DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 475 095   JC 030 212

AUTHOR   Gray, Maryann Jacobi
TITLE   Future Directions for the Campus Compact Center for Community
                Colleges.
INSTITUTION   Education Commission of the States, Denver, CO. Center for
                Community College Policy.; Rand Corp., Santa Monica, CA.
                Inst. on Education and Training.
REPORT NO   DRU-1037-IET/ECSCC
PUB DATE   1995-03-00
NOTE   51p.
PUB TYPE   Reports - Descriptive (141)
EDRS PRICE   EDRS Price MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS   Citizenship Education; Community Colleges; *Educational
                Assessment; *Educational Planning; *Participant Satisfaction;
                Program Evaluation; School Community Relationship; *Service
                Learning; Services; Two Year Colleges
IDENTIFIERS   *Maricopa County Community College AZ

ABSTRACT
                This report presents results and recommendations from an
assessment of the Campus Compact Center for Community Colleges (5C or the
Center), Arizona, designed to support and guide planning for the future of
the center. The study was supported by the Campus Compact and the Maricopa
Community College District/Mesa College, Arizona. The project addressed three
goals: (1) describe and assess the organizational relations among the center,
the national and state compacts, and the Maricopa Community College District
(MCCD); (2) assess the fit between the needs and interests of the community
college sector on the one hand, and the activities of the 5C and the compact
on the other; and (3) make specific recommendations regarding future
directions for the 5C. The study consisted of a two-day site visit to the
center and a telephone survey of 25 community college service learning
coordinators. The survey sample was drawn from four lists of institutions:
(1) those who have received a site visit by 5C; (2) those who attended a
specific 5C national conference; (3) those that are compact members; and (4)
all U.S. community colleges. The findings here indicate that most of the
respondents who had received a site visit found it to be effective, though
the sample is too small to provide results that are generalizable to the
total population of community colleges. (NB)

RAND

Future Directions for the Campus Compact Center for Community Colleges

Maryann Jacobi Gray

DRU-1037-IET/ECSCC

March 1995

*Prepared for Education Commission of the States-
Campus Compact*

1

ERIC
Full Text Provided by ERIC

RAND

Future Directions for the Campus Compact Center for Community Colleges

Maryann Jacobi Gray

DRU-1037-IET/ECSCC

March 1995

Institute on Education and Training

Future Directions for the
Campus Compact Center for Community Colleges

Executive Summary

This report presents results and recommendations from an assessment of the Campus Compact Center for Community Colleges (5C or the Center), designed to support and guide planning for the future of the Center. The study was supported by the Campus Compact and the Maricopa Community College District/Mesa College.

The project addressed three goals: (1) describe and assess the organizational relations among the Campus Compact Center for Community Colleges, the national and state Compacts, and the Maricopa Community College District; (2) assess the fit between the needs and interests of the community college sector on the one hand and the activities of the 5C and the Compact on the other; and (3) make specific recommendations regarding future directions for the 5C. These goals were achieved through two tasks -- an intensive case study of the Center, and telephone interviews with community college service learning coordinators (n=25) and state Campus Compact directors (n=6). Major findings are described below:

- Center activities over the last year included: (1) Providing on-site technical assistance; (2) Presenting at conferences; (3) Organizing a national conference; (4) Responding to requests for information; (5) Maintaining a data base of programmatic information; (6) Maintaining mailing lists of conference attendees and of community colleges in the Compact; (7) Publishing a newsletter; (8) Administering mini-grants; (9) Providing informal consultations and information about community colleges to the Corporation for National and Community Service, state Compacts and the national Compact, and other professional associations interested in service learning; (10) Establishing and maintaining informal contacts with community colleges involved in service learning; and (11) Participating in Mesa College and Maricopa District activities.

- In 1993, the Center Director visited 21 institutions. The purposes of these visits included mini-grant reviews, responding to requests for on-site assistance, or strengthening relations with institutions in regions the Director was visiting for other purposes. Also during 1993, the Center Director provided workshops or presentations at eight conferences, including its own conference.

- The majority of respondents were highly satisfied with the services provided by the Center. Overall, respondents were very positive about 5C site visits, presentations, conferences, mini-grants, resource guide, newsletter, and staff responsiveness to queries and requests.

- Suggestions for future services clustered in four areas: (1) Develop written materials that "sell" service learning; (2) Develop written materials that provide practical advice; (3) Provide recognition and support for faculty and others involved in community service; and (4) Enhance opportunities for networking. In addition, telephone interviews suggested that some community college need more information about what services 5C offers and how to access them.

- Other considerations in planning future 5C services include: (1) Finding a balance between responsive and proactive approaches to providing services; (2) Finding a balance between "planting many seeds" vs. more strategic deployment of resources; (3) Tightening 5C goals and objectives to enable a more focused approach to service delivery; (4) Clarifying the target audience for Center services; (5) Adding continuity to Center services; (6) Evaluating and improving articulation between 5C and other technical assistance providers; (7) Reducing 5C reliance upon a single service provider; and (8) Balancing an emphasis on "nuts and bolts" of establishing service learning programs with some consideration of the conceptual foundation for this activity.

- Organizational challenges facing 5C include: reducing uncertainty about financial resources for the Center and clarifying the Center's responsibilities related to fund-raising; increasing accountability of the Center to its co-sponsors; determining the target audience for center services; and improving articulation among organizations involved in technical assistance about collegiate community service.

- The most important recommendation emerging from this assessment is for 5C and its sponsors to engage in comprehensive planning to include visioning and mission development, strategic planning, fiscal planning, and operational planning. More specific recommendations emerging from this assessment include: (1) Continue the Campus Compact - Maricopa co-sponsorship of 5C; (2) Re-commit to the vision of 5C as a technical assistance center; (3) Narrow the audience for Center services; (4) Improve articulation of 5C and other technical assistance providers; (5) Re-examine the array of 5C services and activities; (6) Develop more written products; (7) Expand the base of 5C service providers; (8) Clarify and strengthen Center accountability; (9) Implement operational planning; and (10) Clarify Center resources.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Future Directions for the
Campus Compact Center for Community Colleges

I. Introduction and Methods

Goals and Purpose of the Study

This report presents results and recommendations from an assessment of the Campus Compact Center for Community Colleges (5C or the Center) designed to guide planning for the future of the Center. The study was supported by Campus Compact and the Maricopa Community College District/Mesa College.

The project addressed three goals: (1) describe and assess the organizational relations among the Center, the national and state Compacts, and the Maricopa Community College District/Mesa College; (2) assess the fit between the needs and interests of the community college sector on the one hand and the activities of 5C and the Compact on the other; and (3) make specific recommendations regarding future directions for 5C. Specific questions that this project examined in support of these goals include:

(1) What are the goals, objectives, and activities of 5C? What services does it offer to the community college sector? What resources are available to the Center, and how has it deployed these resources?

(2) To what extent has 5C achieved its goals and objectives? What are its achievements and accomplishments? What factors hinder or facilitate 5C efforts to promote service learning and volunteerism within the community college sector? What lessons have been learned from the Center's experiences that can be applied to improve its own effectiveness and/or assist other organizations?

(3) What are the major needs and interests of the community college sector related to establishing and promoting service learning, volunteerism, and other collegiate-sponsored community service programs? To what extent do the activities and services of 5C respond to these needs and interests? How could the Center, and the Compact overall, be more responsive to the sector or more effective in serving the sector?

(4) What is the nature of the relationships among the Campus Compact, the Maricopa Community College District, and 5C? Do these organizations share a common vision and set of goals for the Center? What expectations does each hold for one another, and to what extent are these expectations

understood and supported by the others? What is the nature of the relationships between the state Compacts and the Center?

(5) What should the future of 5C be? What organizational structure, mission, and activities will best enable 5C to attain this vision for the future? How can the relationships and mutual obligations among 5C, Maricopa District, Campus Compact, and State Compact be clarified and strengthened? What issues need to be resolved in order for 5C to achieve its goals for the future?

These questions were be addressed through two primary tasks -- an intensive case study of the Center, and a telephone interview of community college service learning coordinators.[1] A third task -- interviews with state Campus Compact directors -- was added when initial data collection revealed the importance of the relationship between the 5C and the state Compacts.

Study Design

Case Study. The case study of 5C consisted of a 2-day site visit to the Center for observation and interviews with Center staff and Maricopa Community College District officials. In addition, the case study included telephone follow-ups as needed with 5C Director and other District administrators, a review of written materials from and about the Center, and telephone interviews with national Campus Compact staff. The case study informed the following issues:

(1) The history and development of the Center, including its mission, goals, activities, and budget;

(2) How the Center interacts with and serves the community college sector, and how other elements of Campus Compact relate to and serve the sector;

(3) The nature of the Center's relationships with national Campus Compact, State Compacts, Maricopa Community College, and other organizations active in collegiate community service;

(4) The perceived effectiveness of the Center from the perspective of staff, Board Members, and other stakeholders and sponsors;

---

[1] Initial plans for this study also included telephone interviews with community college Presidents. This activity was dropped as a result of two factors. First, other data collection activities revealed that the 5C has only limited contact with community college Presidents. Second, an initial set of queries to the offices of ten community college Presidents yielded only one positive response, suggesting that self selection would significantly bias results and that considerable additional time would be required to complete interviews with college Presidents.

(5) Suggestions for: (a) improving the effectiveness of the Center, and (b) clarifying and strengthening relations among the Center, the national and state Compacts, and the District.

