UNO Faculty Senate Meeting, August 25, 2014
Earl K. Long Library, Room 407

1. Call to Order and Welcome

The meeting was called to order at 3:04 PM by Faculty Senate President Dr. Pamela Jenkins, who welcomed everyone and thanked all who came before her for getting processes all set up.

2. Roll Call

Current roster of Faculty Senators:

Administration	Merrill	Johnson	(14-15)	Excused
Staff Council	Brian	McDonald	(14-15)	Present
SG President	David	Teagle	(14-15)	Present
Alumni Assoc.	Dinah	Payne	(14-15)	Present
Adjunct	Michelle	Esposito	(14-15)	Present
Business	Dinah	Payne (SE)	(13-16)	Present
Business	James	Logan	(12-15)	Excused
Business	Matt	Zingoni	(12-15)	Present
Business	Cherie	Trumbach	(14-17)	Excused
Business	Mark	Reid	(13-16)	Present
Business	Christy	Corey	(13-16)	Present
Business	Ivan	Miestchovich	(13-16)	Present
Education	Richard	Speaker (SE)	(13-16)	Present
Education	Zarus	Watson	(12-15)	Absent
Education	Lena	Nuccio-Lee	(13-16)	Present
Education	Ivan	Gill	(14-17)	Present
Education	Matt	Lyons	(14-17)	Absent
Engineering	Edit	Bourgeois (SE)	(14-17)	Excused
Engineering	Malay Ghose	Hajra	(12-15)	Excused
Engineering	Nikolaos	Xiros	(12-15)	Excused
Engineering	Dimitrios	Charalampidis	(13-16)	Excused
Liberal Arts	Nancy	Easterlin (SE)	(14-17)	Excused
Liberal Arts	David	Beriss	(14-17)	Present
Liberal Arts	James	Mokhiber	(14-17)	Present
Liberal Arts	Chris	Day	(14-17)	Present
Liberal Arts	Elaine	Brooks	(12-15)	Present
Liberal Arts	Peter	Yaukey	(12-15)	Excused
Liberal Arts	James	Lowry	(12-15)	Present
Liberal Arts	Marla	Nelson	(12-15)	Excused
Liberal Arts	Vern	Baxter	(12-15)	Present
Liberal Arts	Beth	Blankenship	(12-15)	Present
Liberal Arts	Peter	Schock	(14-17)	Present
Liberal Arts	Steve	Striffler	(14-17)	Present

Liberal Arts	Pam	Jenkins	(14-17)	Present
Liberal Arts	Renia	Ehrenfeucht	(13-16)	Present
Liberal Arts	Laszlo	Fulop	(13-16)	Present
Sciences	Jairo	Santanilla (SE)	(12-15)	Present
Sciences	Elliott	Beaton	(14-17)	Present
Sciences	Greg	Seab	(14-17)	Present
Sciences	Wendy	Schluchter	(14-17)	Present
Sciences	Joel Andrew	Webb	(14-17)	Present
Sciences	Leonard	Spinu	(12-15)	Excused
Sciences	Vassil	Roussev	(12-15)	Present
Sciences	Nicola	Anthony	(13-16)	Present
Sciences	Steve	Rick	(13-16)	Present
Sciences	Tu	Shengru	(13-16)	Absent
Library	Connie	Phelps (SE)	(12-15)	Present
Library	Marie	Morgan	(13-16)	Present

3. Approval of the Minutes from the 4/24/14 Meeting

Dr. Payne moved and Dr. Zingoni seconded to approve the minutes of the 4/24/14 meeting. The motion passed unanimously.

4. Announcements from the Faculty Senate President (Dr. Jenkins)

a) The next meeting does not yet have a home. After that, we will be back in the UCC.
b) **Appointments to Faculty Senate**:
   Dr. Merrill Johnson is the new Administration representative; Staff Council President is Mr. Brian McDonald; Student Council President is Mr. David Teagle; Dr. Payne and Dr. Seab will continue as the Alumni Association representative and Parliamentarian respectively.
c) **Committee Organization**:
   The Faculty Senate Executive Committee began to look at committee assignments for University committees, and each of the colleges has begun to have elections to fill holes from the spring. Senate Committees have not met except for one (Evaluation of Administrators). Senators need to look online for their committee assignments.
d) Drs. Fos and Hansen are at a meeting but will be here later to answer questions.

