

## Assessing Institutional Support for Service-Learning: A Case Study of Organizational Sensemaking

Scott A. Chadwick and Donna R. Pawlowski

Creighton University

*This paper provides an example of how institutional service-learning assessment data can be used to drive organizational change. Furco's (1999) self-assessment rubric for the institutionalization of service-learning in higher education is used in modified form as the instrument through which organizational-level assessments were made. The process of organizational change over time is reported through the lens of Weick's (1995) Organizational Information Theory and specifically the double interact, comprised of act, response, and adjustment as organizational members reduce their uncertainty and make sense of organizational action and communication.*

The need to assess service-learning cannot be escaped. Whether to satisfy regional accreditors' demands, provide data demonstrating programmatic efficacy, or measure student progress and teaching effectiveness, assessment's place in higher education is becoming solidified. Over the past 20 years, the assessment focus has largely been on student learning outcomes (Marchel, 2004), and rightly so. Many universities have designed their assessment practices based on the work of experts such as Banta (1996), Cross and Angelo (1988), and Walvoord and Anderson (1998).

However, assessing service-learning brings into play not just student learning outcomes, but also faculty, community partners, and the institution itself (Driscoll, Holland, Gelmon, & Kerrigan, 1996; Strand, Marullo, Cutforth, Stoecker, & Donohue, 2003). Bringle, Phillips, and Hudson (2004) detail the extant instruments that can be used to assess students' experiences in service-learning. Berman (1999) and Heffernan (2001) show how to embed assessment into service-learning course design. The positive effects of service-learning on students are well documented (Ash, Clayton, & Atkinson, 2005; Eyler, Giles, & Gray, 2000).

As the assessment of student learning matures, more attention is being paid to assessing the effects of service-learning on the community partners (Bushouse, 2005; Jorge, 2003; Oates & Leavitt, 2003) and institutions as a whole. Gelmon, Holland, Driscoll, Spring, and Kerrigan (2001) argue that assessing institutional factors makes sense because those "factors affect decision-making at every level and every stage of operations... service-learning programs are always strongly influenced by their institutional environments... (and) the impact of

organizational context on service-learning and engagement endeavors means that systematic assessment of institutional factors can play an extremely important role in facilitating campus commitment by providing relevant and neutral data to inform decision-making and reduce obstacles" (p. 107). Bell, Furco, Ammon, Muller, and Sorgen (2000) found that institutional support for service-learning is second only to faculty support for service-learning in terms of what is the strongest predictor of the institutionalizing of service-learning. Thus, it is important to conduct assessment on various institutional factors of service-learning.

A critical concern, however, of service-learning research, and in particular assessment, is the paucity of rigorous processes and theoretical grounding of research studies (Bringle & Hatcher, 2000; Kiely, 2005). This is in part because service-learning is a fairly new discipline and that we do not have a great deal of original theories related to service-learning. Ziegert and McGoldrick (2004) argue that we are at a "methodological crossroads," which can be an exciting place to be; but it does mean however, that we need to demonstrate our rigor and highlight theoretical underpinnings when we conduct research in service-learning to enhance our scholarly legitimacy across disciplines. Service-learning scholars recognize that some disciplines' theories (Bringle & Hatcher, 2000; Gelmon, 2000; Giles & Eyler, 1994) have been used to link with service-learning, at least primarily in terms of experiential learning and educational models. But other theoretical perspectives also need to be examined to enhance the spectrum of research. As Bringle and Hatcher argue,

to provide merely a description of a specific service-learning program or an isolated service-learning class is severely limited because of the context-specific and idiosyncratic nature of case description. To show how the design and implementation of the service-learning program or class was guided by theory and to demonstrate how the experiences and outcomes are consistent or inconsistent with expectations derived from a theory, provides a much richer basis from which conceptual generalizations can be understood and a basis upon which lessons learned can be applied to other settings... (p. 70)

From this we can see that description of a program alone is not enough; it is time to provide appropriate application and theory building relevant to service-learning issues.

Given these concerns, this article presents institutional assessment results grounded in organiza-

tional communication theory to contribute to the needed call of service-learning research. The subsequent sections explain our assessment procedures using Furco's Benchmark Worksheet, examine Weick's Organizational Information Theory and its importance in assessment, provide analysis of our organizational actions using the Weick's double interact cycle, and conclude with discussion and implications for future research on institutionalization of service-learning.