Telephone Survey of Community College Service Learning Coordinators. The second research activity consisted of a telephone survey of 25 community college service learning coordinators. The purpose of the survey was to obtain additional feedback about the performance of the 5C and suggestions for improving or strengthening its services to the sector related to collegiate community service. The survey required between 40 and 60 minutes to administer. Issues discussed in the interviews included:

(1) Awareness and understanding of the purposes and activities of the Compact and the Center;

(2) Satisfaction with the Center among those who have used its services, including (a) the degree to which the information or assistance provided by the Center met respondents' needs and expectations; (b) the perceived usefulness of the information or assistance provided by the Center, including how this information or assistance was applied to program, curriculum, or policy development; and (c) suggestions for increasing the Center's effectiveness;

(3) Importance placed on student involvement in community service, and the reasons *why* community service is valued by community college leaders (i.e., the conceptual or philosophical foundations of community college-sponsored service learning and community service activities);

(4) Perceived obstacles or barriers to increased student involvement in community service; and

(5) The types of information, technical assistance, and support that would be most helpful to campus efforts to facilitate student involvement in community service.

The survey sample was drawn from four sources: (a) a list of institutions that have received a site visit by 5C; (b) a list of institutions that have attended either the 1991 or 1993 5C national conferences; (c) a list of community colleges that are Compact members; and (d) a list of all U.S. community colleges. Using these sources, the sample was designed to provide diversity along the following dimensions: membership in National Compact; membership in a state Compact; level of involvement in 5C; and geographic diversity. Respondents were promised confidentiality in order to encourage them to speak openly about their experiences with, attitudes toward, and suggestions for the Center.

Telephone Survey of State Campus Compact Directors. The case study of 5C indicated that the Center interacts frequently with State Compact directors. Other interviews revealed some cause for concern about articulation of Center and state

Compact services. Therefore, six state Compact directors were interviewed about their experiences with the Center. Specific issues that were discussed in these interviews include:

(1) The level and types of support that 5C has provided for the state Compact, including direct services to the director and to member institutions;

(2) Satisfaction with the contributions of the Center, including (a) the degree to which the information or assistance provided by the Center met respondents' needs and expectations; (b) the perceived usefulness of the information or assistance provided by the Center, including how this information or assistance was applied to program, curriculum, or policy development; and (c) availability of or access to Center services;

(3) Perceived level of overlap between Center and state Compact services, and, if applicable, suggestions for addressing this issue; and

(4) Suggestions for future directions for 5C services, including the types of information, technical assistance, and support that would be most helpful to the state Compact director and/or to community colleges in the state.

Design of This Report

This report presents results of the case study and telephone interviews and discusses their implications for future Center activities. Chapter 2 provides a descriptive overview of Center activities, concentrating on its activities in 1993. Chapter 3 describes results of the telephone interviews with community college service learning coordinators regarding use and satisfaction with Center services and suggestions for future services. The following chapter discusses some issues related to Center services that emerge from the case studies and warrant consideration in future planning. Chapter 5 discusses some of the issues emerging from analysis of the organizational relations among 5C and its sponsors. Chapter 6 provides specific recommendations for the next one to three years.

10

II. Overview of the Center

The Campus Compact Center for Community Colleges is located in Phoenix, Arizona, at Mesa Community College, part of the Maricopa Community College District. The Center has one full-time staff member -- Director Lyvier Conss -- as well as a part-time secretary and a part-time programming assistant. All staff including the Director are hired on limited-term, renewable contracts. The Center shares office space in the Student Union building with the Mesa College Center for Public Policy and Service, a unit charged with developing service learning opportunities for Mesa College students.

History

The history of the Center dates back to September 1989, when Action awarded a grant to Campus Compact to support, among other activities, publication of a Resource Manual about collegiate community service and service learning for community colleges. In September 1990, a second Action grant was awarded to Campus Compact. Compact established a subcontract with the Maricopa Community College District to open the Center. Following a search, Lyvier Conss was hired as Director in December 1990, so for all intents and purposes, the Center was first operational in January 1991. In June 1991, the Center hosted the first national conference. In July, the Center and Campus Compact signed an affiliation agreement.

Funding

The Center is supported by several different funding sources: (a) direct and in-kind support from the Maricopa Community College District and Mesa College; (b) half of all membership fees paid to Compact by community colleges; (c) Compact funding designated for 5C and/or community colleges in grants received from various foundations and agencies; and (d) revenues generated by the 5C national conference. Some of these funds -- particularly support flowing to 5C from grants -- must be used for specific activities, while others are more flexible.

Maricopa District/Mesa College is the single largest funding source for 5C. Maricopa Community College District has provided both operational and in-kind support, dating back from before the Center was formally established. In-kind support includes office space and furnishings, a part-time secretary, and supervision. In the summer 1993, the discretionary funds that had been used for the Center were shifted from the district office (under Chancellor Paul Elsner) to Mesa College (under President Larry Christianson).

Under the 1991 affiliation agreement between 5C and Campus Compact, the Center receives a percentage of all membership fees paid to Compact by community colleges. In addition, the Center has received both operational and pass-through funding through Campus Compact grants from Kellogg Foundation, Commission for National and Community Service, Corporation for National and Community Service, and so forth.

Although most of these grant moneys are used to support direct services and programmatic initiatives (e.g., mini-grants), some of the funds have been applied to salaries and administrative expenses.

The Center also generates revenue through its national conference. These funds are used to support planning costs for the subsequent year's conference and for special projects (e.g., strategic planning for 5C). The Center does not charge fees for other services, although it does try to cost share to stretch the travel budget.

Because of its reliance on soft money, including federal and foundation grants and support from discretionary funds under control of the Mesa College President, the long term financial sustainability of the Center is uncertain. If grant support for service learning declines and/or Mesa College experiences new financial pressures, the Center could lose its funding.

Planning and Oversight

The Center's Director reports to the Mesa College Dean of Students and thus is directly accountable to Mesa College. The 1991 affiliation agreement spells out the financial obligations of the Center and the national Compact to one another. In addition, the Center Director provides quarterly financial statements and an annual report to both Mesa College and Campus Compact.

Unlike the State Compacts, the 5C is not accountable to a Board of Directors. Although original designs for the Center called for a board, this has not materialized for the most part. The 5C and Mesa College's Center for Public Policy and Service hosted a joint Board meeting in April, 1992, but the meeting provided little guidance to 5C, and the group has not re-convened.

In theory, then, the Center is accountable to two organizations -- The Campus Compact and Mesa College/Maricopa Community College District. Both have requested 5C to perform certain activities (e.g., the Compact has asked the Center to administer mini-grants and attend staff meetings; the District has asked the Center to participate in number of local activities and committees), and the Center's director has tried to accommodate these requests. In addition, both organizations provide financial and other kinds of support to the 5C (e.g., information, guidance, speakers for conferences). In practice, however, the Center receives little direct supervision. The Compact has little information about the Center's day-to-day activities and no supervisory authority. The District's formal supervision is primarily focused on the Center's activities within Maricopa Community Colleges, although broader issues are raised and discussed periodically and frequent informal consultation occurs. There has been, to date, no comprehensive evaluation of Center services.

12

Center Activities and Services

Some of the services and programs provided by the Center were specified in the Action grant that provided its initial funding. Additional services, such as mini-grant distribution and administration, have been added as opportunities arose. Still others, such as consulting to policymakers, were initiated by the Director in response to perceived needs of the sector.

The Center's ongoing activities can be broadly grouped into three categories: (1) helping campuses to develop or strengthen service learning or other community service programs through on-site technical assistance and workshops; (2) disseminating funds to stimulate the development of service learning programs on community colleges; and (3) advocating on behalf of community colleges in arenas relevant to service learning.

More specifically, Center activities over the last year have included:
(1) Providing on-site technical assistance and consultations to campuses involved in or interested in collegiate community service; (2) Presenting at national, regional, and state conferences; (3) Organizing a national conference on service learning in community colleges; (4) Responding to telephone and mail requests for information; (5) Maintaining a data base of programmatic information; (6) Maintaining mailing lists of conference attendees and of community colleges in the Compact (including the names of the President, coordinator of service learning activities, and relevant student services or academic personnel); (7) Writing and disseminating a newsletter to 2,500 individuals (approximately on a quarterly basis); (8) Disseminating information about, consulting with applicants, coordinating proposal review, and administering mini-grants, as funds for such grants become available; (9) Providing informal consultations and information about community colleges to: staff from the Corporation for National and Community Service; State Compact Directors and national Compact staff; and other professional associations interested in service learning; (10) Establishing and maintaining informal contacts with community colleges involved in service learning in order to identify peer resources, collect materials, and learn about promising new practices; and (11) Participating in Mesa College and Maricopa District activities as requested by College and District administrators.

In 1993, the Center Director visited 21 institutions (see Table 1). The purposes of these visits included mini-grant reviews, responding to requests for on-site assistance, or strengthening relations with institutions in regions the Director was visiting for other purposes. Some of these visits were conducted jointly with a state compact director, and some alone. Some included brief, informal meetings with a limited number of staff and administrators; others were more formal and included workshops for faculty and staff as well as a series of one-on-one or small group meetings. Some campuses were just beginning to develop community service and service learning programs; others had well established programs. For most visits, the Center paid the bulk of travel expenses, with some cost sharing by the campus, but financial arrangements varied. When the Director was asked to make a special trip to visit some institutions that did not belong to a Compact, for example, the institutions covered all travel expenses.

13   BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 1:

Institutional Site Visits Conducted by 5C in 1993

Centralia College

Chandler-Gilbert Community College

Hawaii Community Colleges (N=5)

Illinois Community Colleges (N=6)

Lansing Community College

Miami Dade Community College

Middlesex Community College

Lansing Community College

Pima Community College

Raritan Community College

Seattle Central Community College

Skagit Valley College

14

In addition to site visits, the Director had additional opportunities for direct contact with institutional staff and faculty at conferences. Director Conss provided workshops or presentations at eight conferences, including the 5C conference. Table 2 displays those conferences in which the Center participated in 1993.