5. Senate Committee Reports

Evaluation of Administrators Committee (Ms. Phelps):

This past year, two deans were up for evaluation: Dean Mader from the Library and Dean Johnson from the College of Sciences. The form went out online; the results are in and have been given to Administration. The next step is for Dr. Hansen to meet with the constituents of the Library and College of Sciences to give an update. Ms. Phelps has not yet checked to see if other deans are up for review.

6. Faculty Governance Committee (FGC) Report

Dr. Jenkins talked a little about the process. It is really a difficult process and FGC is working hard to make it transparent and authentic and to have some integrity to it. There are pitfalls, but FGC is definitely aware of them. The FGC charge is to think about what our University should look like. Dr. Jenkins turned the meeting over to Dr. Tarr to give an update on FGC progress, and she encouraged people to stop him at any time if there were questions.

a) **Timeline (Dr. Tarr)**:

Dr. Tarr introduced himself as Chair of the Chemistry Department. He missed one FGC meeting this summer and became FGC Chair (with his approval). Some highlights of his presentation follow (**see** Dr. Tarr's presentation slides).

Dr. Tarr spoke about the background on why FGC was formed, its charge, its membership, and what it is doing. The program evaluation and review currently underway is about "revitalization and restructuring," not just about cutting programs but growing them in the future. FGC members spent a lot of time over the summer talking about how they are going to do the program evaluation. FGC wants an open, objective, fair process. FGC did not just make up the evaluation criteria; other libraries have been using these, but FGC picked ones that are more relevant to the University. Score will be one input. The full Committee will discuss and decide which of three proposed program category models to use and will follow a process similar to the NSF process for grant funding. Items highlighted in green on the "Process" slide have already been done.

Dr. Jenkins said that with help from Dr. Hansen and others, they have begun to get some pretty complete data. She has just about finished a survey that mostly asks qualitative questions. FGC will review and finish the survey at this Wednesday's meetings and then send it to the chairs. People can call her if they have any questions. FGC is fairly confident about the reliability and validity of the data that FGC is getting. Dr. Schluchter added that they have been able to look at spreadsheets and go back and check some things; so far the data seems pretty reliable. There will be some time for chairs to review the data themselves. Dr. Beriss said that he hopes that chairs can get a chance to review the data and see what is relevant. Dr. Tarr stated that it is important that FGC gets feedback on what data is incorrect; the main part of the survey is to get information that data cannot answer. In referring to the four categories, Ms. Esposito said that we do not know what the quartiles will be yet, which Dr. Jenkins confirmed. Ms. Esposito asked if everybody will see some change, and Dr. Tarr replied that he hopes that everyone benefits from this. There are no targets.

Mr. Teagle asked where if any do we put any weight on student input. Dr. Schluchter replied that the survey asks chairs if they survey their students, and that will be considered. Dr. Tarr said that FGC does have data on completion rates. Dr. Jenkins added that if Mr. Teagle can think of some type of question, FGC can add it. Mr. Teagle said that he is afraid of using completion rate since there is no way of capturing why students leave. Ms. Blankenship commented that there is no target by us and asked if FGC knows if the UL System has a target. Dr. Hansen affirmed that no target has been given to us by the ULS Board. Dr. Tarr emphasized that this is a process that needs to happen at each university, and not just for cost savings; and it should be an ongoing process.

Returning to the slides, Dr. Tarr mentioned that FGC welcomed feedback. He then talked about the four main subcommittees. Each one has come up with a list of data deemed to be

important for evaluating that issue. Lists are being made as comprehensive as practical, and each subcommittee will go through all 84 programs and come back to the full Committee for discussion and final decisions. Dr. Tarr stressed that there will no voting by an individual on his or her program. As to timeline, the budget report on September 2 is supposed to give FGC some insight on non-academic revenues and costs; it is important to see the non-academic side before FGC makes decisions on the academic side. Dr. Tarr reminded everyone that the entire meeting is open for all faculty to attend, with the first 10 minutes for feedback. There are updates every two weeks, although these have fallen behind. He concluded by reviewing the six FGC subcommittees.

