN followup study. Our findings about what factors supported the long-term sustainability of service learning in this cohort of school. And then our recommendations for how both academic institution and funders can support the long-term sustainability of service learning. So there are important reasons to care about whether service learning is sustained and what factor can support sustainability. First, there are increasing investments in service learning by funders, by schools, also by community partners, and all of them want to insure their investments aren't lost and that they can maximize the returns on their investment. Second, lapses in service learning can have detrimental effects, for example, reduced willingness among community agencies to engage in future academic partnership. And third, service learning has a number of ambitious goals that can't be achieved in the short term but a sustained commitment to service learning can help to achieve those goals. For example, enhancing mutual understanding among communities and schools and shifting the culture and activities of academia for a greater community engagement, for example, in teaching and scholarship. And also building capacity in both academic and community partners to address community needs and work for social justice. And for all of those reasons we wanted to learn more about what can be done to maximize a long-term sustainability of service learning. In the study, we asked four research questions and the first two were about the sustainability of service learning. There, the first two on the slide, to what extent did the schools that participated in HPSISN sustained service learning 10 years after grant funding ended. And what factors influenced the sustainability of service learning, so facilitating factors, challenges and strategies for success including strategies to address those challenges. In today's talk I'm going to share our findings from those two questions but I also wanted you to see the other two questions we asked. What was the long term impact of HPSISN supported service learning for academic and community partners and what strategies did high sustainability schools used to maximize the quality of service learning. And if you're interested in the findings from those two questions on the last slide or the second to last slide there's a link to the CPPH website where you can download the full text of my dissertation which has those findings in it. This slide summarizes some methods that we used for the study. The research was basically conducted in two phases. In the first phase the aim was to do a broad survey of the participating schools to answer the first question about what extent--to what extent they had sustained service learning. 16 of the 17 HPSISN schools agreed to participate and we interviewed the HPSISN principal investigator from each of those 16 schools and then in cases where they weren't able to reflect on the entire 10-year period. For example, if they have left the school or if they were no longer closely involved with service learning, we asked them to refer additional individuals we could interview and the result was 23 interviews in total. We also engaged in document review to learn more about service learning at the schools. And the findings of the interviews were then analyzed with thematic coding and memo writing. In phase two we conducted index case studies with two of the participating schools. So a main focus of this phase was to learn more about the strategies for success that they had used to sustain service learning and that supplemented what we had already learned in the first phase of interviews about strategies for success and influences on sustainability. So for this case we selected two schools that we had identified and the first phase is having very high sustainability and we selected schools that had very different institutional setting so we could learn strategies that would be appropriate for different setting. Each school also guaranteed participation and interviewed by a broad group of stake holders including three community partner agencies. So we conducted in person site visits to each school and two of those three community agencies. We conducted some document review about service learning at the schools and the agencies and a total of 47 interviews. So those were about evenly divided between the two schools that participated and their community partners. And about two thirds that we interviewed were with academic partners like faculty members, service learning stuff and administrators as well as students and about a third were with community partners that was directors of the community agencies and the

main contact person there for service learning. These are our analytic approaches in these bottom bullets and if you're interested in learning more about those analytic approaches we can talk about that in the Q and A.
^M00:20:14
>> And the study was approved by the institutional review board at the Johns Hopkins School of Public Health. This table summarizes what we want found in response to the question to what extent has HPSISN schools sustained service learning 10 years after grant funding ended. So what we found is that of the 16 schools that participated in the study, 15 of the 16 had sustained service learning to some degree which was unexpectedly positive. We were impressed and we then put these schools into three categories that reflected three levels of sustainability that we created: low, moderate and high. And on the left you can see the number of schools that fell into each of those categories with increasing numbers as sustainability went off. So the three levels of sustainability were distinguished by a couple of factors. One was whether service learning was integrated into the curriculum. Another was the extent of institutional resources that were provided to support service learning. Another was where those resources were located. So did they come from the level of the course, the department, the school or the university? And the last one's the presence of an institutional culture, policies and infrastructure to support service learning. So to tell you a little bit about each of those groups of schools. Schools in that low sustainability category lacked all of those sources of support for sustainability, so service learning wasn't integrated into the curriculum and it didn't benefit from any investment of institutional resources, policies or infrastructure. So basically, it was just being maintained voluntarily by individual faculty member. And in general it was integrated into an elective course for a co-curricular experience. In the moderate category, all of these schools had invested significant resources in service learning. So first, they'd integrated service learning into required courses and then they had invested resources at the level of the department so that involves departmental planning activities, faculty time for service learning, hiring of service learning coordinator and developing partnerships for service learning. At a number of the schools there was also support for service learning in the culture of the school. As reflected for example in the mission and also in support of rhetoric for service learning among administrators who then set