Overall, the Director spent over 60 days out of the office in 1993, on travel to campuses or conferences. This represents over one quarter of the Director's time (estimating 225 days in a work year).

A third opportunity for direct contact with community college staff and faculty comes through the 5C national conference. The Center has sponsored three national conferences since 1991. (Instead of a 1992 national conference, the Center attempted to organize some regional conferences. The Director determined that this approach was ineffective and resumed a national meeting the following year.) In 1993, 150 people attended the conference, representing 51 institutions in 18 different states. The Director obtained corporate donations for scholarship funds to support travel for students, faculty, and staff who could not otherwise afford to attend. (Nonetheless, most participants were local. Approximately 40% were from Arizona. Over half --53% -- came from either Arizona or California.)

A typical 5C presentation or workshop begins with an explanation of what service learning is and how it can benefit students and the institution. Following this, the Director may provide an overview of developments at the national, state, and local levels. She usually describes programs that the campus might get involved in as a means of generating ideas for service projects. She discusses how to integrate service into the curriculum, including adding service as a component to existing courses and developing new courses. She describes grant opportunities and, if time allows and the audience requests this, will provide basic grant-writing guidance.

The Director reports that the services provided by the Center are those that are most often requested by community college administrators, faculty, and staff. Nonetheless, the absence of a formal strategic or operational planning process coupled with a rapidly changing environment suggested the need to more systematically assess the interests and needs of community college administrators and faculty before re-committing the Center to the same set of services and programs. Thus, a small sample of community college service learning coordinators were surveyed about their past use and satisfaction with Center services; their current needs for technical assistance, and the obstacles they face in efforts to develop service learning programs.

```
+--------------------------------------------------------------------------+
|                                                                          |
|                              Table 2:                                    |
|                                                                          |
|             Conferences in Which 5C Participated in 1993                 |
|                                                                          |
|                                                                          |
| American Association of Community Colleges annual conference             |
|                                                                          |
| Colorado service learning workshop for faculty                          |
|                                                                          |
| Florida Campus Compact Faculty Forum                                     |
|                                                                          |
| Illinois Campus Compact annual meeting                                   |
|                                                                          |
| Michigan Campus Compact annual meeting                                   |
|                                                                          |
| NCCSLE                                                                   |
|                                                                          |
| Washington Sate Campus Compact annual conference                        |
|                                                                          |
| Campus Compact Center for Community Colleges National Conference        |
+--------------------------------------------------------------------------+
```

16

III. Center Services: Telephone Survey Results

This chapter reports results from a telephone survey with 25 community college service learning coordinators. The sample includes 12 institutions that were members of a State Compact, seven institutions that were members of the national Compact, and six institutions that were not members of either state or national Compacts. Most (N=21) institutions had some prior contact with the 5C -- almost one third (32%) of the sample had received a site visit, and 15 (60%) had attended a 5C conference. This small sample cannot provide results that generalizable to the total population of community colleges but does suggest issues and concerns for further investigation or consideration.

The majority of respondents to the telephone survey were highly satisfied with the services provided by the Center. Many followed up their positive comments with suggestions for how the Center could better serve community colleges. Among the strongest aspects of the Center are the responsiveness of the Director to requests for information. Suggestions for future services varied but many would like written information (brochures, guides) that provide practical information about program design and implementation. More specific responses follow.

On-Site Consultations

The telephone survey sample included eight institutions that have received a site visit from the Center Director between 1992 and the present time. Of these, most were positive about the effectiveness of the site visit. Respondents noted that, as an outsider and Director of a national center, the Director can command the attention of faculty and top administrators while on-campus staff and faculty carrying the same message may go unheard. Further, the site visits provide an opportunity to convene a group meeting specifically for the purpose of discussing service learning -- and this in itself can be helpful for stimulating discussion and planning. The site visits are often experienced as validating and reinforcing. Faculty and administrators are appreciative when the Director of a national center visits their campus, and most receive reassurance that they are on the right track. Finally, the site visits help community colleges feel connected to some larger service learning "movement" or effort, and that, too, is important, especially for smaller campuses where staff may feel isolated. A small number of respondents reported only moderate levels of satisfaction and felt that the site visits were not as useful as they had hoped. Representative comments include:

> We had a very beneficial brainstorming session. She met with the key
> people on campus to move service learning along. (Her visit)
> accomplished all we needed.

> If Lyvier hadn't come, the Vice President of Instruction wouldn't have even
> considered faculty involvement. She opened the door. He's not supportive
> but he lets it happen, thanks to Lyvier Conss' visit.

Her position gives her an authority. It validated what we're doing. That was very powerful.

Our President was always supportive of positive developments on campus, but from a distance. But now he could see a person at a higher level who's involved, learn about Campus Compact, see money flowing, understand our place in it. The visit helped to bring home the meaning (of service learning) and let him know others are interested.

It was good for the President to hear about service learning from someone other than me. The President feels better because he knows that we're connected to a state effort, and the state effort is connected to a national effort. (From a State Compact member)

(The site visits) are invaluable. It gives credibility to what we're doing. It helps to sell the program internally, from students to the Board of Trustees. Her knowledge of programs is superb.

She's a quick study, friendly, energetic, and helpful and was well-received. (But) the presentation was mostly surface, not depth... It was mostly helpful in getting us to focus, to convene. In terms of substance, there wasn't too much.

A few respondents provided concrete suggestions for improving the quality of site visits. The survey cannot indicate the extent to which these recommendations may be shared by others besides the particular respondent stating them.

Looking back, some people felt they weren't in the loop in the beginning. Looking back, I should have brought in the others, those below the Vice President. If she could share more about the political dynamics -- how to get buy-in and help build enthusiasm -- that would be helpful.

For the future, rather than Lyvier saying "tell me who to meet with," she should tell me who is key to meet with. From her point of view, who are the people that are key to help spread the message about service learning?

It was obvious she's not been on a campus, implementing stuff. Maybe she could have a panel of folks who could speak to these issues.

Despite some concerns, then, most respondents reported that site visits contributed to the development of a campus climate that was more receptive to service learning. Of some concern, however, is the fact that many respondents had difficulty describing how the site visits changed or promoted the development of on-campus service learning efforts. Most would agree with the respondent who expressed satisfaction with the site visit but said, "I'd be hard pressed to say any specific thing happened" (as a result). Given the

complex decision-making processes and slow rate of reform on most community colleges, the fact that a single brief intervention does not consistently produce visible change is unsurprising. Respondents' general inability to link the visits to tangible follow-up actions, however, raises questions about the cost effectiveness of site visits as a change strategy.

Further, the lessons learned and/or benefits derived from the visits may not endure on a campus due to turnover in staff or administration. For example, one respondent worked at a campus that had received a site visit prior to his/her assuming the role of coordinator. Virtually no documentation existed about the visit, and the respondent was unsure about whether the visit had even occurred. Other campuses had experienced turn-over at the Presidential or Vice Presidential levels, so that gains in administrative support and understanding achieved through an earlier site visit were largely lost.

5C Conference

The Center's own evaluations of its annual conference show a strong positive response by attendees. The interviews confirmed this. Representative comments about the conference include:

> It was good to see what others are doing... The grant workshop was very helpful. The personal contact with people throughout the U.S. (was good). There were excellent materials. I used the grant workshop on my own campus. I really don't have any suggestions for improving it.

> The conference was my main information source (about service learning). I made contact with Lyvier Conss and invited her here. We'll send folks to the next couple of conferences... I got a sense of being part of a national movement. I learned what was going on elsewhere.

> I went last year and will go this year. It's the best conference I've been to since I've been involved in service learning. The breakout sessions were really practical.

> I have nothing but positive things to say -- it was theoretically and practically useful. Keep it up. It covered how to set up a center for service learning. Roger Henry gave outstanding information. He helped a lot. There was a lot of good interaction. The people there all have the same problems, and I got ideas for my campus.

Although one or two respondents provided suggestions for improving the conference, the greatest concern about the conference was expressed by those who could not attend. The surveys confirmed the expectation that financial constraints keep many interested staff and faculty from attending.

The Conference in Arizona looks great. I'd love to go but there's no money. Could it be underwritten or subsidized in some way? It comes at the end of the fiscal year (and) it's expensive.

I would love to go. I requested money but the funds aren't there. I can go locally but not out of state.

I hope to find ways to get faculty there. But money is a problem. There's no way to manage travel and release time.

Many who attended the conference did so with the help of scholarships provided by 5C. Others, who could not attend the national meeting, suggested that regional conferences might be a more economical alternative (at least for them) than a national conference. However, those attending the national conference clearly enjoyed the opportunity to interact with a broad range of campuses, not only those in their region (and with whom they are likely to be familiar). Further, an attempt to organize regional conferences in 1992 largely failed due to lack of interest.

Mini-grants

The mini-grants were also received positively. Some respondents had chosen not to apply or did not win a grant in competition. Those that did receive grants, however, were able to use the funds effectively. The Center was viewed as playing an effective facilitative role, despite burdensome reporting requirements from CNCS.

We came close (to applying) but there was no time. One of the hesitations was that I wasn't allowed to ask for the things I needed the money for (e.g., stipends for students).

We're too far advanced (to apply for a mini-grant). They're for start-up programs.

The mini-grant was very helpful. We are getting good at leveraging money. It's cost effective. We can give recognition, which is key.

