Attributes of SL Course	Low Intensity	Medium Intensity	High Intensity
1) Reciprocal partnerships and processes shape the community project and course design.	The instructor contacts a community organization to host students and provides a brief overview of the course (e.g., learning outcomes, syllabus) and the purposes of the community project.	The instructor meets with the community partner(s) to discuss the course (e.g., preparation/orientation of students, learning outcomes, syllabus), and to identify how the community project can enrich student learning and benefit the organization.	The instructor collaborates with and learns from the community partner(s) as co-educator in various aspects of course planning and design (e.g., learning outcomes, readings, preparation/orientation of students, reflection, assessment) and together they identify how the community project can enrich student learning and add to the capacity of the organization.
2) Community project enhances academic content and assignments.	The instructor includes a community project as an added component of the course but it is not integrated with academic content or assignments. The syllabus does not address the purposes of the community project.	The instructor utilizes the community project as a "text" to provide additional insight into student understanding of academic content and ability to complete assignments. The syllabus describes the relationship of the community project to learning outcomes.	The instructor integrates the community project and relevant social issue(s) as critical dimensions for student understanding of academic content and ability to complete assignments. The syllabus provides a strong rationale for the relationship of the community project to learning outcomes.
3) Diversity of interactions and dialogue with others across difference.	The instructor offers students limited opportunities for interaction and dialogue with others across difference.	The instructor engages students in periodic interactions and dialogue with peers across a range of experiences and diverse perspectives.	The instructor and community partner(s) engage students in frequent interactions and dialogue with peers and community members across a range of experiences and diverse perspectives.
4) Civic competencies (i.e., knowledge, skills, disposition, behavior) are well integrated into student learning.	The instructor focuses on discipline-based content with little attention/priority given to civic learning or development of civic competencies.	The instructor focuses on discipline-based content and connects to civic learning and civic competencies when relevant to the community project.	The instructor focuses on the integration of discipline-based content with civic learning and civic competencies and emphasizes the relevance of the community project to the public purposes of the discipline in society.
5) Critical reflection is well integrated into student learning	The instructor asks students, on a limited basis, to create reflective products about the community project, usually at the end of the semester.	The instructor structures reflection activities and products about the community project that connect the experience to academic content, require moderate analysis, lead to new action, and provide ongoing feedback to the student throughout the semester.	The instructor builds student capacity to critically reflect and develop products that explore the relevance of the experience to academic content, use critical thinking to analyze social issues, recognize systems of power, lead to new action, and provide ongoing feedback to the student throughout the semester.
6) Assessment is used for course improvement.	The instructor articulates student learning outcomes but no measurement tool is in place for assessment.	The instructor articulates student learning outcomes and administers a measurement tool for assessment.	The instructor and community partner(s) articulate student learning outcomes and metrics for organizational capacity/ community outcomes and administers measurement tools for assessment.

Definitions

1) Service learning is defined as a "course-based, credit bearing educational experience in which students (a) participate in an **organized service activity** that meets identified community needs, and (b) **reflect on the service activity** in such a way as to gain further understanding of course content, a broader appreciation of the discipline, and an enhanced sense of personal values and civic responsibility" (Bringle & Hatcher, 2009, p. 38).

2) Service learning can be defined as a "course or competency-based, credit-bearing educational experience in which students: participate in **mutually identified service activities** that benefit the community, and reflect on the service activity in such a way as to gain further understanding of course content, a broader appreciation of the discipline, and an enhanced sense of personal or professional values and civic responsibility (Mary Price adaptation).

3) We define service-learning as "the **integration of academic material**, **relevant community-based service activities**, and **critical reflection** in a **reciprocal partnership** that engages students, faculty/staff, and community members to achieve academic, civic, and personal [growth] learning objectives as well as to advance public purposes" (Bringle, Clayton, & Bringle, 2015; Bringle & Clayton, 2012, p. 105).

Goals for Taxonomy

Improving practice

1. Identifying types of resources (e.g., workshops, on-line materials) to support SL course design.
2. Coaching instructors and community partners on SL course design.
3. An online "Taxonomy" could be developed where someone could click on any cell and have an example that illustrates the cell.

Improving assessment and research

1. Recognizing quality in service learning course design.
   a. How will the campus actually use this in campus-level assessment? (SL – low; SL – medium; SL – high?)
   b. Currently, identification of a service learning course is left to faculty/instructors/departmental registrar/dept. chair. How does this assist at the departmental level?
2. Identifying variables (dimensions of the course design that may vary from low to high) for research
   a. Which of these variables has a particular link to civic outcomes?

References

Bradley, B. (1995). America's challenge. Revitalizing our national community. *National Civic Review*, *84*(2), 94-100.

Bringle, R. G. & Hatcher, J. A. (2009). Innovative practices in service-learning and curricular engagement. In Sandmann, L. R., Thornton, C. H., & Jaeger, A. J. (Eds.), *Institutionalizing community engagement in higher education: The first wave of Carnegie classified institutions. New Directions for Higher Education* (pp. 37-46). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass/Wiley Publishing.

Bringle, R. G., & Clayton, P. H. (2012). Civic education through service-learning: What, how, and why? In L. McIlraith, A. Lyons, & R. Munck (Eds). *Higher education and civic engagement: Comparative perspectives* (pp. 101-124). New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Bringle, R. G., Clayton, P., & Bringle, K. E. (2015). From teaching democratic thinking to developing democratic civic identity. *Partnerships: A Journal of Service-Learning and Civic Engagement*, *6*(1), 51-76.

Gazley, B., Littlepage, L., & Bennett, T. A. (2012). What about the host agency? Nonprofit perspectives on community-based student learning and volunteering. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, *41*(6), 1029-1050.

Giles, D. E., & Eyler, J. (2013). Review Essay: The endless quest for scholarly respectability in service-learning research. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 20(1), 53-64.

Jacoby, B. (2015). *Service-learning essentials.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Mabry, J. B. (1998). Pedagogical variations in service-learning and student outcomes: How time, contact and reflection matter. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 5, 32-47.

Mitchell, T. D. (2015). Using a critical service-learning approach to facilitate civic identity development. *Theory Into Practice. 54,* 20-28.

Pigza, J., & Troppe, M. (2003). Developing an infrastructure for service-learning and community engagement. In B. Jacoby & Associates, *Building partnerships for service- learning* (pp. 106-130). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Smith, M. B., Nowacek, R. S., & Bernstein, J. L. (Eds.). (2010). *Citizenship across the curriculum*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.

Stokamer, S. T. (2011). Pedagogical catalysts of civic competence: The development of a critical epistemological model for community-based learning. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement, 17*, 113-121.