expectations for engagement and service learning. And finally, in that last category, the high sustainability category. They had all the same sources of support for sustainability as the schools in the moderate category. And then they had additional support in the form of institutional policies and institutional resources--infrastructure, excuse me. So, three of these schools had hiring promotion and tenure policies that supported faculty participation in service learning. And all of the schools had a service learning center, five of which also had a university level service learning center in addition to the school level center. And four of them had a steering community that supported service learning in the health profession. So now I'd like to show what we found when we explored what factors influenced the long term sustainability of service learning. And I'm gonna start with the facilitating factor. Participants described three sets of facilitating factors that supported the continuation of service learning and these were factors in the institutional environment, the presence of infrastructure and resources to support participation in service learning, and characteristics of the design and implementation of service learning. So within that first group participants described three key facilitators for sustainability. First they described the importance of an institutional culture that supports service learning and they described two ways that culture could support service learning. The first was that the mission of the institution reflected a dedication to service to society. But what was interesting is that it was participants from both state-based schools and the then state schools who described this factor. Second, the institution could have strong ties to the local community and that then created a culture that supported service learning because service learning was seen as a way to support those ties. And it was interesting to find that participants from urban schools identified that culture. Second factor in the institutional environment that supported

sustainability was support for service learning among high level administrators at the university level and also in the health profession school or program that participated in HPSISN. So this included, for example, the university president as well as the university and school level deans. So, they described how supportive rhetoric from this administrator in concrete expectations for community engagement supported sustainability. They described also how deans were able to cultivate support for service learning among other decision maker which provide--created a more general environment in support of service learning. The third factor in the institutional environment described by participants as important for sustainability was having a critical mass of support for service learning. So they described how leadership from the top wasn't enough to sustain service learning. That sustainability also requires the support of faculty members and students. And what they described is how each of those groups had a unique role to play in supporting sustainability. So they described how the administrators created a supportive environment for service learning. They described how faculty members buy in was critical because they were the ones who actually use service learning in their courses so they were the key to continuing to deliver a high quality service learning experience. And they described how faculty could also build support for service learning among their peers and students. And finally, students were seen as important to sustainability because they could articulate the value to their educational experience perhaps better than anyone else. And they were also in the best position to demonstrate demands for continuing service learning. Participants also described how students at their institutions had created new opportunities for service learning, for example, through new community partnerships. The second group of facilitating factors with infrastructure and resources to support participation and service learning and this is to support participation by everyone involved, faculty members, community partners and students. Participants described two key factors in this area. The first was having a service learning center that included resources to sustain service learning. So these included a full-time service learning director with the skills and time to support participation by faculty members, community, agencies and students. So for example, maintaining community partnerships and helping students identify service learning opportunities that suited their individual interests. The second was resources to support service learning, for example, preexisting community partnerships. Teaching tools, for example, tools to structure preparation and reflection activities and quality standards to guide faculty and community participation in service learning. The third resource within that center was actually its location. So they described how a centralized location for the service learning center and the organizational structure. For example, at the level of the office of the dean of the college rather than in a department enabled the center to support and engage service--the entire school in service learning and to participate in strategic planning for service learning at that level. And that also help to sustain service learning. The second key resource was support for faculty participation in service learning. So this is specifically support for faculty. And as I mentioned before, faculty participation was understood to be the bottom line for sustainability. Participants identified a number of important sources of support for faculty participation. And this included initial training, ongoing professional development, opportunities and technical assistance when planning for service learning and then when engaging in service learning. As well as resources to help implement service learning in their courses like the ones I just described as being provided through the service learning center. And incentives and recognition to support their involvement in service learning. For example, fellowships or stipends to support someone developing a new service learning partnership or a new component in a course for service learning. As well as course release time to compensate them for the additional time needed to engage in service learning. The last of the three groups of facilitating factors was aspects of how service learning was designed and implemented. And the interview participants identified three key facilitators in this group. So the first was integrating service learning into required courses which involves using service learning to teach valued learning objectives in those courses. Participants from some sites really drove home the importance of integration into the required courses. They described how even when funding no longer

existed to support service learning at their institution and even when they had no service learning director or service learning center, because they had integrated service learning into required courses and tied it to teaching valued learning objective, service learning was sustained and sustained at a very high quality level.