Dr. Jenkins asked for other comments. Dr. Beaton asked Dr. Tarr if he would make the slides available. Dr. Jenkins asked Dr. Tarr to send the slides to her, and she will send them out. Dr. Gunter Bischof asked if the Centers are part of this, and Dr. Tarr replied that it is only for degree-granting programs. Dr. Corey said that it seems that the biggest problem where people might challenge is the "Quality" area that has 25%. She suggested that FGC have individual ratings, or some kind of agreement scale for people to see for anyone who might want to challenge. Dr. Seab thought that this was a good idea. Dr. Tarr said that there are actually quantitative measures for "Essentiality," but the number is not the end. Each program is going to get a score based on the criterion, but that is one piece. He stressed that qualitative and subjective are not the same thing. Dr. Jenkins said that the subcommittees will develop code books. Dr. Beriss wants FGC to keep in mind that quantitative criteria, such as Gen. Ed. targets, are moving. Dr. Tarr remarked that FGC does not have anything to do that is easy. Dr. Speaker added that that is even when we look at trends. Dr. Seab commented that one of the judgments of the Committee as a whole was that just because an area does not have a quantifiable number attached to it does not mean that it is not important.

Mr. Teagle stated that, not to beat a dead horse, when he was at Delgado, they went through the same process. It was open, but students in the programs that got cut were unaware. It seems very important that chairs should take into account the student leaders in their programs so that at least they are aware and have some input. Otherwise, he feels that no matter what is decided, we have a lot of shock. Students do not read the emails. Dr. Jenkins concluded this section by emphasizing that the fact that we are evaluating departments and not programs makes this process more difficult.

b) **Subcommittee reports**:

Revenue and Cost: Dr. Schock said that he has full confidence of the numbers being rolled out today. His subcommittee saw a spreadsheet broken down in simple terms, and what they intend to do is to aggregate it to get the total revenue. They can get faculty and administrative costs, but they will not be considering other punitive costs such as scholarships and fellowships. They will add in the research revenue. He thinks that it will be a pretty straightforward analysis of revenues and costs, and they will not get into the 80/20% factor. This purely quantitative piece of the picture is weighted 15%, but it is balanced by many qualitative issues.

External/Internal Demand: Dr. Speaker stated that this is a little more complicated. They are looking at trends at pier institutions and Louisiana universities, and they are looking at workforce development. They can capture some of the external demand by looking at freshmen applicants and transfer students. There are three broad categories, worth 15%.

Guiding Documents: Ms. Phelps said that they have been looking at a few other institutions that have done this, primarily focusing on the University of Alaska-Anchorage, which has over 300 programs. She and Dean Kruger talked with two members of the UAA committee. It took UAA 21weeks, and they used a piece of software to submit the documents. Everyone who goes through this has issues with data and challenges whether it is reliable or not. The investment of administration is also important. Ms. Phelps feels that we have the full backing of Administration here, and they are fully involved in the process. Dr. Beaton asked if we look back five years or so, are there other institutions in our aspirational peers who have gone through this lately. Ms. Phelps responded no; this committee looked at those who had all their documents on their webpage.

Impact/Justification/Essentiality: Dr. Seab stated that his committee is the most qualitative as well as has the highest weight. They are looking at these criteria as they relate to the UNO urban mission. Research is largely numbers, and they can get those. Qualitative aspects include how programs relate to other programs and courses. Ms. Esposito asked how, since centers are not departments, they get counted with the programs. Dr. Seab responded that they have not discussed centers. Dr. Schluchter added that faculty publications can be documented in Faculty 180. Mr. Teagle asked about some of the other quality directives of the University, such as how programs correspond to QEP. Dr. Schluchter replied that that is still under development.

7. Service Learning Model (Mark Stahl, Office of Service Learning)

Mr. Stahl brought two handouts to the meeting about the University of New Orleans Office of Service Learning: (1) "An Overview of Service Learning for UNO Administrators and Faculty" (**see Appendix 1**); and (2) "Faculty Application for Competitive Course Development Stipend" (**see Appendix 2**). He thanked the Provost's Office for the enthusiastic reception the past few months. The Office of Service Learning is currently located in the University Center, but they will eventually move to the Administration Building. They are looking for new courses with a service-learning component. There are five service learning guidelines.   He is really enthusiastic about the community partners that they have developed. If one is looking to add a service component to a course, applications for the stipend need to be in by November 3, 2014; if one is looking to develop a new course, it has to go through Courses and Curricula. The Service Learning website will be revised.