Community service is happening here, but the grant drew people out of the closet... There's a new appreciation for community service, validation, ideas on how to enlarge it, networking in the state with others. The grant drew those community service proponents out and put them together. Community service expanded as a result.

The mini-grant was wonderful... It was a real stretch. We put in a lot of hours. We have to report back every quarter. It keeps you directed. I wish the mini-grants were bigger.

20

Other Center Services

Due to time limitations, not all respondents were queried about all Center services and activities (e.g., presentations at conferences, dissemination of written materials, responding to queries). Those that commented on other services were generally pleased with the quality and responsiveness of the Center. For example, some praised the newsletter:

The newsletter gives me ideas for service projects.

I enjoy the newsletter. I like to know about grant money.

The newsletter is helpful, especially when they have funding information.

I like the newsletter (but) a lot of information becomes redundant. I get
the state, national, and center newsletters. The information seems to be all
the same. Maybe that's unavoidable.

The Resource Guide also received strong positive reviews:

The notebook was very helpful, especially the levels of involvement
schema.

The three-ring notebook was very helpful. I used it a lot in my work.

Comments on presentations at conferences include:

She gave specifics and was very concrete. She had good examples.

She did a fine job. Her presentation style is excellent.

Service learning (at this college) can be traced back to a presentation
Lyvier Conss made... I picked up on the potential. For a year we've
worked with her to figure out how to establish a program here. Due to
Lyvier, our President sent (a team) to Brevard to meet with Roger Henry.
We were captured by Roger's model and adopted it here. So we got all
this support and more from Lyvier.

Comments on telephone assistance include:

I wanted some statistics for a grant proposal, so I called. She gave me
what I needed... At the conference, I asked something and she didn't know
the answer. She went and got it for me afterwards.

The staff have always been very helpful and answer all questions with great patience: If they have information, they'll help. I'm confident of that.

Awareness of Center Services

A small number of respondents raised a potentially important issue by relating that they were unsure of what services the Center provided and/or how to access them. Two respondents from institutions that were not members of Compact were aware of the Center but responded that, as non-members, they did not have access to the Center. Several respondents from Compact institutions noted that they did not know what services the Center provided. One said, "I really don't understand what 5C does." Another, when asked if s/he had ever called the Center to request assistance, responded, "I didn't know I could do that."

Although only a minority of campus-based respondents raised this issue, it is congruent with concerns raised by several State Compact Directors. This suggests a need to provide better information to community colleges and to gatekeepers such as the state Compact directors about who is eligible for Center services, the types of services provided by the Center, and how to access them.

A related issue is that relatively few site visits occur in response to a specific request from a campus. More often, a State Compact Director will suggest that the Center Director visit a campus while in the area for a conference; or the Center Director will offer to visit a campus if she plans to be in the area. Since campuses that receive an offer of a site visit are generally very receptive, the small number of direct requests may indicate confusion about how to access Center services rather than disinterest.

Future Directions for T/TA services

Respondents varied in their felt need for additional technical assistance services. Some -- mostly those that belonged to Campus Compact -- responded that they had access to a strong support system. These respondents usually called their State Compact director when in need of assistance but were aware of the Center as well as other technical assistance resources. Although many of these respondents provided suggestions for fine-tuning or strengthening technical support services, they were for the most part able to meet their needs. Others -- generally those that did not belong to Campus Compact -- were hungry for more information and felt a strong need for guidance and technical assistance. A third group -- also non-members for the most part -- were frustrated by their lack of progress in developing service learning but felt that the obstacles were institutional and organizational, and that technical assistance would not be helpful to them at this time.

The majority of suggestions for additional services focus on four areas: (1) develop written materials intended to educate and convince others about the meaning and value of service learning in community colleges; (2) develop written materials that provide practical advice; (3) provide recognition and support for those involved in service learning; and (4)

enhance opportunities for inter-campus networking and exchange. Representative responses include:

1. Develop written materials that "sell" service learning.

Most (Center) publications and services are based on the supposition that the institution already made a commitment to service learning and even understands what it's all about. In addition to what's being done, a real push needs to be educating institutions about what service learning is all about and why it is in their selfish self interest to get involved.

I believe that the community service philosophy will affect all levels of community college, especially the curriculum. It involves new thinking -- revising the curriculum to include service learning as a component and not as an aside... But I'm a lone voice in the wilderness. Campus Compact can help (spread the word).

(The type of support needed her is) how to spark people, how to get momentum, impetus. I'd like to get administrators' support and faculty support. It's easier in community colleges than in four year schools because the faculty are more innovative.

2. Develop written materials that provide practical advice.

I'd like a concise summary that I can use to educate faculty and students -- definitions, general education. How could we use service learning on this campus? What are the possibilities? It should be readable for lay people. We have lots of information and a lot of it conflicts. We have too much information. It gets confusing... The (on-campus) meetings confuse me too. I think, "I thought I knew what I was doing before I got here."

Programs at different stages of development have different needs. I'd like *specific* suggestions for how to start a program. I want more direct resources on how to get things started, such as sample correspondence, forms, materials to help me with a presentation to the Board... I'm still struggling with questions like, How does it work with agencies? What's important in terms of job assignments? How should students get in contact with agencies? I want to know the options. I don't want to re-invent the wheel. Getting the logistics down of recruiting and placing can be frustrating.

I'd also like help on how to include service learning in budget planning.

I'd like help on getting people to think more about incorporating service in the curriculum. How have people *started* to do that? I want more

information on different structures, the approaches that have been used. Should the President create a task force, for example, or should it be a faculty professional development group?

I'm all for programs developing uniqueness but there are probably preferred ways (to develop service learning). Tell us, "These are four or five ways to do it." We're figuring out our own way. If we're a model, tell other schools so they can have an easier time. They don't have to do all the initial thinking if some other schools have already done it.

I'd like better ideas on how other campuses are doing, such as examples of programs. (I'd like) more particulars. (I'd like) a step-by-step process for developing a community service program.

I'd like pamphlets, literature to use in working with the community.

I'm interested in maintaining quality. (I would like information on) things like how to conduct effective site visits, how to keep up with agencies and volunteers. Also the legal aspects -- liability. Right now I'm trying to decide if we should pay for criminal checks.

3. Provide recognition and support.

If service learning is going to work, we have to hook into faculty... Can the Center tap into the "hidden stars" -- the faculty members we don't hear about who are doing service learning -- and make heroes out of them? They care. Tell their stories (or) let them tell it.

The (service learning) projects really turn on students, but faculty don't have a way to share it. They don't get attention, reinforcement, recognition.

4. Enhance opportunities for networking.

I'd like to see a clearinghouse, maybe, some kind of information exchange. Find out who's doing what. Then write them up -- not the whole syllabus, just an abstract. I'd like the Center to publish more about courses. I'd like more faculty contacts... Help build connections.

Maybe a communication net (would help). It would solidify the movement, build kinship, develop a cadre of people.

24

Obstacles to Developing Service Learning Programs

Respondents were asked to comment on the obstacles they encountered in trying to develop service learning opportunities for students. Responses to this question may provide some additional clues about future directions for the Center.

Most respondents provided similar responses about the obstacles they face. The two primary concerns were (a) faculty skepticism, disinterest, or resistance and (b) financial constants. In addition, lack of support from top administration, lack of student interest and/or time to participate, and confusion or ignorance about how to proceed were also mentioned.

Two thirds of the respondents stated that a major obstacle to developing student community service opportunities on their campus is a lack of faculty awareness, understanding, or acceptance of service learning. Many of these respondents described faculty on their campuses as resistant to new initiatives of any kind, particularly when they involve a change in curriculum and/or teaching methods. Even on campuses where faculty are generally receptive to the notion of service learning, they may not understand how service can be integrated into their own courses. Other respondents pointed out that faculty lack the skills and time needed to develop contacts with community agencies or other service sites, arrange placements for students, and supervise them in the field.

These barriers are exacerbated when responsibility for developing service learning and community service opportunities resides with Student Activities, the Dean of Students Office, or other non-academic units. Even when Presidential or Chancellorial support is strong, respondents repeatedly pointed out that faculty leadership is crucial.

These barriers suggest a need for technical assistance that can help service learning coordinators and administrators build understanding and support for service learning on the campus. This might involve descriptive information about what service learning is and how it would benefit students, faculty, the institution, and the community; case studies of how other institutions have overcome these obstacles; or guidelines or suggestions for winning faculty support and participation.

Because the Center staff do not have previous experience as community college faculty, some respondents pointed out that the Center has only limited ability to sway faculty opinion and only limited knowledge of the complex processes of curricular change, course development, and faculty decisionmaking. The Center might have more credibility in this arena if it could enlist the participation of community college faculty.

Financial obstacles were also a major concern. Given the financial constraints many community colleges face, few respondents could devote 100% of their time to service learning and community service. For most, their responsibilities in this area are an add-on to a job that was already occupying at least 40 hours a week. These respondents lack the time for sustained development efforts. This pattern of inadequate staffing and

financial support hinders the development of collegiate community service. Respondents pointed out that until staff are available to help faculty develop and manage community placements for students, the likelihood that faculty will implement service learning is low. A related problem is reliance on external grants to support service learning staff and programs. These "soft money" positions lack long-term stability or security.

Some respondents pointed out that the information the 5C has disseminated about grant opportunities and grantsmanship is very helpful. Nonetheless, the inherent insecurities of soft money coupled with the restrictions that often accompany grant awards are experienced as barriers to program development. This suggests a need for interventions directed at top level administrators that would provide the rationale for making collegiate community service a top institutional priority deserving of long-term financial support. Administrators may also need better information about the actual costs of developing and maintaining service programs.