^M00:30:18
>> The second facilitating factor in this group was having a full-time service learning director, something I mentioned before, but the difference here were skills not only to implement service learning but additional skills including the ability to advocate for service learning at the institutional level, for example, advocating for more funding for service learning or for the institutional value of service learning and a person with the ability to cultivate champions for service learning should build that critical mass of support and finally, the ability to provide leadership for using service learning in creative ways to address key educational goals and community goals. So a participant described this as "staying current" both in the university and in the community in order to maintain the value of service learning and therefore sustain it. The third facilitating factor in this group was investing in stable long term community partnerships for service learning. Participants described how sustainability on the academic side wasn't sufficient and that continuity and commitment in the community was equally important. They describe how this could be achieved by implementing key principles of community, campus, partnerships. For example, using service learning relationships to help partners fulfill their organizational mission and providing technical assistance and professional development to community partner and they said there was a need to select partners who could also make a long term commitment to service learning, for example, selecting stable organizations and organizations where their leadership had bought into service learning. So now we wanna move on to the challenges that were identified by our participants. What's interesting to note is that participants from institutions at all three levels of sustainability identify challenges and these are the five main challenges they identified. The first was turnover among faculty participants in service learning. Interview participants at school for service learning wasn't integrated into the curriculum described how faculty turnover could lead service learning to be cut from the curriculum or dramatically reduced. And participants at school where service learning was integrated into the curriculum also identified turnover as a threat because it could reduce the quality of service learning and that in turn was a threat to sustainability. The second challenge was competing priority per faculty time and actually this was particularly true in research-oriented schools where promotion and tenure policies emphasized research and were faculty interview participants described how they had engaged in service learning "in their spare time" and both of those factors threaten therefore to reduce faculty participation and service learning. The third challenge to sustainability that participants mentioned was turnover among champions for service learning at the level of high level administrator and also among highly regarded faculty member. Participants from low and moderate sustainability schools described how turnover in leadership have led their institutions to deprioritize community engagement and as a result, service learning had been deprioritized and time for service learning had been drastically reduced. Even participants from high sustainability schools spoke about how the departure of highly regarded faculty member who are champions for service learning had led to significant drop off in participation among both faculty and students and they saw drop off in participation as a threat to sustainability. There were two additional challenges reflected on the slides. So the fourth challenge to sustainability that participants described was competing educational priority and they described two ways that new educational priorities could compete with service learning for a place in the curriculum. The first was that service learning was not seen as an appropriate tool to teach those new educational objectives. So in our study, participants identified two competing priorities which were clinical care skills--excuse me--clinical care skills and research skill that in other professions or disciplines there might be other competing priorities that you could think of that might pose a threat to service learning and the place it's held in the curriculum for it. The second way that competing

priorities were a challenge was when there were so many educational objectives that students were required to complete. That their schedules were overloaded and time for service learning was therefore reduced. The fifth and final challenge participants described was how to grow their service learning activities to accommodate increasing student participation and also increasing desire of their institutions to engage in service learning but doing so in the context of having limited resources to support participation amongst faculty members, community members and students and they described how lack of resources to support the growth of service learning could decrease the quality of community partnerships as well as classroom-based service learning activity and how those reductions in quality could in turn threaten the sustainability of service learning because they could decrease interest among participants in engaging in service learning in the future. Now I want--
>> Amanda?
>> Yes?
>> May I just interrupt to just to do a quick shout out to remind people that they--even though we're not taking questions, as questions occur to them they should remember that they can type them in in the Q and A section at the bottom and that we will get more questions and type them up up there as they think about it. Thank you.
>> Thanks Kevin. So the last set of findings I wanted to share was the strategy that participants shared. So participants from schools at all three levels of sustainability identified the challenges that I described but what distinguished among schools at the various levels was whether they were able to respond effectively to those challenges and the extent to which those responses were effective in our setting. I wanted to identify--to describe the five strategies that participants offer for how they had addressed these challenges in their setting. So the first of these strategies was to provide ongoing opportunities for faculty professional development to address the challenge of turnover among faculty. So this included new faculty orientation, for example, using pee-to-peer outreach and mentoring to support new faculty engagement service learning for the first time as well as to support the service learning staff for the faculty via professional development and technical assistance. The second strategy used to address these challenges was through articulate how service learning contributes to valued educational objective including both currently established objectives as well as new and emerging objective. So participants for example described how they had used service learning to teach the current educational objectives that were central to the core curriculum and participants from some schools identified how they were able to link service learning to achievement of accreditation requirements. These were all participants from nursing and pharmacy schools who described the ability to do that. And nursing schools would pass optional accreditation guidelines and in pharmacy schools with current guidelines. Participants also described how they use service learning to teach emerging hot topics. So in the health professions in our cohort, they described the following topics they were using service learning to teach to. Electronic medical records, health disparities and cross cultural communication but I think that that finding is likely generalizable to other professional schools and perhaps more widely. And finally, participants described how they use service learning to establish new educational priorities. So I wanted to give you an example of this. One of the schools in this study created an interdisciplinary service learning initiative which involves students from nursing, medicine, physical therapy and other health professions in a single interdisciplinary service learning team which provided service to a community partner organization. And what they found is that students were learning skills for interdisciplinary collaboration. I should state they did an extensive evaluation of student outcome and what they found is that these skills for interdisciplinary collaboration were immediately relevant to the clinical care they would provide on graduation such as respect for and understanding of different profession skill areas. That's the national priority area that's growing in terms of health professions' education and training that they identified as being uniquely addressed by service learning and nowhere else in the school and by identifying that priority, they in fact created a new priority area for the school. The third strategy