8. Old Business. None.

9. New Business. None.

10. Adjournment.

A motion to adjourn was moved by Ms. Blankenship and seconded by Dr. Schluchter. The meeting adjourned at 4:10 PM.

Respectfully submitted,
Marie Morgan
Faculty Senate Secretary, 2014/15
September 22, 2014

The University of New Orleans Office of Service Learning

Community Engagement through Service Learning

An Overview of Service Learning
for UNO Administrators and Faculty

Introduction

Service Learning is a teaching and learning approach that integrates community service projects with academic studies to enrich learning, teach civic responsibility, and strengthen the communities in which we live and work. Through fieldwork, applied research, and other academic activities, students engage in project-based service initiatives with community partners. Students, faculty, and partners work together to arrive at desired results, create innovative solutions to challenges, and achieve sustainable outcomes that benefit our partners as well as create a legacy of engagement within the community.

The mission of the Office of Service Learning at the University of New Orleans is to engage our undergraduate and graduate students in academic work that intersects with the needs of community organizations. Service Learning at UNO will allow students and faculty to put to work the philosophies, skills, and theories learned in the classroom while serving the community.

Students who enroll in service learning courses commit to completing designated service work that is integrated into the classroom environment. UNO encourages socially conscious students already enrolled at UNO as well as incoming freshmen with service learning experience to become service-learning leaders. Moreover, UNO invites students from universities throughout the country who seek unique experiences to fulfill their service learning requirements in New Orleans, one of America's culturally and historically singular cities.

UNO provides an academic environment that cultivates and graduates leaders ready to continue their service in communities within Southeast Louisiana, throughout the United States, or across the world. Service Learning at the University of New Orleans is made possible through generous support from the Joe W. and Dorothy Dorsett Brown Foundation.

Service Learning Definitions

Service Learning is a growing movement in education with an extensive history in the United States. Stemming from John Dewey's work on democratic and experiential education and William James's pragmatism, Service Learning has evolved and developed for the last hundred years. Its pedagogy is simple — to provide meaningful, engaged, and experiential opportunities for students to connect classroom theories to practice and to contribute to their communities. Though typically based in courses, service learning also occurs through specially designed internships and independent studies. The following definitions offer a perspective on the depth of possibilities and meaning of Service Learning in higher education.

Bringle and Hatcher define Service Learning 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 civic responsibility."[1]

Jacoby argues that "Service-learning is a form of experiential education in which students engage in activities that address human and community needs together with structured opportunities intentionally designed to promote student learning and development. Reflection and reciprocity are key concepts of service learning."[2]

---

[1] Robert G. Bringle & Julie A. Hatcher, *A Service Learning Curriculum for Faculty.* Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning, Vol. 2, 1995, p. 11.

[2] Barbara Jacoby, *Service-Learning in Higher Education: Concepts and Practices.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1996, p. 5.

Service Learning Course Guidelines

Service Learning (SL) courses are credit-based educational experiences designated by a special section number. In order for a course to be designated as service learning it should meet the following guidelines:

- **Fully integrated into the course content:** The service opportunity is intentionally designed to enhance the student's knowledge and is fully integrated into the course content.

- **Structured Reflection:** The course provides structured reflection activities that allow students to reflect throughout the course period on their experience. The activities engage students in deep, critical reflection about community issues and challenges and provide methods for drawing connections between course concepts and service experience.

- **Addresses a community need:** The community partner selected for the project or activity is contacted by the university; the SL project is designed in collaboration with the community partner. The faculty member works to build a relationship of trust and mutuality with the community partner. The service learning project is designed to accomplish defined goals, using the university's best resources to produce desired benefits for the community partner.

- **The course assessment and evaluation criteria include a process for the student and the community partner to measure impact, successes, and challenges.** This process helps to include the community partner's voice and ensure that the service learning experience is a mutually beneficial exchange of knowledge and resources.