Because community college students tend to have multiple responsibilities and more financial pressures than do traditional college students, they may have limited time to spend providing community service. Others may be involved in service on their own initiative, without linkages to their education. Also, because many community college students will not become very involved in campus life, they may be unaware of the opportunities available to them. Thus, some respondents suggested that they need to find ways to inform students about service learning, educate them about its benefits, and design service opportunities that fit students' busy schedules.

Administrative support for service learning ranged widely. Some schools are responding to Presidential directions (top down) while others are trying to convince administrators that service learning is meaningful (bottom up). Some pointed out that administrators are supportive in theory but provide little tangible assistance (money, release time, membership in Compact, etc.) Another challenge, then, is building administrative support for service learning and educating administrative leaders about what is required to implement service learning.

All of these barriers -- faculty resistance, financial constraints, student constraints, and administrative passivity -- are recognized by the Center Director, and Center workshops and services attempt to address these issues. The appropriate issue, then, is not *whether* the Center should be addressing these obstacles but rather *how* it should do so, including how it should allocate its limited resources in relation to these issues.

In summary, most participants in this research are satisfied with the services provided by the Center. Participants' suggestions for additional services coupled with their descriptions of the barriers and obstacles they face may suggest some new directions for technical assistance in the future. In particular, respondents would like written resources and information that provide descriptive information and practical advice. Guidelines for building faculty, student, and administrative support are also needed.

IV. Future Development of Center Services

The telephone surveys coupled with the conference evaluations indicate that Center services are well received. The case studies, however, raised a number of issues related to the broad mix of services provided by the Center. The basic concern is that the services provided by the Center may not be optimally effective in promoting collegiate community service in the community college sector -- not because the services are poorly delivered but rather because the Center is not guided by a clearly delineated vision and focused set of goals and objectives.

The concerns about 5C described in this section reflect the perspective of this researcher only. The extent to which they are shared by Center sponsors or clients is not known.

Finding the Balance Between Responsive and Proactive Approaches to Providing Services

For the most part, 5C activities are direct responses to requests from state Compact directors, campus-based administrators and faculty, or others (e.g., National Compact office, CNCS staff). This approach probably made great sense when the Center was a brand new organization. At this point, however, some reconsideration may be in order. As the Center gains knowledge about the needs of the sector related to service learning, it may want to be more proactive in designing and disseminating services.

After three years of operation, the Center can now anticipate the needs of colleges that are just beginning to develop service programs and can perhaps develop materials or interventions that inform these needs without waiting for specific requests -- and without responding to these requests on a case-by-case basis. For example, the Center currently sends syllabi to those requesting this information, but has not yet developed a publication that contains sample syllabi as part of a broader discussion about the integration of service into curricula. This is one example of a more pro-active approach to fulfilling the need for help developing syllabi.

The Center might also assume a more pro-active stance by attempting to anticipate emerging needs for community colleges and developing resources that respond to these needs. For example, growing emphasis on the "school to work transition" and the integration of academic and vocational education may create new approaches to service learning within vocational programs. Increasing accountability pressures from state legislatures may create a need for cost effective assessment strategies. Continued efforts by community colleges to develop articulation agreements with 4-year institutions in their service areas may create new questions about service learning. By anticipating and responding to these issues, the Center can maintain its leadership role and ensure that its services continue to meet the needs of the sector.

The Center might also consider adopting a more pro-active posture with regard to conducting site visits. In particular, the Center might recommend the key people who should attend campus-based workshops and presentations. Several respondents specifically requested such assistance. Further, some respondents would like the Center to be more active in making site visit arrangements.

In maintaining its responsive posture, the Center is responding to the overt "demand" for services. Obviously, its continued good relations with the sector depend to some degree on its continued ability to do so. At the same time, community colleges may have needs that are not being expressed, either because they are unaware of those needs or because they do not think that the Center can help them. One must at least consider the possibility that a kind of "closed loop" has developed -- the Center offers a set of services because it gets requests for these services; but community colleges request these services because they believe that this is what the Center provides.

Finding the Balance Between "Planting Many Seeds" Vs. More Strategic Deployment of Resources

The Center sees its mission, in part, as "planting many seeds" in the hope that some will take root and grow. This reflects the fact that it is difficult to determine when an intervention may result in meaningful change. Nevertheless, given limited resources, one wonders if a more purposeful strategy might be more cost effective. After three years, the Center perhaps has some knowledge of the conditions under which service learning is mostly likely to succeed, for example. Activities that focus on creating and taking advantage of these conditions might be most useful in the long run.

This suggests a need to re-examine the mix of services provided by the Center. As one state Compact director noted, site visits by the director of a national center are a "precious resource" that should be used where they can have the strongest impact. In contrast, the development and dissemination of written materials is more cost effective and would enable the Center to provide basic information to a broader audience. Then, the Center could target site visits to those schools most likely to benefit (based on some set of criteria), secure in the knowledge that written materials are continuing to seed the field.

Broad, Diffuse Goals and Objectives

The Center staff and sponsors agree that the Center's mission is to provide technical assistance to community colleges related to collegiate community service. All agree that they want to increase the number of community college students involved in service. All agree that the integration of service into the curriculum is the optimal model. Beyond this, however, there is little specificity about the goals and objectives of the 5C. A critical unresolved issue is the target audience for Center services. This is discussed in the next paragraph. In addition, however, there is little evidence that the activities of the Center are strategic efforts to promote particular outcomes, e.g., educating the sector about the meaning and potential of service learning, promoting adoption of service

learning models, or improving the overall quality of service learning in the community college sector. In fact, Center staff and/or those affiliated with the Center cite all of these goals -- a highly ambitious agenda for a Center with very limited resources. In trying to address multiple goals with a limited staff, however, the Center risks spreading itself too thin and failing to address any of its goals in a manner that is likely to bring long lasting results. On the other hand, the Center would be hindered by a highly restrictive set of goals. The issue here is one of balance.

Target Audience for Center Services

Since there are over 1200 community colleges nationwide and only one full-time staff person in 5C, the Center cannot realistically serve the needs of the entire sector. Yet it has been unable to specify a target audience for its services. One issue is whether a higher level of services should be given to Compact member institutions than non-member institutions. From a practical perspective, 5C services might reasonably be seen as a benefit of membership in the Compact. Further, Compact institutions have already made a high level commitment to community service and might be more receptive to and more likely to act on the information and guidance 5C can provide. On the other hand, the 5C Director and its Maricopa sponsors believe that the Center should serve those campuses that are just developing an interest in service learning. These campuses may not be ready to make the commitment implied by joining Compact -- or they may lack the resources to join Compact -- but might represent fertile soil for the growth of service learning. Since only about 70 community colleges are currently Compact members, restriction of services to members only would exclude over 90 percent of the sector from Center services. A possible approach, of course, is a "two tiered" system that provides one level of services to non-members and another for members.

Much previous discussion about this issue has focused on the best strategy for recruiting new community colleges into the Compact. If the Center is effective in serving non-members, one might expect more community colleges to join the Compact, reflecting their growing commitment to service learning. To date, however, Center services to non-members have not produced much growth in membership. An alternative explanation, then, is that non-members who have access to Center services lose the incentive to join the Compact. Other possible explanations that have been offered include the possibility that non-members who have received services will eventually join the Compact, but the process takes longer than expected; or many community colleges simply cannot afford to join the Compact so access to 5C services is irrelevant to their decisionmaking.

A related issue is whether 5C should concentrate its services to Compact members on those campuses that do not have access to a State Compact versus those that are part of a State Compact. Many of the Center's site visits and workshops have been provided to campuses in states where a State Compact has been established. The Compact member institutions in regions without state Compacts, however, may stand to benefit more from the Center services, but may have less awareness of the Center and fewer opportunities for direct contact with the Center Director.

Still another issue is the balance between providing direct service to community colleges as opposed to "training the trainers," especially but not exclusively the state Compact directors. In states that have state Compacts, Center resources may be most effectively deployed by working with the directors to increase their awareness and understanding of the needs of community colleges. This suggests, for example, that rather than spend five days visiting community college campuses within a state, the 5C director might instead spend one day meeting with the State Compact director to train him or her about community colleges. This would then leave time for visits to campuses in regions without state Compacts or for other activities. It would also operationalize the view of the Center Director and sponsors that responsibility for community colleges is the joint responsibility of the Center and other components of the Compact, not the Center's responsibility alone.

Finally, this study revealed some differences of opinion about whether the Center's target audience is community colleges that are just beginning their involvement in collegiate community service versus all community colleges, including those at more mature stages of development in this area. A review of the campuses that the Center has visited suggest that it strives to provide services to institutions with well-established programs as well as those just getting started. By concentrating its resources on newcomers to the field, the Center might be able to carve out a more definable market niche and also provide more intensive and focused services.

One-shot Nature of Many Center Services

Due to limited resources and multiple responsibilities, most Center interventions are "one-shot" efforts, without systematic follow-up. Existing information about institutional change, however, suggests that any single intervention is likely to have little impact, and that a series of interventions is generally needed. In light of this, one-shot site visits, workshops, and presentations may not be the best use of limited resources.

Center staff and sponsors might wish to consider how to build more continuity into Center services. For example, the Center Director might work with the state Compact directors or national Compact staff so that they help follow-up on 5C site visits. Another approach is to develop low cost follow-up strategies, ranging from telephone consultations to providing scholarships for site visit recipients to attend the national conference. Yet another approach is to develop a workshop series or institute, so that campus teams could convene several times a year to plan community service programs.

Articulation Between Center Services and Other Technical Assistance Resources

Some campuses have considerable technical assistance resources available to them from a variety of sources. Others feel very much alone as they start exploring collegiate community service issues.