that participants described for addressing these challenges was to articulate how service learning contribute to broader educational goals--or excuse me--broader institutional goals outside of educational goals and they described three broad institutional goals that service learning contributed to. ^M00:39:59
>> The first was improvement in town-gown relations. Service learning was used at some of these institutions as one of multiple factors that were being used sort of in a package of activities to improve town-gown relation and some of the interview participants who cited this outcome of service learning also described the secondary benefit of improvements in public relations and even in fundraising as a result. A second broad institutional goal that was identified as the link to service learning was other valued initiative. So participants described their work to identify how service learning contributed to other valued initiative such as research centers, elective tracks that were derived for students and other required community-based training activities, for example, practica, internships and fellowships and they had articulated how service learning could support the activities of these practica, internships and fellowships by sustaining community partnerships through a reciprocal relationship. And finally, participants described how service learning had been articulated as a tool for student recruitment and how some of them were working closely with their student recruitment offices and marketing offices to use service learning in this way. The fourth strategy participants described to address challenges was engaging in internal marketing of service learning. So it wasn't enough for them to know, for the service learning champions to know how service learning contributed to educational justice and institutional goals. There was the need to publicize these messages. So they spoke about engaging in the internal marketing through university newsletters and newspapers and also through the local media. For example, local newspaper that could reflect the benefits of service learning to the local community and also impact market service learning locally. They also described how they focused individual attention on developing champions in the administration. So by bringing this information about the value of service learning, particularly to administrator who had an existing interest in the community or in community academic relations and on using that sort of preexisting interest to cultivate champions. Among research institutions in this cohort of school, another way that they identified as critical to engaging in successful internal marketing was to engage in extensive evaluation of service learning. So a number of participants described how at their schools the outcomes of service learning had been evaluated for students, faculty and community partners and by having this hard data, they were able to then successfully make the case in an institution where the culture value hard data like that. So fifth and final strategy that participants used and this is to address the challenge of growing a service learning initiative while retaining its quality was to engage faculty members to support the activities of the service learning center, so that involves engaging faculty members in peer mentoring to support faculty participation in service learning and engaging them also in maintaining community academic partnerships to support the activities of the service learning center and maintaining those partnerships. I'd now like to discuss the implications of these findings for both academic institutions and funders with some recommendations. So these findings suggest a number of recommendations for how academic institutions including administrators, faculty, and service learning staff can support the sustainability of service learning. Ideally, the first recommendation is to have sustainability as a goal from the start of service learning activities. Obviously, many of you on this call have been actively engaged in service learning for a year. But to make service learning an articulated priority--oh excuse me--to make sustainability an articulated priority from the start or from whatever stage you're in now is the first step in planning for successful sustainability. The second recommendation is to appoint a service learning director who has both the time and the skills to implement the strategy for success that were identified here by our participants. So this can't be done in the spare time of others and having an individual who's a champion for service learning who can engage in these advocacy skills and support strategic planning for service learning was identified as critical by our participants. This third recommendation is

to actively plan for sustainability by developing incremental goals to work toward sustainability and then revisiting them periodically to assess their progress as an institution, challenges that have emerged and strategies that you might use to address those challenges. So for example, how will you link service learning to the institutional culture and how will you make a convincing case for how service learning supports cultural values of the institution. What will you do to develop a critical massive support for service learning at your institution? How will you integrate service learning into the curriculum? How will you use service learning to teach to value the educational objective and continuing on this next slide, how will you secure resources to support faculty participation and service learning and what will you do to build strong community partnerships for service learning. A final recommendation is to identify current and anticipated challenges and then plan strategies to address or prevent them. So for example, how will you address turnover among champions if you believe that that may be a current or anticipated challenge. How will you address turnover among faculty members who use service learning. What competing educational priorities exist now and are there others that you can see on the horizon and how will you articulate the equal value of the educational objectives that are taught through service learning. How will you revisit service learning over time to ensure that it remains relevant to changing educational objective and what process will you engage in to adopt service learning to new objective. And finally, how will you plan for growth while also maintaining quality. So what existing resources may you be able to tap and what new resources will be needed and what process will you engage in to plan for how to obtain those resources. The next couple of slides are recommendations to service learning funders. So these recommendations are related to the institutional environment on this page. And the recommendations relate to both requirement for grant applicants and some later recommendations will be related to requirements for grantees. So related to the institutional environment, my recommendations are to require grant applicants to include a compelling argument about how service learning appeals to the institutional culture and if needed, describe how they'll make their case, this case at their institutions. My second recommendation is to document existing support for service learning among administrators, for example, letter of support from high level administrators as well as faculty and students. Or if that support does not exist to have them describe a plan of action for how they will plan to cultivate that support. Related to infrastructure and resources to support participation in service learning, my recommendations are to require grant applicants to describe what infrastructure and resources currently exist that could be used to support service learning. For example, a community engagement center that could then be utilized to support service learning or, for example, a center on research in health disparities that could be used to support service learning as well as faculty participation to support service learning activities at the service learning center. And then they should describe how they plan to leverage those recourses. Or in the absence of those resources they just should describe what process they'll engage in to develop that infrastructure. And another recommendation here is to provide matching funds that for it to have grantees provide matching funds that increase over the grant period in order to prepare the school to eventually support service learning by the time the grant funding ends. So this is a way then to create internal funding for the infrastructure and resources needed to support service learning. Related to how service learning is designed and implemented, funders could require grantees to integrate service learning into the core curriculum and use service learning to teach the core educational objective. Identify current, a current full time service learning director already at the institution or describe their plans to hire a service learning director with skills to work with administrators, community partner, faculty and students. Grantees might be required to describe how they'll nurture stable long term community academic partnerships.