### Instrument: Benchmark Worksheet

Based on Kecskes and Muyliaert's (1997) conceptual framework of a three-stage developmental continuum (i.e., Critical Mass Building, Quality Building, and Sustained Institutionalization) and institutional dimensions of service-learning integration (See Table 1), Furco (1999; 2002) advocates the use of a Benchmark Worksheet, an insti-

Table 1  
*Scores on Self-Assessment Rubric for the Institutionalization of Service-Learning in Higher Education at three points in time (using Furco's Benchmark Worksheet)*

	2000	2004	2005
<b>Dimension I: Philosophy and Mission of Service-Learning</b>			
-Definition of service-learning	1	2*	2
-Strategic planning	1	4*	4
-Alignment with institutional mission	1	3*	3
-Alignment with educational reform efforts	1	2*	3*
<b>Dimension II: Faculty Support For And Involvement In Service-Learning</b>			
-Faculty awareness	1	4*	4
-Faculty involvement & support	1	3*	4*
-Faculty leadership	1	4*	4
-Faculty incentives & rewards	1	4*	4
<b>Dimension III: Student Support For And Involvement In Service-Learning</b>			
-Student awareness	1	4*	4
-Student opportunities	1	7*	7
-Student leadership	1	2*	2
-Student incentives & rewards	2	3*	3
<b>Dimension IV: Community Participation And Partnerships</b>			
-Community partner awareness	1	4*	5*
-Mutual understanding	1	4*	4
-Community partner voice & leadership	1	3*	3
<b>Dimension V: Institutional Support For Service-Learning</b>			
-Coordinating entity	1	5*	5
-Policy-making entity	1	3*	3
-Staffing	1	4*	4
-Funding	2	5*	5
-Administrative support	1	4*	4
-Evaluation & assessment	1	3*	4*

Note.

1, 2, or 3 is Stage One: Critical Mass Building.

4, 5, or 6 is Stage Two: Quality Building.

7, 8, or 9 is Stage Three: Sustained Institutionalization.

\* denotes improvement over the prior assessment rating for that component.

tutional self-assessment tool, to measure:

- “Faculty acceptance and support for service-learning,
- Student acceptance and support for service-learning,
- Institutional acceptance and support for service-learning, and
- The presence of *Evaluation* processes that help assess the advancement of service-learning on campus” (2002, p. 42, italics in original).

The Benchmark Worksheet allows an institution to assess the extent to which it has institutionalized service-learning. It proposes five dimensions of institutionalization: (1) philosophy and mission of service-learning, (2) faculty support for and involvement in service-learning, (3) student support for and involvement in service-learning, (4) community participation and partnerships, and (5) institutional support for service-learning. Each dimension contains three to six components, each of which are assessed independently. For each assessment, the institution determines if its institutionalization efforts are at the “Critical Mass Building,” “Quality Building,” or “Sustained Institutionalization” stage. There exist three data points within each stage, so an institution could show improvement without moving from one stage to another.

As an example of those three stages, one of the components of “Dimension 5: Institutional support for service-learning” is “funding.” An institution would assess itself to be in the “Critical Mass Building” stage if service-learning activities are funded primarily by soft money from external sources. An assessment of “Quality Building” would be achieved if the institution’s service-learning activities are funded with soft (external) and hard (internal) money. “Sustained Institutionalization” would be reached when service-learning activities are primarily supported by hard money. Moving from one stage to another is a matter of judgment within the institution. But, as the rubric is designed for assessment, feedback, and change purposes, consistency in applying the rubric over time is more important than having definitive points of demarcation between the stages.

### Theoretical Grounding

Overall, assessment is concerned with the systematic process of collecting and analyzing data to determine the degree to which goals or objectives are being met. As with any new service-learning program or an attempt to institutionalize a program, several concerns and issues need assessing as various individuals within an organization have different perceptions of how and what should be implemented. Gelmon (2000) indicates that assess-

ment is learning for short-term and long-term program improvement. In addition, assessment provides feedback to make programmatic changes at institutional levels. Assessment is a continuous process; one is always assessing and re-assessing to strengthen and improve the program at hand. Thus, for a new service-learning program it is important to recognize and listen to all players within the institution to gather pertinent data when completing assessment processes.

