

Development of Civic Learning and Engagement Outcomes

Alyssa Hilliard, Mathematics and Statistics, anh1018@sru.edu

Introduction

In community-engaged learning, there is a lack of comprehensive assessment tools that assess all major areas. The Office for Community-Engaged Learning has developed a set of sixteen civic learning and engagement outcomes (CLEOs) to determine the quality of community-engaged learning efforts on campus. Each outcome falls in the category of civic knowledge, skills, values, or action and includes 2 – 5 quantitative and 1 – 3 qualitative questions. Two CLEOs are selected per service-learning course, and a pre-assessment and post-assessment are sent to students in the course.

To test the validity of the survey questions, cognitive interviewing was used for a total of four outcomes and the process will continue until every outcome has been tested.

Materials & Methods

After creating the assessments, cognitive interviewing was used to test a total of four outcomes and will be used to test the remaining twelve outcomes. There are two main methods of cognitive interviewing: think aloud and verbal probing. The think aloud technique was used in combination with verbal probing for the CLEOs.

To assess the outcomes, pre-assessments and post-assessments were administered at the beginning and end of the semester. A paired t-test was then used to analyze the data and decide if there was a true difference in the answers.

Results

Results for Cognitive Interviewing

- CLEOs 2, 4, 8, and 12 were tested using cognitive interviewing
- After three rounds of testing for CLEO 4 and CLEO 8, all questions except one were understood by participants
- After two rounds of testing for CLEO 2 and CLEO 12, all questions were validated, and participants understood what was being asked
- Students misunderstood words such as “marginalized” and “demographics”
- The question in CLEO 4 that did not improve after changing the wording two times has been tabled for consideration.

Results

Results for Academic Service-Learning Courses

Outcome	Pre-assessment Average	Post-assessment Average	Difference (post-pre)	P-value
Civic Knowledge Outcome 1**	3.526	4.053	0.526	0.0041
Civic Knowledge Outcome 2**	3.676	4.176	0.500	<0.0001
Civic Skills Outcome 1*	3.591	3.970	0.379	0.0401
Civic Skills Outcome 4*	4.109	4.324	0.215	0.0160

* Significant at $\alpha=0.05$

** Significant at $\alpha=0.01$

Discussion

- Many issues were found in the wording of the four CLEOs that were tested
- Cognitive interviewing must be done on survey questions to determine if students understand what is being asked.
- The CLEOs have been used for three courses in Fall 2021 and are being used for four courses in Spring 2022.
- The Bonner Leader Program will also be assessed using combinations of the CLEOs for each year.
- The courses in the fall semester implemented a total of four CLEOs, and each class had statistically significant results for at least one CLEO each.
- Overall, two CLEOs had p-values less than $\alpha=0.01$. The other two CLEOs were significant at $\alpha=0.05$.

Limitations

- Cognitive testing occurred over Zoom; little is known about the effects of video-based cognitive interviewing.
- The RockServe platform currently does not have an automated way to assign specific pre- and post-assessment questions to specific courses; all coding of the pre- and post-questionnaires was completed course by course.
- Qualitative questions are more difficult to assess and interpret and are not included in this poster.

Future Work

- Future work will include testing of the remaining twelve CLEOs and development of a rating scale for the qualitative questions.