- **Each semester-long course includes at least 25 hours of engaged learning per student with a community partner on a project approved and assigned by the course instructor.** Engaged service learning includes any academic work that directly benefits the community partner and the approved project. It may include work on-site as well as communication and relationship building with the community partner.

Expected Learning Outcomes

- **Civic knowledge and engagement:** participation will develop skills and methods for successfully engaging and improving students' local and global communities as well as prepare students for a life-long commitment to community engagement

- **Intercultural knowledge and competence:** by engaging with their community, "students gain understanding of the pluralistic nature of institutions as well as society and culture in the United States and across the world"[3]; consequently, they develop skills for working in a complex, diverse, and multicultural society.

- **Foundations and skills for life-long learning:** participation in a designated service learning course will enhance a student's leadership skills, critical thinking, and ethical reasoning skills as well as assist in developing interpersonal skills.

---

[3] The Ohio State University (2014), http://asccas.osu.edu/curriculum/ge-goals-and-learning-outcomes

Service Learning Models

A Service Learning course can be designed using a variety of different models. Successful service learning models described below have been designed to maximize community impact and student development. Each one addresses a distinct type of service learning project; each engages with the community partner in a unique way to enable students and university resources to address a defined community need in the most appropriate manner. These models can be applied in an intensive summer program, within a traditional semester, or as part of a student's capstone course and cumulative academic experience. Campus Compact, a national coalition of college and university presidents dedicated to campus-based civic engagement, has generated several of these models.

(1) Service Learning Course

In a service learning course, community engagement is an integral part of the course work. In such courses, a student is required to complete at least 25 hours of engaged service with a community partner, in addition to other course work. The work that the student does with the community partner helps to enhance the student's knowledge of the course content. There are several different models for this type of course. Two common ways service learning students are assigned to work with community partners are:

Ø Students often work in project teams with a designated community partner. The students share the responsibilities and project duties; each student works with the community partner project for up to 3 hours a week during the semester. Minimally, each student must complete at least 25 hours of engaged service with the organization upon completion of the semester.

Ø For limited scope projects, an individual student may be assigned a community partner to work with on a one-on-one basis. The student completes at least 25 hours of engaged community service.

(2) Service Learning Internship

In a service learning internship, a student is expected to work on-site with a community partner on a regular weekly basis. Like a traditional internship, the student works with the community partner on a project that is useful to the community or the site. However, in a service learning internship, emphasis is added to the reciprocal relationship of the internship; both the community partner and the student benefit equally from the experience. Service learning internships also are distinguished by the addition of reflective assignments that allow the student to find connections between course content and their experience. An internship often is well-suited to an intensive summer session where a student intern or group of interns is working 20-40 hours per week to accomplish a sizeable task; an internship also may be appropriate for a senior student to gain additional skills or workplace experience prior to graduation.

(3) Problem-Based Service Learning
In problem-based service learning courses, students work as "consultants" for a selected community partner, either individually, in teams, or as an entire class. To understand a community problem, students in these courses need to draw from a basic knowledge of the problem that is enhanced by the course content. With this knowledge, they help to make recommendations and develop solutions with a community partner.

(4) Community-Based Action Research
This model is similar to an independent study. In a community-based action research course, a student works closely with faculty members to address a community need through an extensive research project. The student learns research methodology and works to formulate innovative research for a community partner or works to address a community need.

(5) Service Learning Abroad
In a service learning abroad course, a student works with a faculty member, using the model that is most appropriate for the designated project. Throughout the study abroad experience, the student reflects on the service learning experience and the connections made between course content and the actual experience.

(6) Service Learning Exchange
Many universities and colleges encourage students to spend a service learning semester at another university. UNO welcomes transfer students to spend that semester in New Orleans where they can engage with partners in unique cultural and physical environments. In a Service Learning Exchange course, students take part in the National Student Exchange program. Students from participating colleges and universities are invited to participate in a summer or semester-long exchange program, focused particularly on service learning. Students from the University of New Orleans may have the opportunity to spend a semester with a participating college or university and take service learning courses.