^M00:50:05
>> And they might be required to earmark a portion of funding to support professional development and capacity building in community partners. And finally, funders should provide support to grantees to address the challenges which are going to be inevitable over the long run when you're looking at long-

term sustainability with professional development and opportunities. And in a resource on the CCPH website described on the later slide we have a list of suggested topics. So I wanted to close like any good researcher with some limitations. So the findings from this study should be interpreted in light of these limitations. The first is limitations to the generalizability. So this was a study with 16 health profession schools and as a result, the findings may not be generalizable to other schools outside of these 16 and especially outside of health profession schools. However, the fact that these findings reflect many of the themes in the existing literature creates evidence that suggest that they are in fact more generalizable. And we also believe that these findings may be generalizable to other professional schools that face some of the same challenges. For example, rapidly evolving expectations towards the educational objective and competencies that students are expected to master. The second limitation is that there are restrictions in the variables that could be explored in the study as influences on sustainability. So this cohort as Sarena described had grant funding, matching internal support in cash or in kind, technical assistance in professional development during their startup phase of 4 years. And therefore, we couldn't explore the influence of those factors on long-term sustainability. And in fact some of them may be an influence. Rather what the study did have was a focus on site-specific influences. So factors that differed among the schools as well as influences that occurred in the 10 years after funding ended. And finally, the last limitation to keep in mind is recall bias. So this was a retrospective study. We asked people about their experiences with service learning, their institution's experiences with service learning over a 10-year period of time. And in any retrospective study there's gonna be some bias. For example, in the schools that successfully sustained service learning they might identify more facilitating factors and then those that had been less successful they might identify more challenges looking back. That closes this portion of the call and Kevin is going to now moderate the discussion and I think make a few comments as well.
>> Thank you, Amanda. Once again I want to thank Amanda for bringing forth her research. I think it's clear that it raises some interesting questions for the institutions of our education and for those who are funding service learning to untie this knot about sustainability and her recommendations particularly for funders are ones that we at Learn and Serve America have looked at closely and are always thinking about ways we can implement to assure long-term sustainability. I do not wanna take up much of your time because I think the questions that we have queued up are going to get us into what I hope is an interesting discussion. I will say just very briefly that we as a corporation are very interested in the long term effects of funding. As I said in the past we have indicated--we have thought of our funding as seeding service learning in the field with the idea that service would keep the garden there from moving forward that it would take root and grow. And so the research that Amanda and that Sarena have supported is critical to getting us some insight about whether those things are happening and what we could do to encourage and support and develop a long-term commitment to service. And the research indicates that there are some factors that are encouraging that development, ones that we ought to continue to examine and push forward and there are some things that require us to rethink how we do business and maybe raise the fix. It's always been Learn and Serve's objective to really critically change the way which higher educations operate. So we see this mission as long term and we see research like Amanda's helping us understand how we're moving through this journey and how we are amazed that we have been successful in ways that we are not gonna--we are not [inaudible]. I--like I said I have lots of questions queued up here. We I think have about another 25 to 30 minutes left for questioning and answer period so let me quickly get to some questions. Amanda, I have a question here from Jim. It looks like he's at CUNY [phonetic] rhetoric school and his question is were facilitators work--or the facilitators for sustainable service learning mentioned by Amanda, are they part of the institutions with the students at first or did they over time after exposure to the benefit of service learning activities come to those institutions?