References

1. Association of American Colleges and Universities (AAC&U). (2009). *Civic Engagement Value Rubric*.
2. Bringle, R. G. (2017). Hybrid high-impact pedagogies: Integrating service-learning with three other high-impact pedagogies.
3. Bringle, Robert G, Hatcher, Julie A, & Hahn, Thomas W. (2016). *Research on student civic outcomes in service learning: conceptual frameworks and methods* (Vol. 3, IUPUI series on service learning research). Stylus Publishing, LLC. Large Guide
4. Clayton, P., Bringle, R., & Hatcher, J. (2013). *Research on service learning. Volume 2A, Students and faculty: Conceptual frameworks and assessment* (IUPUI series on service learning research ; Volume 2A). Large guide.
5. Doolittle, A., & Faul, A. C. (2013). Civic engagement scale: A validation study. *Sage Open*, 3(3), 2158244013495542.
6. Einfeld, A., & Collins, D. (2008). The relationships between service-learning, social justice, multicultural competence, and civic engagement. *Journal of College Student Development*, 49(2), 95-109.
7. Felten, P., & Clayton, P. H. (2011). Service-learning. *New directions for teaching and learning*, 2011(128), 75-84.
8. Franke, R., Ruiz, S., Sharkness, J., DeAngelo, L., & Pryor, J. (2010). Findings from the 2009 administration of the College Senior Survey (CSS): National aggregates. *Higher Education Research Institute at the University of California Los Angeles, Los Angeles, CA*.
9. Gelmon, S. (2018). *Assessing Service-Learning and Civic Engagement: Principles and Techniques*. Campus Compact.
10. Gottlieb, K., & Robinson, G. (Eds.). (2006). *A practical guide for integrating civic responsibility into the curriculum*. Amer. Assn. of Community Col.
11. Hatcher, J. A. (2011). Assessing Civic Knowledge and Engagement. *New Directions for Institutional Research*, 2011(149), 81-92.
12. Hébert, Ali, & Hauf, Petra. (2015). Student learning through service learning: Effects on academic development, civic responsibility, interpersonal skills and practical skills. *Active Learning in Higher Education*, 16(1), 37-49.
13. Higher Education Research Institute. (2021). *College Senior Survey*. HERI.
14. Keen, C. (2010). New Efforts to Assess Civic Outcomes. *Journal of College and Character*, 10(7), 1-8.
15. Lau, K. H., & Snell, R. S. (2021). Confirmatory factor analysis for a service-learning outcomes measurement scale (S-LOMS). *Metropolitan Universities*, 32(1), 3-34.
16. Levesque-Bristol, C., & Richards, K. A. R. (2014). Evaluating civic learning in service-learning programs: Creation and validation of the Public Affairs Scale–Short Survey (PAS-SS). *Journal of Public Affairs Education*, 20(3), 413-428.
17. Locklin, Reid B. (2012). Civic Engagement in Higher Education: Concepts and Practices - By Barbara Jacoby and Associates. *Teaching Theology & Religion*, 15(2), 196-197.
18. McClrath, L., & Lyons, A. (Eds.). (2012). *Higher education and civic engagement: Comparative perspectives*. Springer.
19. Moely, B. E., McFarland, M., Miron, D., Mercer, S., & Ilustre, V. (2002). Changes in college students' attitudes and intentions for civic involvement as a function of service-learning experiences. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 9(1).
20. Molee, L. M., Henry, M. E., Sessa, V. I., & McKinney-Prupis, E. R. (2011). Assessing learning in service-learning courses through critical reflection. *Journal of Experiential Education*, 33(3), 239-257.
21. Prentice, Mary. (2007). Social Justice Through Service Learning: Community Colleges as Ground Zero. *Equity & Excellence in Education*, 40(3), 266-273.
22. Reiff, John. (2014). *Civic Learning*. Massachusetts Department of Higher Education
23. Terkla, Dawn Geronimo, & O'Leary, Lisa S. (2015). *Assessing Civic Engagement* (J-B IR Single Issue Institutional Research). Somerset: John Wiley & Sons, Incorporated.
24. Torney-Purta, Judith, Cabrera, Julio C, Roohr, Katrina Crotts, Liu, Ou Lydia, & Rios, Joseph A. (2015). *Assessing Civic Competency and Engagement in Higher Education: Research Background, Frameworks, and Directions for Next-Generation Assessment*. *ETS Research Report Series*, 2015(2), 1-48.

Acknowledgements

- Jeffrey Rathlef
- Dr. Jana Asher
- The Office for Community-Engaged Learning

Learning Outcome	Type of Question	Wording for 1 st Round (06/29/2021)	Notes	Wording for 2 nd Round (06/30/2021)	Notes	Wording for 3 rd Round (07/02/2021)	Notes
CK04	Likert	I am knowledgeable about the demographic composition of the Slippery Rock community outside of the University campus.	S1 – did not understand demographic S2 – did not understand demographic	I am knowledgeable about the distribution of age, gender, race, and other demographic characteristics of the Slippery Rock community outside of the University campus.	S3/S4 - did not think of Slippery Rock community. Did not understand distribution	I am knowledgeable about the percentage of people of different ages, genders, races, ethnic origins, and sexualities within the Slippery Rock community outside of the University campus.	3 rd round volunteers were still confused as to what is means by “Slippery Rock Community outside of campus.” One thought we meant the off-campus student housing. Tabled for consideration
CK04	Likert	I know how to obtain information about the demographic, social, cultural, life-style, and religious composition of a local community.	S1 – did not understand demographic S2 – did not understand demographic	I know how to obtain information about the age, gender, race, and other characteristics of a local community.	S4 – did not understand “information”	I know how to obtain information about the percentage of people of different ages, genders, races, ethnic origins, and sexualities within a community.	No issues