30

The extent to which the Center coordinates services with other technical assistance providers is unclear, but efforts appear to be ad hoc, based largely on opportunity rather than an overall assessment of the sector's needs in relation to available resources. Some consideration of whether there are areas of redundancy and/or critical gaps in the distribution of technical assistance resources may therefore be useful. This may be particularly important in the coming year, since the Corporation for National and Community Service has now funded an array of technical assistance providers, including some specializing in services to the postsecondary sector.

A subset of articulation issues of particular concern is the possibility of redundancy between 5C and the state Compacts. As the number of state Compacts grow, and as the number of community colleges involved in state Compacts grows, the chances of overlap between the two increase. The state Compact directors interviewed for this project differed in their attitudes about duplication of services between the state Compacts and 5C. Half of those interviewed feel that redundancy is fairly high. For example, one director said, "There is not very much that 5C can do that I can't do. I know pretty much whatever they know." In contrast, other state Compact directors said that 5C and the state Compacts enjoy a mutually beneficial relationship. These directors pointed out that they know little about community colleges and therefore rely on Director Conss. Still others suggested that the need for 5C assistance could decline over time as the state Compact directors absorb the lessons and information that 5C has to offer.

Several state Compact directors suggested that the Center might want to give a lower level of service to campuses with access to a state Compact and concentrate its efforts on campuses without access to a state Compact. These directors believe that campuses in states without a state Compact need Center services more than others. The directors said they would continue to contact the Center as needed for assistance and information, but they see a limited, and declining, role for such services.

Although overlap between 5C and the state Compacts is small at this time, the potential for unintended duplication of services in the near future seems substantial as the number of state Compacts increases and as the directors gain more class knowledge. The emergence of new technical assistance providers funded by the Corporation for National and Community Services raises additional articulation challenges. It is important for the Center to position itself for the future so it avoids unintended duplication and maximizes campus access to technical assistance resources.

Over-identification of the 5C With One Person

With only one full-time staff member, to say that the Center is highly dependent upon Director Conss is an understatement. Under these conditions, the Center has naturally gravitated toward offering those services that best reflect the Director's skills, knowledge, and abilities. As the survey results indicate, these services are valuable to many institutions. Nonetheless, the Center's total reliance upon Director Conss for service delivery is potentially problematic. Specifically, 5C currently lacks a means of

25   31

delivering services that are needed in the field but beyond the Director's current abilities to provide. Although the Director can and does strive to increase her skills, it is unrealistic to expect her -- or any single individual -- to be able to fulfill the broad variety of needs expressed. The annual conference enables the Center to bring in speakers to address specialized concerns (e.g., legal issues), but not all those in need of this information can attend. Thus, the Center is constrained in developing new services and responding to some emerging needs by the fact that it depends on only one service provider.

The likelihood that the Center will be able to increase its staff is low, given funding concerns. Thus, the Center may need to consider creative approaches to involving others without increasing payroll, and the Director may need to shift some of the time spend *providing* services in order to spend more time *accessing* services. In this way, the Center may be able to both reach more schools and provide a broader range of services.

"Big Picture" Issues Versus "Nuts and Bolts."

Most Center services and materials are geared toward mid-level administrators and faculty -- those who have responsibility for developing and implementing a community service plan for their campus. As such, the materials and services provided by the Center reflect a programmatic perspective. This is congruent with the goals and mission of the Center as understood by the Director and 5C sponsors.

At the same time, however, there is a potential opportunity for the 5C to move into a leadership role with regard to the broader issue of how community colleges envision and operationalize their relationships with the surrounding community. This is a conceptual and policy issue, not yet a programmatic issue. The issue is relevant to Compact interests because it may offer an important justification for making service learning an integral component of community colleges, not only an ancillary enterprise. Thus, 5C and its sponsors may wish to consider how the Center could contribute to this issue. One possible role, for example, would be for the Center to convene meetings of high level administrators, selected faculty, and community leaders to discuss and develop a new vision for college-community relations. Such a role would, however, represent a substantial change in activity for 5C and might dilute its service mission.

32

V. Relations with Sponsoring Institutions

5C is one element of the national Campus Compact network, which also includes the national office in Providence, Rhode Island, a rapidly growing set of state compacts, and a Center for Historically Black Colleges and Universities. At the same time, 5C is part of the Maricopa Community College District and Mesa College. The Compact and the Maricopa district each have distinctive organizational cultures, and has its own goals and expectations for the 5C.

Thus, the Center is in the unenviable position of trying to fit into two different organizational structures and contexts. This has created a number of tensions that, if left unresolved, will potentially reduce the Center's effectiveness. This section describes issues that may need to be resolved as the Center looks toward the future. Each of these issues was discussed in one or more of the interviews conducted with staff from 5C, Maricopa, national Compact, or state Compacts.

Unresolved Organizational Issues: Overview

The interviews revealed reveals four key organizational issues that are currently unresolved and that hinder the ability of 5C to plan for the future. These issues are:

1. Financial Support. Although the 5C sponsors are supportive of the Center, the level of financial support they can provide over the next two to five years is unclear. Should these organizations experience new demands or fiscal pressures themselves, their funding allocations to 5C could decline. Further, 5C and its co-sponsors have not yet reached a clear understanding of the extent to which 5C should be involved in raising funds and generating revenue.

2. Accountability Mechanisms. As discussed, both 5C co-sponsors perceive a need to strengthen and clarify 5C accountability. At minimum, both organizations have expressed a desire for more information about 5C activities and both organizations recognize a need for more systematic planning, monitoring, assessment, and reporting. At this time, however, the reciprocal responsibilities between 5C and its co-sponsors are unclear. Further, procedures for information exchange, quality control, and supervision are lacking.

3. Audience. 5C and its sponsors have not yet reached agreement about the primary audience(s) for Center services. Related issues include how 5C should serve institutions that are not Compact members and whether 5C should further focus its efforts by defining a specific market niche within the population of community colleges interested in collegiate service. Clarification about the audience(s) for Center services is a prerequisite to addressing the service mix issues raised in the previous chapter.

4. Articulation. 5C operates in a system of schools, associations, and service providers that is growing increasingly complex. The nature of the 5C relations with and

responsibilities to other technical assistance providers -- including but not limited to the State Compact organizations -- carries important implications for Center activities, structure, and processes.

In the remainder of this chapter, we describe some of the specific organizational conditions that have contributed to ambiguity related to these four issues and that could potentially pose obstacles to resolving these issues in the future.

Relations Between 5C and Campus Compact (National)

As discussed previously, the financial relationship between 5C and the Compact (as represented by the national office) is described in their letter of agreement. A number of issues have surfaced, however, that reflect differing perspectives on the responsibilities of 5C and Compact to one another. These differing expectations have led to some degree of frustration for both 5C and the national office.

Frequency and nature of communication. Other than the periodic Compact staff meetings, most contact between 5C and staff from the national office occurs by telephone. Until recently, communications between 5C and the national office were intermittent; one respondent estimated that one or two telephone calls a month was average. With the appointment of a network coordinator, contact became more frequent and predictable.

A substantial percentage of Compact-5C contact involves requests for information and assistance. For both 5C and Compact, requests from one another are sometimes perceived as an added, "extracurricular" duty, not an integral part of the job. Because staff in both organizations are extremely busy, the requests often add to work stress.

Relatively little time has been devoted to sharing information about activities, decisions, and concerns. The national Compact office has a great deal of justifiable concern for ensuring that 5C services are of high quality and congruent with other Compact activities. If 5C fails to perform well, Compact will pay the consequences; yet it has obtained little information and provided only intermittent feedback to the Center.

On the other hand, 5C has often felt left out of the Compact communications loop, missing information about the overall Compact plans and activities and having inadequate opportunity to comment on Compact decisions. It is difficult for 5C to develop a sense of connection and belonging to the Compact when it has inadequate information about the overall organization.

All parties agree that more regular communication between Compact and 5C has improved relations in recent months, although concerns remain. Nonetheless, sharing information and requesting and providing feedback take time, and Compact and 5C staff are extremely busy.

$3\,4$

In short, both organizations at least intermittently feel that the other does not understand the types of assistance and support they need. Both perceive the other as a somewhat mysterious "black box." Both would like the other to be more aggressive in recruiting community colleges into the Compact and in identifying and including community college leaders in Compact activities. Both would like more information about the other and more opportunities to provide input, but both have backed off aggressive pursuit of these goals partly due to ambiguity about roles and partly due to time constraints. Although both organizations want opportunities to provide input and advice, neither has the time to take on additional tasks and responsibilities.

The Compact commitment to community colleges. To a large extent, the difficulties 5C and Compact have experienced in their relationship are a function of the physical distance between them. This geographical distance renders regular, informal contact difficult. Because each organization is extremely busy, moreover, insufficient time has probably been devoted to building and maintaining organizational relationships. The differences between 5C and Compact, however, are exacerbated by continuing concerns by 5C about the degree to which Compact is committed to community colleges.

Given uncertainty about the Compact's concern for community colleges, the Center Director has adopted an advocacy role for the sector within the Compact. She argues for greater participation of community college leaders and for greater visibility of the sector in Compact activities. When Compact staff do not agree with the Center's specific recommendations, the Compact's commitment to the sector may be questioned.

Results of this project indicate that Campus Compact is strongly committed to serving community colleges and increasing their participation within the Compact at all levels. The Center can and should facilitate these efforts, particularly by identifying leaders in the field (both Presidents and staff or faculty members) so that Compact can include these individuals in meetings, institutes, and so forth. For its part, Compact should more regularly consult with 5C on issues of potential relevance to community colleges.