>> That's a really great question and actually I was able to see that question before and think about it. So I think what's helpful about these three categories of facilitating factors is that it sort of distinguishes between the factors that are malleable and not malleable. So the first group of facilitating factors was factors in the institutional environment. So for example, the culture of the institution is something that was present at these institutions at many of them at the start of the HPSISN initiative, not at all of them. At some of the institutions, they did describe how the culture has shifted over time and they described HPSISN as one of many factors that had contributed to that shift over time. They had--they also discussed sort of just a shift in general in the health professions about greater interest in community engagement and in higher education more probably as shifting culture. So culture though at many institutions is a less malleable factor, one that advocates and champions for sustainability and so concerning can't influence or have less power to influence. Some of these other facilitating factors were ones that were either established under the requirements of the HPSISN grants for example, integration of service learning into the curriculum and HPSISN did create--did find a position, a service learning coordinator position and then others are in fact and I would say looking at the facilitating factors, these eight of them, I'd say more than half probably did evolve over time so due to the efforts of the service learning advocate at these institutions. So for example, well HPSISN provided support for service learning coordinator and many of these institutions advocates for service learning including the principal investigator as well as others advocated for the creation of a full time service learning director position and in time at a number of those institutions that director position evolved into a center or office. Support for faculty participation and service learning. Again, this was a factor that existed under the HPSISN grant but then a number of participants described how in recent years with greater turnover in faculty who had participated in that grant, their institutions had committed to significant effort to train new faculty in service learning. So again, that was the facilitating factor that occurred later. And your question is did some of these factors developed after exposure to the benefits of service learning and I would say the answer is yes. Both exposure to the benefits and the presence of champions who were able to clearly articulate those benefits and articulate the value of service learning and therefore the need and the value of providing additional infrastructure and resources to support it.
^M01:00:10
>> Great. We have another question which is really I kind of wish to go which is from Ashley Frazier [phonetic] who is asking whether or not these slides for the presentation will be made available after the presentation.
>> So I think the answer to that is that they will be available. Is Liberty on the call? Will they be available on the servicelearning.org website?
>> Hello, this is Larry, the web master for the National Service-Learning Clearinghouse and yes, both the recording and the presentation will be available on the website for download and for view.
>> And this is Sarena. The slides will be up on the CCPH site also.
>> Great. Another question from Jim from CUNY. Did you find that the strength of the community organization in terms of resources, internal structures, sustainability of their organization take an important role in sustainability of service learning programs in the academic institutions?
>> So also a very interesting additional question and one that I was looking out for in the analysis of these findings and in fact I've found something a little bit different. So what I found is that what was important was the stability of the commitment in service learning and the stability of the commitment of the leadership of those organizations to service learning. So many of these interview participants described how there was in fact significant turnover among the staff members at community organizations that were partners for service learning, the staff members who were sort of the main contact but how what they described is that continued dedication to service learning amongst the leadership of the organization has helped to sustain their participation. They also identified other factors in the relationship, the community academic relationship that were important to sustainability.

So, one was having a memorandum of agreement which is very common. Another was creating reciprocal benefits for community partners. Another was--so I described some of those reciprocal benefits, for example, engaging community partners and professional development and capacity building and making sure that service learning activities and the partnerships more broadly help contribute to their organizational, their agency goals. Let's see. I had one more that's now slipped my mind but maybe it'll come back to me but what's most important was the leadership and the relationship and not the stability of the organizational structure.
>> Great. Looks like we have a question from Desiree Simmons [phonetic] from Simmons College. Can you tell me more about how service learning was used in the recruitment of students?
>> Sure. Self-participants from a number of the schools described how service learning was identified at the draw for students both because this millennium generation of students is more actively engaged in service and more concerned towards integrating service into their educations and also because of an influence on community engagement or community practical experiences in the health professions. So they identified how students were interested in service and community-based practical experiences and service learning has been identified as a way to attract these students. They also described how service learning set their institutions apart from other institutions in their local areas. So for example, if there were three nursing schools in an urban area, the fact that they have service learning could be used as a way to distinguish their institution from others.
>> Great. Thank you, Amanda. We have another question from Deborah Bailey [phonetic] who's asked did you look at the positioning of service learning office in your study, whether they were on the academic side, student affairs side and whether--and where those offices are located in an institutional hierarchy.
>> So I didn't answer this whole question so I answered part of it. So I looked at whether the center and the service learning director were located in the department school or university. So in the literature on sustaining service learning, the centralized location of the service learning center in the hierarchy of the institution has been identified as an important influencing factor and that's what I ended up looking at and in fact what I found was that the level of the service center--learning center tracked with other variables that were in that table for identifying the three levels of sustainability.. I didn't look at differences in the academic side versus student affairs side centers and that's a really good question. At many of these schools, in fact, the center is [inaudible] on the student affairs side. Even though I do know that there are now discussions about the relative value of academics versus student affairs located center.
>> Great. Thank you. We have another question from Desiree Simmons who has asked when speaking about professional support for community partner, who would provide the training?