Even though assessment of service-learning is essential, little assessment evidence has been developed (Gelmon, 2000; Kiely, 2005). One approach to assessment is to provide theoretical perspectives that examine processes and structures that affect individuals involved in an organizational structure. Weick’s Organizational Information Theory (Weick, 1979; Weick & Quinn, 1999), consisting of retrospective sensemaking, equivocality, and the double interact provide such grounding to understanding assessment of institutionalizing service-learning and takes into account all players and systems within an organizational culture.

First, let us examine Weick’s process of *retrospective sensemaking* (1995; Weick, Sutcliffe, & Obstfeld, 2005), which is a process that entails seeking to understand what is currently happening by seeing what was done in the past, understanding why those actions were taken, and determining if those actions were effective for the institution’s goals. According to Weick et al., sensemaking “is not about truth and getting it right. Instead, it is about continued redrafting of an emerging story so that it becomes more comprehensive, incorporates more of the observed data, and is more resilient in the face of criticism” (p. 415). As one can see, this continued redrafting parallels the process of assessment such that more data creates restructuring of programs and strengthening of ideas, a process similar to assessment.

In particular for this study, Furco’s (1999; 2000) Benchmark Worksheet fits well with this systemic approach to understanding service-learning in our institution because it (a) focuses on structures, processes, and actions across the institution, and (b) provides a means by which we can document the past and its effect on the present. Whenever new programs or systems are implemented in an organization, vast amounts of information are managed and synthesized to reach a shared understanding of the programs or systems. Shifting from service-learning as an isolated endeavor within a particular college (the College of Arts and Sciences in our case) to a university-wide effort with supportive infrastructure is an example of a new system that would generate much information. This under-

taking can result in organizational cultural change if the institution first makes sense of the past while looking to what the future may become (Schein, 2000). To make sense of the past and what might happen in the future, organizational members must reduce the uncertainty about what the past means, what the future might become, and the meaning of the messages used to talk about both.

In our discussion of the growth of service-learning at our university, and the assessment practices that informed the growth, we also employ Weick's notion of *equivocality* and the *double interact*. Equivocality refers to conditions of ambiguity and uncertainty. With ambiguity, persons are confused because there are too many possible correct interpretations. With uncertainty, persons are confused because they do not know the possible correct interpretations (Weick, 1995). Either way, for the organization to progress in an orderly fashion, the ambiguity or uncertainty must be reduced or eliminated.

Weick provides a framework through which to reduce this equivocality as organizational members collect, manage, and use information (Weick, 1979; Weick & Quinn, 1999). Weick is concerned with the process of how individuals organize the information and the steps individuals take to understand and make sense of the information within the organization. Organizations have two tasks when organizing information: (1) interpreting external information received and (2) coordinating information to make it meaningful to organizational members and reduce equivocality about the information (Daft & Lengel, 1986). For an organization to be effective, persons who deliver information or act in administrative positions should work toward helping individuals within the organization to reduce equivocality so they can better understand the nature and meaning of extant information.

Finally, Weick asserts that behaviors typically enacted when interacting with others for purposes of disseminating information and attempting to reduce ambiguous information exist cyclically in what is called the *double interact* (1979; 1995). Communicative interactions first consist of an *act* performed by an individual or organizational entity. Second is the *interact*, or *response*, by those who perceived the act; a reaction to the act. The final portion of the double interact is the *adjustment*, comprised of any modifications to the original act, which may acknowledge that the reactor understood the information or requires more clarification. Thus, a cycle of organizational action and communication creates behaviors to reduce equivocality of information, but provides a feedback loop (from reaction to adjustment to subsequent action) to assess whether the ambiguity was sufficiently reduced and guide poten-

tial future communication.

Overall, Weick's Organizational Information Theory helps us create order and make retrospective sense of what occurs (Weick et al., 2005), as well as reduce information uncertainty to assess the current state of, in this case, a service-learning initiative within a university. According to Craig-Lees (2001), there is a general acceptance that information is inherently unstable and that there are likely to be elements of shared or collective meaning across individuals. However, "unless elements/components are identified, how they relate cannot be assessed nor the process examined" (p. 515). By conducting assessment and examination of the language used across the university, Weick's theory helps us identify the elements of information/data, understand multiple parties' perceptions, and modify the institution's service-learning model, thus continuing the assessment process.