Relations Between 5C and State Compacts

The state Compacts are critical to the effectiveness of 5C. They refer campuses to 5C for consultation; disseminate 5C information; and invite the 5C Director to provide presentations at conferences and to make site visits to campuses. At the same time, 5C is critical to the efforts of some state Compact directors. Access to 5C offers an incentive for community colleges to join state Compacts. State Compact directors who have accumulated most of their experience in four-year institutions count on the Center for assistance in serving community colleges. 5C presentations at state Compact meetings are important sources of technical assistance for community colleges.

Relations between 5C and the state Compact directors are largely positive. The state Compact directors and Center director provide both professional and social support for one another. Both the Center Director and the state Compact directors have many

anecdotes about shared experiences that add humor, warmth, and occasionally adventure to their jobs. Five of the six state Compact directors interviewed reported that the 5C Director shows a high level of collegiality in her relations with them.

Against this largely positive backdrop, state Compact directors differ widely in the level and nature of their contact with 5C, based on the number of community colleges in the state and their own comfort levels about serving two-year institutions. For this most part, this process of "self selection" appears to work well. As the number of state Compacts continues to increase, however, relations between 5C and the state Compacts may need clarification. Most of the issues have been discussed in other sections of this report. Briefly, issues include:

• There may be increasing overlap or redundancy between 5C and the state Compacts, especially as state Compact directors learn more about the sector.

• Some state Compact directors would like 5C to be more pro-active in serving community colleges. They particularly recommend developing written materials that can be disseminated to community colleges in a cost efficient manner. Also, some state Compact directors would like 5C to make more of the arrangements for site visits, rather than leaving the logistical details up to the state directors. Finally, some state Compact directors would like 5C to enhance its services, recognizing that community colleges are rapidly gaining sophistication in the service learning arena.

• Some state Compact directors recommend that 5C concentrate its efforts on Compact institutions that are outside states with a state Compact. Others, however, rely upon 5C to provide services to community colleges in their own state and would be reluctant to give that up.

• Because many of the 5C site visits, presentations, and workshops originate with the state Compact directors, the proliferation of state Compacts may signal increasing demand for Center services. Without additional resources, however, 5C may be unable to meet the demand for services from state Compacts.

State Compact directors showed great diversity of opinion about future directions for the Center. Each director appears to have his or her own vision for 5C. These directors agree, however, that the state Compacts will be serving more community colleges in the future. Many of the state Compact directors have limited experience with community colleges and need assistance in serving the sector. The 5C can be an important resource for them.

Relations Between 5C and Maricopa Community College District/Mesa College

The staff and administrators in the district office and on the Maricopa Community College campuses are highly supportive of 5C and the efforts of Director Conss. Many praised the Director's professionalism, work ethic, concern for quality, and achievements

in serving the community college sector. These respondents pointed out that the Center has made substantial progress in developing services and programs since inception. Several noted that the annual conference attracts national participation and brings eminent speakers to the area.

5C services to the District. The major concern Maricopa respondents expressed about the Center concerns the use of Center services by the Maricopa colleges. In agreeing to co-sponsor 5C and house the center within the District, Chancellor Elsner and his staff hoped that the Center would spur the development of service learning (and other forms of collegiate community service) within the district. Use of Center services by the Maricopa colleges, however, has been disappointing.

5C has repeatedly invited campus service learning and community service coordinators to participate in Center services and activities. Several factors may inhibit use of 5C services within the District, however. First, some respondents at both Mesa College and other Maricopa colleges noted that faculty and staff within the district are confused about the 5C charter. Many believe that the Center is "only for Mesa," for example. Others have heard that 5C is a national Center and are therefore uncertain about whether they have the right to request its services. Still others have heard that the Center is available but don't know what services it can provide or how to access them. Second, internal politics within the District may deter some faculty and staff from using the Center. Specifically, some may be concerned that, since the Director reports to a Mesa College administrator, Mesa College therefore obtains information that potential Center clients would not want disseminated within the District. Third, in recent years the Maricopa Community College District has experienced budgetary pressures which may have increased faculty resistance to new initiatives of any kind, including service learning. These factors suggest that education and-information about the Center, appropriate assurances of confidentiality, and efforts to identify and nurture "grass roots" support for service learning on the campuses might increase district-wide use of 5C.

Other issues. Maricopa respondents also discussed the need for planning for the future of 5C. Among the issues that need to be addressed are the Center's financial sustainability, how the Center can continue to grow (both in size and in sophistication) without increases in its resources, and how Maricopa and Compact should work together in the future.

Although Maricopa has been and continues to be extremely supportive of 5C, the Center might benefit from assistance in fund-raising from Maricopa development officers. To some extent, 5C and the Maricopa Colleges are in competition for funds from local foundations. Opportunities to develop joint proposals might be explored as one way to foster a more cooperative relationship at the fund-raising level.

37

Relations Between Campus Compact and Maricopa Community College District/Mesa College

Both Maricopa Community College District, Mesa College, and Campus Compact have in common a deep commitment to collegiate community service and the desire to include community colleges in the service "movement" unfolding in higher education today. Yet Compact and Maricopa differ in the vision they hold for 5C. These differences create questions -- and some tensions -- about future directions for the Center.

5C responsibilities to Compact members. A critical issue is that of 5C responsibilities to recruit and serve Campus Compact members as opposed to community colleges more generally. As a membership organization, Campus Compact considers recruitment to be an important aspect of the Center's mission. Further, Compact staff believe that the Center should differentiate services to members from services to non-members, either by charging non-members higher fees, providing non-members with a lower level of services, or some combination. This not only maintains an inducement to join the Compact but also recognizes that half the membership dues from community colleges are directly used to support Center services. On the other hand, Maricopa staff and administrators are concerned that the Center serve the community college sector broadly. The target population for 5C services from their perspective -- campuses that are just beginning to develop community service programs -- are unlikely to have the resources or the readiness to join the Compact. Further, Maricopa staff and administrators want to ensure that the 5C mission of providing technical assistance does not become diluted by pressure to recruit members for the Compact.

The increase in state Compacts offers a partial solution to this issue. The state Compact directors outreach to and recruit community colleges, thereby reducing the need for the Center to take on this role. However, fewer than half the states currently have a state Compact.

Management Styles. A second issue concerns different management styles of Compact and the Maricopa District. The management style of Maricopa District administrators is to give the Center a high level of autonomy and flexibility. This is typical of higher education institutions and settings. On the other hand, the Compact, as is typical of many non-profit agencies dependent on external support, would like a higher level of Center planning and accountability, so that its activities are predictable, grounded in a well-articulated rationale, and can be evaluated against measurable objectives.

Role of Community Colleges within Compact. A third issue is the Compact responsiveness to community colleges. This issue has been discussed in some detail in the section above on Compact-5C relations, but also colors relations between Compact and the Maricopa District. Campus Compact's founding members were primarily elite 4-year institutions. Even today, community colleges are under-represented in the Compact. Thus, some Maricopa respondents suggested that the Compact is not sufficiently aware of or responsive to concerns of the community college sector. Specific issues of concern

include the overall representation of community colleges within the Compact, the representation of community colleges on Compact Executive Committees and Boards, participation of community colleges in Compact institutes, meetings, and activities, and consideration of community colleges in Compact written materials and presentations.

The Compact has taken several steps within the last year to increase the participation of community colleges in the Compact. In addition to increasing the level of resources provided to 5C, Compact has added more community college Presidents to the national Board, and is actively seeking to include more community colleges in its membership and activities. Compact has recently agreed to increase the number of Community college Presidents on the Executive Committee, such that the percentage of community college presidents on the Committee will reflect the percentage of community colleges in the national higher education system.

The Compact is, wisely, cautious about fractionating its membership along special interest lines. The unifying theme of the Compact is commitment to collegiate community service, an ideal that applies across all segments of the system. The Compact leadership is concerned that an over-emphasis on the differences among members will obscure their common goals, needs, and vision.

Against this backdrop, 5C emerges as both an opportunity and a risk for Compact. On the one hand, Compact's support for 5C is a public and visible expression of its desire to serve the community college sector and to include more community colleges in the Compact. On the other hand, observers might question whether 5C enables Compact to continue "business as usual" while assigning responsibility for the community college sector to an ancillary enterprise (i.e., the Center).

Concern within the Maricopa District about the role of community colleges within Compact influences the nature of organizational relations. This issue is larger than 5C, but the Center has become a channel through which concerns are expressed.

VI. Action Recommendations

The Center's continued development and effectiveness require both substantive and organizational changes. The need for change does *not* stem from an inadequate performance by the Center. The Center's services have been well received. Rather, change is needed because (a) the organizational context is changing, and the needs of the sector are changing and (b) inadequate information and communication coupled with some disagreements about goals and strategies hinder the Center and its sponsors from working together with maximum effectiveness to serve the needs of the community college sector. This section strives to serve as a starting point for this change process.

Unresolved Issues

The single largest challenge facing the Center as it looks ahead is the development of a strategic vision and plan that will guide Center decisions about its services and activities, give coherence and meaning to Center activities, and provide a foundation for future assessments of Center effectiveness. The ideal planning process should include at least four components. These include:

1. Developing the Center Mission Statement and Vision. After three years of operation, the fundamental mission of 5C should be re-examined and modified if needed. The outcome of this process should be a 5C mission statement and vision that can be used to guide planning. Development of a vision for the Center might begin with a consideration of the relationships between community colleges and they communities they serve. Although a vision for 5C does not require analysis of this broader issue, it provides a strong foundation for the assertion that service learning should become integral to community college education, not simply an ancillary activity.