>> So I'm assuming Desiree means profess--when I said professional development for community partners, and if that's not right then there's another note. So that's a good question. In my mind and in my sample, there were institutions where the service learning director had the skills to work with both faculty members and community partner. So let me give you some examples of how that professional development for community partners was provided. One was including or funding community partners to attend the conferences on service learning so that they could get all the benefits of that educational experience that their academic partner could obtain. Another form of professional development in technical assistance for community partners that was used by participants in this cohort was to gather community partners a few times a year with or without their faculty partner to discuss how their experiences were going and to learn from some of the partners that had had longstanding successful partnerships about how they could enhance what was going on in their partnership. So those activities were organized by the service learning director but called on the experiential knowledge of some of the longer standing community partner. I could also see, you know, as a spin off idea on that inviting in

successful community academic partnership to discuss what they've done to enhance the quality of the experience for the community partners and the students.
>> Thank you. We have a question--
>> Oh Kevin, just one second, this is Liberty Smith again. I wanted to suggest that when we get through this next question, we still will have about 10 minutes to go I think by my clock although I may be a little off. So if folks are willing to please join in using the phone line by unmuting with star 7 and remuting with star 6. Just so we get some other voices on the line. Not the respondents' lovely voices.
>> I know. Thank you. That had been great. So yes, if you are like me who think faster than you can type and you wanna ask a question as soon as we get finished with the ones that are queued up, please remember to press star 7 to unmute your phone and then you can ask us a question and then if you would remute by hitting star 6 again so that we can answer your question without hearing the background noise. Okay, we have a few more questions and I wanna get to them. Mary Alice's question which was, what are some good strategies that can be used to assess whether community partnerships will be stable ones?
>> Good strategies to assess whether community partnerships will be stable ones?
>> That's correct.
>> Yeah, well there were a couple of factors identified in this cohort which I described and I'm happy to mention again. So one is a commitment from the director of the community agency, the service learning buy in amongst the directors of service learning and another is a stated commitment to a long term relationship and that could be reflected in a memorandum of understanding, for example.
^M01:10:23
>> So that desire to commit for the long term among community partners should match the desire of the academic institutions to commit for a long term relationship as opposed to, for example, you know, a one off service learning opportunity like a one day healthcare. Obviously, you want to give community partners the opportunity to engage in a partnership and try it out but a commitment--a stated commitment to further engagement when the partnership is going well is what's needed, yeah, according to these participants.
>> Okay, Ashley Frazier [phonetic] asked, I think she is quoting you here. You talked about the ability to teach current core curriculum and accredited requirements. You mentioned HER as an example. Can you please repeat the other examples you gave, Amanda?
>> Sure. So, so in this cohort of participants, participants from pharmacy and nursing schools described how service learning could be--had been used at their institutions as a way to fulfill accreditation guidelines. So at nursing schools that participated, a couple of them described how during the HPSISN grant there was an optional guideline for service that they were able to link service learning to and then once service learning had been incorporated into their curriculum that guideline, that optional guideline, no longer existed but they were able to continue the service learning. Among pharmacy school participants they described how recent guidelines for clinical practice training had been the hook that they had used to integrate service learning into the curriculum. So these are early clinical practice opportunities that were being fulfilled through service learning.
>> Great. We have two more written questions and then we will open the lines up for call, for questions. One question here was could you tell us which school implemented insufficient [inaudible] service learning [inaudible].
>> No, I cannot tell you because all of the participants were consented with the understanding that the findings would be anonymized.
>> Okay, final question before we open up the lines for additional question. Can you speak to the challenges of the institutions involved in the study in building the infrastructure that is community engagement centers, service learning coordinator's role to support an institutional mandate of community based learning.

>> So--
>> Last one.
>> Yeah. You know, I think that probably what this is--what--I think from this study, the general experience was that service learning was led from the middle up not from the top down. So I don't know if I can really directly address the question but I think that that's an important point to reflect on that. It was faculty members and service learning staff member who were the driving force behind service learning and developing the infrastructure and that they pushed their institutions to identify resources to support service learning. So I'll give you an example that drives that home. One of these, well one of these participants who was a dean and there were a number of participants who were deans, they didn't all start in that role but then 10 years later a number of them were. He describes how the faculty members who were champions for service learning were really the keys to the growth of service learning at the school and not necessarily the leadership. I can say that in this there is some probably response right here because in this work I interviewed an individual from across 16 schools. So since the breadth of their experience is what I'm referring to and most of them were faculty members and service learning directors rather than deans, so if I had interviewed 16 deans and university presidents, I might have gotten a different perspective on where the leadership was coming from. But while individuals identified the extreme importance of leadership from the top, it was clear that leadership was coming from all interested stake holders in service learning.
>> Great. Okay. Now, it's time for us throw the lines open and see if we can take some questions.
>> Just one reminder. This webinar is being recorded so if you're uncomfortable being recorded, please don't ask a verbal question. Thank you.
>> Thanks, Liberty. If you're interested in asking Amanda a question, remember hit star 7 to open your line, ask your question, and then hit star 6 to mute it again. Do you have any questions?