In the next section, we examine how we used institutional assessment data, and the lack thereof, in three phases to inform the University's process of institutionalizing service-learning: first, beginning with the "formal" recognition in 2000 to 2003, second from 2003-2004, and third from 2004-2005. We explain organizational actions using the double interact cycle of act, interact (response), and adjustment. Finally, we close the paper by discussing possible paths the University can take to use assessment as a change agent.

### Application of Weick's Sensemaking and Double Interact

A case study design was employed to best examine how to understand service-learning at Creighton University. Case study analysis is useful for providing in-depth investigation of a particular program for improvement, policy-making, or illuminating information (Bringle, 2003; Kiely, 2005; Patton, 2002). As Creighton is in initial stages of overall university assessment, the case approach is an appropriate method for this particular research endeavor, while still providing heuristic and replicable avenues for future research.

#### *Benchmark Worksheet and Sensemaking*

Creighton University, as part of the Midwest Consortium for Service-Learning in Higher Education, has used the Benchmark Worksheet since 2000 to assess service-learning institutionalization. Efforts prior to 2000 to collectively promote service-learning, ranging from requests for dedicated service-learning staff to a proposal for a service-learning center, were unsuccessful. In 2000, however, the acquisition of external grant

funds prompted the University to evaluate the state of service-learning on campus and consider what was needed to promote service-learning and develop faculty to teach using this pedagogy. The University first used the Benchmark Worksheet prior to the beginning of institutional support for service-learning. In fall 2003, formal support for service-learning was shifted within the institution, from a dedicated group of faculty members within the College of Arts and Sciences, to the Office for Academic Excellence and Assessment. As part of this shift, a one-half time staff person was hired to serve as a liaison between faculty members wanting to design and teach service-learning courses and organizations in the Creighton community wanting to participate as community partners. Service is an integral part of Creighton University's mission, and it defines its community as the greater Omaha metropolitan area, Native American reservations in Nebraska and South Dakota, and areas within Central and South America with a particular focus on the Dominican Republic.

Table 1 shows our self-assessment rankings in the years 2000, 2004, and 2005. The lack of self-assessment in 2001, 2002, and 2003 reflects the absence of a centralized service-learning support mechanism. This self-assessment process now resides in the Office for Academic Excellence and Assessment. In the following section, we will discuss what we did to move forward in the institutionalization continuum and what we plan to do in the future.

### *Institutionalization Efforts Seen through Weick's Double Act*

*Phase 1.* To begin to generate interest in service-learning across the campus in 2000, faculty in our College of Arts and Sciences were awarded an external grant that totaled (with matching funds) more than \$250,000. Although a committee created the grant proposal and mapped out ideas of how the dollars would be spent, the announcement of the grant alone generated ambiguity regarding the money's use and recipients, thus beginning the equivocality cycle.

As we began our service-learning journey in 2000 we realized soon into the organizational path that we began in a state of equivocality; faculty had been teaching service-learning courses in small units on campus. For example, students in our Justice and Peace Studies program were taking "service-learning" courses, but only one faculty was providing exposure to service-learning in that program and from only one disciplinary perspective. Others in the College of Arts and Sciences taught what they labeled as "service-learning" but upon further review some courses would not have

met any well-accepted definition of service-learning, in most cases because they did not involve students in true reflection linking course content with the service experience. Two faculty members were teaching service-learning courses in the College of Business Administration, as were a few in the School of Nursing and School of Pharmacy and Health Professions. Finally, students participated in an educational program in the Dominican Republic which included service-learning courses.

Looking at service-learning across the University, we soon realized there were various perceptions of service-learning. Each faculty member had a unique approach to service-learning sites, assignments, and reflections. For the University to *react* to the faculty members' service-learning *actions*, substantial ambiguity needed to be reduced to reach one shared understanding of service-learning and its component parts.