(7) Capstone Course
A service learning capstone course is generally made available to students in their final year, providing seniors with the opportunity to gain more insight and in-depth practical experience. By participating in a project that requires a more intensive period of direct engagement (in some combination of fieldwork, research, analysis, consulting) with an approved community partner, students gain valuable experience that helps them prepare for career and workplace life after college.

Capstone courses ask students to draw upon the knowledge they have gathered throughout their coursework and apply it to a significant service learning project in the community. The goal of capstone courses is often designed to apply students' skill sets in exploration of a new topic or to synthesize overall understanding of their academic field of study. These courses offer an excellent way to help students make the transition from the world of theory to the world of practice by helping them establish professional contacts and gather personal experience. Moreover, capstone experiences are typically designed to produce reciprocal benefits for the student, the community, and for the university itself.

Faculty Resources

Service Learning courses assist faculty in building connections between course content and practical, real world application. Such courses can offer faculty an opportunity to establish partnerships within the community, conduct meaningful research, collaborate with community and campus leaders, and create significant teaching and learning opportunities for students. Additionally, designing service learning courses and creating SL research projects can assist faculty in developing grant writing skills.

The Service Learning Office has resources to assist faculty in developing courses, creating Service Learning projects and locating a potential community partner. The Service Learning Office also offers workshops and information regarding the competitive application process that supports faculty who develop a service learning course proposal. If selected, a faculty member could receive a $1,500 stipend and a $250 allowance for course-related supplies.

Maximizing Impact and Engaged Learning:

The University of New Orleans recognizes that each service learning experience has the potential to produce significant results that provide substantial benefits to community partners, to academic programs of study, and to students. Student engagement with their surrounding community enhances social consciousness, enables them to gain valuable skill sets, and develops leadership qualities.

To maximize those opportunities, UNO seeks to engage its service learning students with visible community partners in meaningful projects that are capable of transforming the community and creating a legacy that has a lasting impact on the quality of life for all involved.

Consequently, we encourage our colleges and faculty to structure service learning experiences that attract students and build engaged leaders who want to make a difference in the communities around us and in the world in which we live.

Creating a service learning course that maximizes community impact, student learning, and student development requires following specific guidelines. Projects must be intentionally designed to encourage students to build connections between theory and practice. Community partners should be involved in helping to create a meaningful project for the student and for the organization.

Steps for Developing a Service Learning Course

o Attend a service learning workshop or schedule a meeting with a representative from the
Service Learning Office to learn more about course guidelines and the application process.

o Consider course goals and how service learning can be fully integrated into the course content. Service learning projects should complement course work and help students to bridge theory with practice.

o Consider what type of service learning course you wish to design and what project model might be most useful in your course, keeping in mind the nature of the project and the needs of the community partner.

o Work with the SL office to locate a community partner whose needs closely align with the course content, the knowledge and abilities of your students, and the mission of service learning at the university (The Office of Service Learning may be able to help you locate a partner).

o Develop reflection assignments that help students to connect course content to their service learning experience.

o Decide how the community partner can be involved in evaluating and measuring the impact, successes, and challenges of the service learning project.

o Develop a plan for building and sustaining a relationship with the community partner based on reciprocity and respect.

o Submit the Faculty Application for a Competitive Course Development Stipend. The primary purpose of the UNO competitive award program is to encourage the integration of community engagement through service learning into the academic curriculum.

The Office of Service Learning Contact Information For a copy of the application form and assistance with the application process or any other questions, please contact the Office of Service Learning:

Mark B. Stahl, Program Consultant, mstahl@uno.edu
Lacey Cunningham, Service Learning Program Coordinator, lmcunni1@my.uno.edu

Learn more about service learning:
http://www.uno.edu/service-learning. Office Location:
University Center 248 A & 248B

APPENDIX 1

The University of New Orleans Service Learning Program

Faculty Application for Competitive Course Development Stipend

Purpose of the Competitive Service Learning Course Development Process:
The primary purpose of the UNO competitive award program is to encourage the integration of community engagement through service learning into the academic curriculum. **Service learning (SL)** is a pedagogical method used to engage the academic learning process with the community by blending credit course requirements and activities such as research and fieldwork with service projects approved and defined in cooperation with community partners.
Two important components are: a) enhancement of student learning and knowledge within a discipline through reflection on and engagement in community-based service; and b) production of lasting benefits to the community as a result of the successful completion of service-based projects developed in cooperation between the university and its partners.