>> Kevin, this is Sarena. I just wanted to jump in. I know it's frustrating to hear the answer to the question about whether the identity of these schools can be released and they really can't be because of the way the study was designed, but I did wanna mention that on the CCPH website we have a very extensive section on syllabi, case studies, course materials, models, service learning interdisciplinary collaboration in the health profession. So the person that asked that question, there actually were seven of the original HPSISN grantees that wrote case studies on their interdisciplinary programs and they're all posted as PDFs on the site. So there are a lot resources out there that it hopefully can be helpful to people but we can't specifically name names in terms of this study.
>> Thank you, Sarena. Yes. There are tremendous resources out there and we hope as a result of this webinar that folks will take advantage of those resources and are able to find the answers to the questions that they're seeking. Again, if you're interested in asking a question to Amanda, or Sarena or to myself, remember just hit star 7, ask your question, and then hit star 6 to mute your phone again.
>> Hello, this is Desiree Simmons again. I have a question about when Amanda you're talking about engaging at internal marketing of service learning and you talked a little bit about the evaluation and how that was used in looking at outcomes and hard data and I just wanted to know what sorts of outcomes folks were looking at or what they were studying exactly?
>> Yeah, sure. Well student participants described looking at learning outcomes, so identifying the core learning objectives that service learning was being used to teach to and then identifying learning outcomes in those areas and those core learning objectives were around civic professionalism, community-oriented primary care, and understanding the roles of community agencies and supporting public health. More technical skills included patient provider communication, cross cultural communication, a better understanding of health disparities and social determinants of health and understanding of the roles of health professionals in relation to each other, so interdisciplinary collaboration in the programs that had interdisciplinary service learning opportunities. Participants who engage in evaluation also described how they had evaluated the outcomes for faculty members and for

community members. So for faculty members, they looked at outcomes around developing partnerships that were then used for scholarly practice and for community-based research and translation of research findings into programs and practice in the community. They, in community partners, they looked at whether service learning was fulfilling needs of the clients of the agencies, whether it was addressing organizational objective of the agencies. They also looked at attitudinal factor so community partner's experiences participating in the education of health profession students and their evaluation of that experience.
^M01:20:05
>> Great. Thank you. Any other questions? Alright. Again, once again, if you wanna ask a question, hit star 7 to unmute your phone, ask your question, and then please hit star 6 again to mute it back and that will give an answer. Okay.
>> I think there are a few more slides.
>> Alright. Are there more slides you wanna go through, Amanda?
>> There is just that we have--there is this slide. I think it's helpful maybe to mention this. So this first point is the CCPH website and there's a search window on the left hand side of the site and if you pick and hit this in followup study, you will be taken to the page with all of the information about the products of this study so all the prior slide sets, posters, articles, and the full text PDF of my dissertation where you can see the results from the other research questions. For those suggesting professional development topics to be supported by funders, this is the slide to look at, this April 2010 talk at CNS. Also Sarena and I and our colleague, Cheryl Gilman [phonetic] coauthored an article reporting findings in the first phase of this research and that's in this bullet point. So it's published with Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning and that's the website there. The hard copy will be published out in late October and I'm imagining that you'll find the access online around that time. This is the title and the partial citation. We don't have the page numbers yet.
>> And this is--oh.
>> Yeah, go ahead please.
>> Oh, okay. And this is Liberty again from the clearinghouse. All of the materials from this webinar as well as links to the resources that Amanda mentioned will be available on our higher education sector page which is the primary resource for any of our targeted materials for the higher education sector. So that's where we will have the webinar recordings. Please share that with any of your colleagues and shortly within the next few days or within the next week, we'll have a fact sheet posted that includes some of the information from this webinar and from Amanda's research on maximizing community impact in higher education service learning. So please you go to that page for that information. We will also send a link to the participants and any other followup material that Sarena and Amanda want to share and I'll probably contact Jessica Wade [phonetic] about some information we have on interdisciplinarity. Thanks Amanda.
>> Thanks Liberty. Finally, this is our contact information for myself and Sarena and Kevin and feel free to email us.
>> Great. Well, I wanna thank Amanda for doing the work and for being willing to share it not once but many times. As I said, it's really important work that we're so happy she'd undertaken and we find the information provided in this research, in this study to be both interesting and useful and will influence us [inaudible]. I wanna thank Sarena for supporting Amanda, her work and for being a wonderful partner and I wanna thank my colleague at the clearinghouse who are always--excuse me--who are always a joy and a pleasure to work with. I hope you have found this webinar to be as interesting as I have and I think my job as moderator is complete. Go forth and have a wonderful evening or afternoon folks.
>> Thank you very much.
^M01:24:42

[Pause]
^M01:24:51
>> The chairperson has disconnected. The conference will now end.