Additional *acts* by administrators and service-learning leaders to reduce some of the initial ambiguity included four semester-long faculty development programs. These addressed the conceptualization of service-learning; service-learning and justice; service-learning and diversity; course/syllabi construction; local, overnight, and international immersions; establishing an advisory board; creating policies for embedding service-learning in courses (including an orientation to service site, designation of service-learning courses within a college, logging of student hours at community partner sites, and liability issues); hosting nationally recognized service-learning experts on campus; creating and mailing a survey to community partners around the surrounding Omaha area to assess relationship interest and community needs; hiring students to serve as liaisons between faculty members and community partners; and funding faculty members' and administrators' attendance at regional and national service-learning conferences. This faculty development program was, in effect, a faculty learning community, defined by Cox (2004) as a group of faculty across disciplines engaged in active, collaborative programming related to curriculum about teaching and learning via "frequent seminars and activities that provide learning, development, the scholarship of teaching, and community building" (p. 8).

These initiatives created multiple opportunities for individuals on campus as well as for community partners. Initial *responses* (the second element of Weick's double interact cycle) to most acts were positive in nature. Twenty faculty members participated in the development program and reacted favorably to their experiences in local and international immersions; approximately 100 attended presentations made by visiting experts; more facul-

ty began to teach service-learning courses; other colleges within the University became more interested in service-learning; community members began to attend events on campus; students became more involved with service-learning on campus on a small scale; and administrators began to attend more closely to service-learning on campus as students and faculty generated more energy and interest in service-learning.

Because this initiative was large in scope, initial responses also created some questions and more equivocality, which required attention for modification, i.e., the adjustment to the reaction. For example, based upon pre- and post-questionnaire results, faculty participants in the programs wanted more focus on reflection writing and day-to-day assignments, so the curriculum was adjusted. It was also obvious that faculty, students, and administrators had a number of different definitions of service-learning, so time was allocated during faculty development and service-learning luncheons to differentiate service-learning, internships, service, etc. Faculty members did not particularly care for the multiple layers of policies they were required to follow to teach their service-learning courses; though useful, these policies needed to be streamlined to assure administrative control yet not frustrate or deter faculty from teaching service-learning courses. Surveys from community agencies brought useful information but due to large turnover and the impersonal nature of the survey, we used follow-up interviews. This allowed us to be able to respond more fully to questions regarding what is service-learning and how participation with Creighton could benefit their community and our students.

*Turning Point: Moving from Phase 1 to Phase 2.* At the end of Phase 1, several changes had been made on campus. However, the grant funding had been exhausted and additional energy was needed if service-learning was to flourish on campus. Progress had been made in creating a shared understanding of service-learning practices and definitions, yet not all equivocality had been eliminated. A committee was formed to create a proposal for the Academic Vice President (AVP) to develop a phased service-learning program.

In addition, at this time a new campus program was created (an organizational *act*) on campus called *Cortina*, a living-learning sophomore community rooted in the Ignatian tradition of the service of faith and the promotion of justice. This community has as one of its goals to experience service via service-learning courses, thus providing a prime opportunity to collaborate with faculty “newly developed” through the service-learning program. With this new opportunity came new

ambiguity.

With the acceptance of the proposal to the AVP, Phase 2 (2003-2004) kicked-off, generating various *acts* to sustain service-learning on campus. To create a more credible and open perception of service-learning across campus, responsibility for service-learning shifted from a dedicated group of faculty members within the College of Arts and Sciences to the Office for Academic Excellence and Assessment (AEA), which provides faculty development and promotes student learning assessment for all colleges and schools within Creighton. The University also joined the Midwest Consortium for Service-Learning in Higher Education (MCSLHE), a Nebraska/South Dakota initiative, as well as Campus Compact. In *response* to the need for more energy into the system, grant funding was sought (and subsequently obtained) from the MCSLHE for institutional and faculty service-learning *acts, responses, and adjustments*.

As part of this shift, a one-half time staff person was hired to serve as a liaison between faculty members wanting to design and teach service-learning courses and community organizations. Through this *act*, this individual assumed some responsibilities of the faculty member and student liaisons and helped maintain community partner connections. This allowed the faculty development coordinator in AEA to focus on other aspects of service-learning related to faculty development, enabling *adjustments* to faculty needs across campus. Rather than having a four-semester program, the program was condensed to a one-semester six-module format to serve more faculty members, while accommodating faculty schedules. In addition, more lunch-time workshops provided quick overviews of various service-learning topics. Finally, these efforts were coordinated with opportunities for faculty members to present their service-learning-related research and scholarship of teaching and learning (SoTL) at conferences. As faculty returned to campus and discussed their conference experiences, equivocality about service-learning was further reduced.