The Competitive Award Process:
Faculty who choose to develop a 3-credit hour service learning course may apply for a financial stipend through a competitive application process established by the UNO Service Learning Council. Eligible courses may include the re-design of an existing course to meet service learning guidelines. Each academic year, two stipends per college may be awarded to individual

faculty whose course proposals meet the competitive criteria and are selected for an award by the Council.

If a new or re-designed 3-credit hour service learning course is selected to receive a course development stipend, the individual faculty member will be awarded a $1,500 stipend plus a $250 allowance for course-related supplies.

Course Design Guidelines:
Faculty who submit an application to have a course considered for a service learning award should meet the following course design guidelines:

- The Service Learning experience is to be fully integrated into the course content
- There is a plan for structured reflection throughout the semester
- The service learning experience addresses a significant community need that can be successfully addressed by students who engage with a community partner in a well-designed class project
- The course includes at least 25 hours of direct service per student with an approved community partner
- Expected student learning outcomes should be aligned with the SL project objectives
- The evaluation criteria includes a process for students and community partners to evaluate impact, successes, and challenges

Additional Selection Criteria:
- Faculty understanding of service learning and how to integrate it with identified community assets and/or needs
- The number of students to be engaged in service learning project(s)
- The scope and potential impact of the community need being addressed
- The range and value of benefits to be realized by all participants (student, community partner, community at-large, university)

Stipend Recipients:
Instructors are encouraged to use the service learning course as an opportunity to develop student scholars knowledgeable in service learning methodologies and skilled in using their academic learning experiences to address community-based assets and needs. Recipients also are encouraged to serve as a service learning resource for SL teaching and course development and to promote the use of service learning methodologies to other faculty. Moreover, recipients are encouraged to consider publishing on the topic of engaged learning.

Year 1:
Stipend recipients are expected to complete the development and design of the newly approved service learning course proposal. In addition to teaching the new SL course, recipients will be expected to attend SL workshops and seminars as well as encourage their colleagues to participate in SL. Year 1 also is a time to cultivate relationships with community organizations that may make excellent SL partners.

Years 2 and 3:
Service learning stipend recipients are expected to continue to teach their service learning course(s) and are encouraged to begin the process of publishing community engaged scholarship. Also, stipend recipients are asked to mentor new SL instructors as well as attend SL workshops and seminars.

All SL Stipend Recipients are required to:
  a) Be a college resource for SL teaching and course development
  b) Participate in at least one SL workshop and share SL experiences and results
  c) Participate in presenting at Innovate UNO and/or the spring UL academic summit
  d) Submit a brief report at the end of each course
  e) Commit to teaching the SL course (or another approved SL course) for at least 3 years

Deadline for Submission: November 3, 2014

Awardees will be notified in early

UNO Competitive Service Learning Stipend Program

APPLICATION COVER FORM

Deadline for Submission: November 3, 2014

Name: _____ Title: _____

Phone: _____ Email address: _____

Dept: _____ College: _____

Signature: _____ Date: _____

Department Chair's Statement of Support:
I support the attached proposal for financial support for the development of a departmental service learning course.

Signature: _____ Date: _____

Dean's Statement of Support:
I support the attached proposal for a service learning stipend by a member of the faculty who will assist in promoting the use of SL in the curriculum of the college, department, or interdisciplinary program.

Signature: _____ Date: _____

APPLICATION PROCESS

The service learning application for a competitive stipend must include the following:
1. A two-page narrative addressing:
   a) Personal experience with or desire to learn about service learning
   b) Name/number of the course in which you plan to incorporate SL
   c) Kind of community engagement project being developed, how students will engage with the community partner, and why the project is important
   d) How and why the community partner was selected (selection criteria)
   e) How the course will help your department or college meet its service learning goals
   f) Benefits of the completed service learning project (for the community partner; for the community at-large; for the student; for the department/college; for the university
   g) The positive, long-term impact the project will leave on the community
2. A course syllabus submitted for SL Council review
3. A completed Application Cover Form
4. Endorsement of the department chair **and** the dean (signatures on cover form)

Send application to: Service Learning Director at servicelearning@uno.edu