Given that this was a transition year, there was some confusion, which again, according to Weick (1979, 1995), required attention to modification. Faculty and staff questioned who was responsible for various tasks, which demanded open lines of communication across campus. While *responses* were made to create the best transition to the “new” service-learning organizational structure by engaging those faculty and staff in dialogue, it was impossible to have perfect implementation without equivocality. This became more complicated as service-learning was now housed in a different

office, with the responsibility for leading service-learning changing from a faculty member to an administrator.

In addition, because different student populations and service-learning opportunities across the colleges and schools at Creighton had varying conceptualizations of reflection writing and service sites, these had to be added to the previously developed College of Arts and Sciences model of service-learning. While other colleges also focus on justice and diversity, their emphasis of such issues are different and needed to be placed on a continuum rather than be assumed to be the same as those within Arts and Sciences. When Arts and Sciences faculty led the University's service-learning effort, their service-learning definition and policies were assumed to work for the entire university, requiring no response or adjustment. These issues, coupled with feedback received from other areas of the University, resulted in organizational *adjustments* as the new office supporting service-learning balanced multiple needs and wants and prepared to strategically focus support on a few, targeted areas.

*Phase 3: Strategically Using Assessment Data to Effect Change.* Phase 3 commenced with an institutional assessment (see Table 1). The efforts to reduce equivocality in Phase 2 were found to have paid off, as the University moved from the "Critical Mass Building" stage of the self assessment rubric to the "Quality Building" stage. While the efforts in Phase 2 were directed primarily at building a shared understanding of service-learning definitions, practices, and structures, the efforts in Phase 3 focused on expanding that shared vision across campus, increasing faculty involvement, increasing community partner's awareness of service-learning opportunities, and embedding assessment practices into service-learning courses.

Taking the state of service-learning at the beginning of Phase 3 as the act, the University's *responses* focused on faculty, staff, administrators, and community partner attention to the areas listed above. Faculty development opportunities were expanded to include faculty and staff. Service-learning administrators spoke to students in service-learning courses to help build a shared understanding of service-learning that matched the rest of the University. Faculty and staff participation in regional, national, and international service-learning conferences and meetings was funded. Planned interactions with local community groups, designed as cultural immersions, were reduced in duration so more faculty could attend. And, the staff member serving as a liaison between faculty members and the community partners reinforced the shared understanding of service-learning in her

day-to-day actions.

Salancik and Pfeffer (as cited in Weick, 1995, p. 53) state that "the social context is crucial for sensemaking because it binds people to actions that they then must justify, it affects the saliency of information, and it provides norms and expectations that constrain explanations" (1978, p. 233). Using this as a basis for action, the University situated all service-learning support efforts within the context of assessment. The University's preparation for a regional accreditation self-study process was occurring simultaneously to Phase 3. Assessment is a key component of the self-study process and had gained traction across campus. By integrating assessment into all service-learning support actions (e.g., symposia, celebratory lunches, training sessions, grant applications, and the SoTL about service-learning), faculty and staff started understanding service-learning in terms of learning outcomes and effects on community partners, rather than just a pedagogical form bound by policies and definitions. By providing a context within which to reduce equivocality and learn what the future could be, the University helped its faculty and staff learn what is basic and necessary, rather than allowing them to engage in unfounded conjecture and generalization that can lead to increased equivocality (Weick & Ashford, 2001).

Toward the end of 2005, we took another institutional assessment snapshot and found that intentional actions have moved the University slightly forward in the targeted areas, and in no other areas. Those targeted areas include (a) aligning the philosophy and mission of service-learning with educational reform efforts, (b) increasing faculty involvement in and support for service-learning, (c) increasing community partner awareness in service-learning opportunities, and (d) increasing the quality and quantity of service-learning evaluation and assessment. Faculty, staff, administrator, and community partner reactions to the University *responses* described above were enacted as *adjustments* in behavior and ways of thinking, thus completing the double interact across Phase 3.

## Conclusion

This case study provides visibility into the organizational activities that can enhance and hinder the institutionalization of service-learning. Using Weick's theory helps us focus on the individuals and groups who comprise an organization and their behaviors and communication that create the organizational structures, processes, and procedures through which the organization works. The sense-making process reminds us to first determine the institutionalization level of service-learning. The

process of analyzing acts, responses, and adjustments allows us to understand how the institution arrived at its present state, how efforts to further support service-learning can fit within typical patterns of action, and what organizational members' reactions will likely be to those efforts. Sensemaking is inherently a goal-directed process to reduce uncertainty. Orienting efforts to change institutional support for service-learning from a sensemaking point of view will greatly increase the likelihood that those efforts are goal directed as well. Unless an institution has unlimited resources, the use of the self-assessment rubric will enable institutions to target for change specific components of each dimension of service-learning support. The attention on organizational actions that the sensemaking process provides creates the foundation for strategic decisions about which components and dimensions should, and can, be targeted.

Creighton's future efforts to institutionalize service-learning will be guided by assessment data and knowledge of the double interact process. Success at intentionally targeting areas for improvement based on the institutional assessment rubric provides some confidence that we can influence continued improvement in those areas while shaping positive changes in other areas as well. Our experiences with institutional assessment leads us to believe that having funding, assessment practices, and good intentions in place is a good start, but the glue that binds together programmatic development, assessment, and organizational processes is the cycle of double interacts that occurs through organizational action and communication. Not only is this case study important for our continued efforts in the growth and development of service-learning, but others may learn from our reactions and adjustments to the challenges we faced. Institutions may be encouraged to engage in self-assessment practices using Furco's instrument and examine their own organizational activities via Weick's theory. It is important that service-learning scholars continue to engage in service-learning projects and analyses based on theory and relevant research.

### Note

A version of this paper was presented at the National Communication Association Convention in November, 2005.

### References

- Ash, S. L., Clayton, P. H., & Atkinson, M. P. (2005). Integrating reflection and assessment to capture and improve student learning. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning, 11*(2), 49-59.
- Banta, T. (Ed.). (1996). *Assessment in practice: Putting principles to work on college campuses*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Bell, R., Furco, A., Ammon, M. S., Muller, P., & Sorgen, V. (2000). *Institutionalizing service-learning in higher education: Findings from a study of the Western Region Campus Compact Consortium*. Berkeley, CA: University of California.
- Berman, S. (1999). *Service learning for the multiple intelligences classroom*. Arlington Heights, IL: Skylight Training and Publishing, Inc.
- Bringle, R. G. (2003). Enhancing theory-based research in service-learning. In S. Billig & J. Eyler (Eds.), *Deconstructing service-learning: Research exploring context, participation, and impacts* (pp. 25-50). Greenwich, CN: Information Age.
- Bringle, R. G., Phillips, M. A., & Hudson, M. (2004). *The measure of service learning: Research scales to assess student experiences*. Washington, D.C.: American Psychological Association.
- Bringle, R. G., & Hatcher, J. A. (2000). Meaningful measurement of theory-based service-learning outcomes: Making the case with quantitative research. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning: Strategic Directions for Service-Learning Research* [Special Issue], 68-75.
- Bushouse, B. K. (2005). Community nonprofit organizations and service-learning: Resource constraints to building partnerships with universities. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning, 12*(1), 32-40.
- Cox, M. D. (2004). Introduction to faculty learning communities. In M. Cox & L. Richlin (Eds.), *Building faculty learning communities* (pp. 5-23). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Craig-Lees, M. (2001). Sense making: Trojan horse? Pandora's Box? *Psychology & Marketing, 18*(5), 513-526
- Cross, K. P., & Angelo, T. A. (1988). *Classroom assessment techniques: A handbook for faculty*. Ann Arbor, MI: National Center for Research to Improve Postsecondary Teaching and Learning, University of Michigan.
- Daft, R. L., & Lengel, R. H. (1986). Organizational information requirements, media richness and structural design. *Management Science, 32*, 554-571.
- Driscoll, A., Holland, B., Gelmon, S., & Kerrigan, S. (1996). An assessment model for service-learning: Comprehensive case studies of impact on faculty, students, community, and institution. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning, 3*, 66-71.
- Eyler, J., Giles, D. W., Jr., & Gray, C. J. (2000). Research at a glance: What we know about the effects of service-learning on students, faculty, institutions and communities, 1993-1999. In *Introduction to service-learning toolkit: Readings and resources for faculty*, (pp. 19-25). Providence, RI: Campus Compact.



- Furco, A. (1999). *Self-assessment rubric for the institutionalization of service-learning in higher education*. [Monograph]. University of California, Berkeley: Service Learning Research and Development Center.
- Furco, A. (2002). Institutionalizing service-learning in higher education. *Journal of Public Affairs*, 6, 39-67.
- Gelmon, S. B. (2000). Challenges in assessing service-learning. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning: Strategic Directions for Service-Learning Research* [Special Issue], 84-90.
- Gelmon, S. B., Holland, B. A., Driscoll, A., Spring, A., & Kerrigan, S. (2001). *Assessing service-learning and civic engagement: Principles and techniques*. Providence, RI: Campus Compact.
- Giles, D. E. Jr., & Eyler, J. (1994). The theoretical roots of service-learning in John Dewey: Toward a theory of service-learning. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 1, 77-85.
- Heffernan, K. (2001). *Fundamentals of service-learning course construction*. Providence, RI: Campus Compact.
- Jorge, E. (2003). Outcomes for community partners in an unmediated service-learning program. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 10(1), 28-38.
- Keckes, K., & Muyliaert, J. (1997). *Benchmark Worksheet for the Western Region Campus Compact Consortium Grants Program*. Bellingham, WA: Western Washington University.
- Kiely, R. (2005). A transformative learning model for service-learning: A longitudinal case study. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 12(1), 5-22.
- Marchel, C. A. (2004). Evaluating reflection and socio-cultural awareness in service learning classes. *Teaching of Psychology*, 31(2), 120-123.
- Oates, K. K., & Leavitt, L. H. (2003). *Service-learning and learning communities: Tools for integration and assessment*. Washington, D.C.: Association of American Colleges and Universities.
- Patton, M. Q. (2002). *Qualitative evaluation and research methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Salancik, G. R., & Pfeffer, J. (1978). A social information processing approach to job attitudes and task design. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 23, 224-253.
- Schein, E. H. (2000). Sense and nonsense about culture and climate. In N. M. Ashkansasy, C. P. M. Wilderom, & M. F. Peterson (Eds.), *Handbook of organizational culture and climate* (pp. xxiii – xxx). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Strand, K., Marullo, S., Cutforth, N., Stoecker, R., & Donohue, P. (2003). *Community-based research and higher education*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Walvoord, B. E., & Anderson, V. J. (1998). *Effective grading: A tool for learning and assessment*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Weick, K. E. (1979). *The social psychology of organizing*. New York: Random House.
- Weick, K. E. (1995). *Sensemaking in organizations*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Weick, K. E., & Ashford, S. J. (2001). Learning in organizations. In F. M. Jablin & L. L. Putnam (Eds.), *The new handbook of organizational communication: Advances in theory, research, and methods* (pp. 704-731). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Weick, K. E., & Quinn, R. E., (1999). Organizational change and development. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 50, 361-386.
- Weick, K. E., Sutcliffe, K., M., & Obstfeld, D. (2005). Organizing and the process of sensemaking. *Organization Science: A Journal of the Institute of Management Sciences*, 16(4), 409-421.
- Ziegert, A., & McGoldrick, K (2004). Adding rigor to service-learning research: An armchair economists' approach. In M. Welch & S. Billig (Eds.), *New perspectives in service-learning: Research to advance the field* (pp. 23-36). Greenwich, CT: Information Age.

### Authors

SCOTT A. CHADWICK, Ph.D., is the associate vice president for Academic Affairs and director of the Office for Academic Excellence and Assessment at Creighton University. Dr. Chadwick's office is the primary source for service-learning support, training, and assessment at Creighton.

DONNA R. PAWLOWSKI, Ph.D., is an associate professor in the Department of Communication Studies and the service-learning faculty development associate within the Office for Academic Excellence and Assessment at Creighton University. Dr. Pawlowski teaches courses primarily in interpersonal, family, and managerial communication, while also providing training for faculty pursuing service-learning course development.