2. Strategic Planning. Following development of a mission statement, 5C and its co-sponsors might engage in a strategic planning process, laying out long-term goals and objectives along with some strategies for accomplishing these goals. This would be the ideal time to define the target audience for the Center, including its responsibilities to Compact members and non-members and its responsibilities to high level administrators as well as faculty and line staff. This is the time to consider the mix of services and activities conducted by the Center. Strategic planning should involve 5C, Maricopa and Mesa College representatives, and Compact representatives (including state Compact representatives). It would require a substantial investment of time over several months. Direct services might need to be cut back during this time. Yet a strategic plan will guide the Center in working systematically to achieve its vision.

3. Fiscal Planning. Long-term planning for 5C requires a realistic appraisal of resources. Although the Center can probably increase the revenue it generates,

40

it will not become self-sustaining within the next five years. Concern about the financial sustainability of the Center could lead to fundamental changes. Sponsors need to estimate the level at which they can continue supporting 5C over the next three to five years. Further, realistic fund-raising targets for 5C should be established, based on a consideration of (a) the funds available for service learning from the government and private foundations and (b) the development strategies of both Maricopa and Compact. Should the Center become active in fund raising, it may find itself in competition with other Compact units and/or the Maricopa District for grants and contracts. Fiscal planning also should recognize that the ability of the Center to fulfill its mission may be reduced if it is required to raise funds and/or generate revenues sufficient to cover its costs.

With these caveats in mind, fiscal planning might nonetheless consider how 5C could generate revenue without reducing its effectiveness. Such policies could have several beneficial effects. They would increase the resources available to the Center and reduce its reliance on external support. Clients might attach more value to Center services if they were expected to pay for them. And the Center would receive clear feedback about the perceived value of its services, based on schools' willingness to pay for them.

4. Operational planning. Following development of a strategic and fiscal plan, the Center Director might develop an annual plan that includes measurable objectives and specific strategies for achieving these objectives. Such a plan would keep sponsors informed of Center activities, provide a rationale for these activities rooted in the Center's mission and strategic plan, and offer facilitate assessment of the Center's progress and accomplishments. Therefore, co-sponsors should be asked to comment on the plan, and it should be revised in response to their comments. Further, the Director might be expected to report once or twice a year on progress toward implementation of this plan.

The primary problem with this set of planning recommendations is that implementation could require a considerable investment of time from a number of different people, making this a highly expensive process. Discussion with 5C and its sponsors suggests the following guidelines for planning:

- Planning might begin with a retreat that could bring together staff from 5C, Compact, Maricopa District and Mesa College, and outside experts for one to three days of focused discussion. This type of group should address broad questions of the Center mission and vision, its key audience, accountability mechanisms, and possibly financial support for 5C. In other words, this group should provide the basic information that 5C needs to engage in strategic and long-range planning. The inclusion of outside experts in this group can provide additional insights into sector needs as well as a

neutral facilitator for addressing areas of disagreement among co-sponsors.

- Long-range and operational planning should, insofar as possible, be delegated to the 5C Director. Although the Director could attempt these tasks independently, the effort probably will be more productive and enjoyable if approached collaboratively. Thus, the Center Director might be invited to convene a small committee or work group to address these issues. The recommendations of the work group would be subject to review and approval by 5C co-sponsors.

Specific Recommendations

In the interests of facilitating a planning process for 5C, the following specific recommendations are offered as a *starting point* for discussion and review. Readers are encouraged to modify the recommendations that follow and add new ones as needed. In fact, such a process is necessary if 5C and its sponsors are to develop a commitment to implementing these (or any other) recommendations.

1. Continue the co-sponsorship arrangement. Despite the tensions and challenges inherent in the co-sponsorship arrangement, this is also a major strength of the Center. The Compact's leadership role in collegiate community service coupled with Maricopa's leadership role within the community college sector give the Center tremendous credibility, visibility, and access to information and resources. It is unlikely that the Center would have reached as many campuses as it has without the network of state Compact directors providing referrals and invitations. It is unlikely that the Center would have been received as favorably as it has without its association with Maricopa Community Colleges. Further, the financial support of both organizations gives a measure of stability to the Center and reduces the strain on each sponsor. Finally, the partnership of Compact and Maricopa is a compelling symbol of Compact's commitment to community colleges; dissolving the partnership will have implications beyond 5C alone. Thus, if possible, Compact and Maricopa should try to continue co-sponsoring 5C.

2. Re-commit to the vision of 5C as a technical assistance center. Given the considerable change the Center and the sector have undergone over the past three years, there is a need to re-consider the Center mission and create a new vision to guide 5C's programmatic activities.

5C should ground its mission and activities in serving as a technical assistance center for community colleges interested in collegiate community service. For the next one to three years, it should continue to focus the majority of its energy on campuses in the formative stages of program development[2]. Given limited resources, the Center may therefore be unable to serve the needs of the most sophisticated campuses. One way to

---

[2] One respondent suggested three levels of campus development: (a) inquiries, for which written materials and group presentations are most appropriate; (b) start-up phase, for which personalized assistance can be quite useful; and (c) institutionalization. Using this classification system, I recommend that 5C concentrate most of its resources on campuses in the start-up phase.

resolve this potential dilemma is to involve these campuses in service delivery, thereby recognizing their accomplishments to date and providing them with opportunities for informal networking with peers at a similar level of development.

Specifically, 5C should: (a) describe the collegiate community service "movement" to community college faculty, staff, and administrators and explain why it is in their best interest to become involved; (b) explicitly link the collegiate community service to other issues of concern to community colleges, including campus-community relations, vocational education and school-to-work transitions, National Service, educational reform, retention and student success, etc.; (c) provide community colleges with "how to" information and guidance for establishing, developing, and funding collegiate community service programs (both curricular and co-curricular); (d) assist community colleges in building enthusiasm for community service, especially among faculty and high-level administrators; (e) disseminate information about model programs and practices, (f) facilitate networking and peer exchange among community colleges; (g) keep community colleges informed about external trends and events relevant to collegiate community service including state and federal policies, funding, professional association activities, and so forth; (h) identify (and perhaps develop) experts and leaders within the community college sector who can represent the sector in meetings and assist peer institutions; and (i) inform and train service learning leaders and experts about community colleges, so that they can better serve the sector (in effect, train the trainers).

3. Narrow the audience for Center services. The primary audience for 5C services should be line staff and faculty charged with developing and implementing collegiate community service. Further (as discussed above), the Center should concentrate on serving institutions at the formative stages of program development.

Although the Center should of course respond to queries from community college leaders and should help campus-based staff and faculty convince their leadership of the need to support service learning, the primary responsibility for engaging community college Chancellors and Presidents in thinking about service learning should rest with the State and National Compacts and their Executive Committees/Boards.

The Center should provide differential services to Compact members and non-members. In particular non-members should pay a higher fee for Compact services (site visits, publications, conference registration, etc.) than members. The Director should be asked to draft guidelines for this process, addressing both the availability of services and fees for service. In this way, enhanced access to Center services will stand as an incentive for community colleges to join the Compact, but non-members will not be left without any assistance.

The Center should also strive to balance services to Compact members in state Compacts and those outside state Compacts. The latter may have particular need of Center services (see recommendation 4 below).

Once the target audiences are identified, the Center should strive to intensify outreach about the services it provides and how colleges can access them. Much of this outreach can be facilitated by the state Compact directors. In addition, however, two especially important audiences for this effort are the Maricopa community colleges and other community colleges that belong to the national (but not to a state) Compact. Because staff and administrators turn over, and because institutions' need for and interest in Center services will vary over time, outreach needs to be an ongoing activity.

4. Coordinate efforts with other technical assistance providers. As the number of technical assistance providers increase in response to the growth of state Compacts and the funding strategies of the Corporation for National Service, 5C must better define its own niche while working with other providers to ensure that community colleges are well served. Among technical assistance providers, 5C can and should play a leadership role in raising awareness and skills relevant to community colleges. By "training the trainers" the Center will be able to leverage its services so that more campuses receive assistance and support for developing service learning programs. Further, in so doing the Center will send a message that community colleges are an integral component of the higher education service learning movement and that all of those who work in this area share responsibility for serving the sector (i.e., 5C is not an excuse for other organizations to neglect community colleges).

5. Re-examine the array of 5C services and activities. 5C should systematically re-evaluate its repertoire of technical assistance activities. The goal here is to develop a set of activities that (a) meets the needs of the sector, (b) is cost efficient, and (c) is coherent and logical. In other words, the Center Director should be able to explain *why* 5C offers its particular mix of services in relation to the needs of the sector and the other options that might be available for meeting these needs. This requires a consideration of both the types of services 5C can provide (e.g., conferences, workshops, site visits) and the content or focus of these services (e.g., grantsmanship, National Service, developing service learning projects).

One important factor to consider in reviewing Center services is how to increase continuity in services. As discussed, "one-shot" services such as some of the 5C site visits and presentations are generally less effective than longer-term efforts in promoting institutional change. Therefore, I recommend that the Center seek to develop methods for follow-up and continuity in service delivery. The narrowing of the Center's mission and target audience should help to make this feasible, but creativity will be required to overcome resource limitations.

6. Develop more written products. The participants in this research were in agreement about their desire for the Center to produce more written materials that will (a) explain service learning within a community college context; (b)provide a rationale for why community colleges should invest in service learning; (c) provide detailed "how to" information for establishing service learning programs in community colleges; and (d) describe model programs, policies, curricula, and syllabi. This suggestion was simply too

widespread to ignore, and I recommend that the Center consider alternative approaches to developing these materials including updating the Resource Manual, publishing a series of working papers, revamping its newsletter, and so forth. If the Center is to develop written materials, the Director may need to cut back (temporarily at least) on direct service to find the time to write and/or the Center will need to obtain supplemental resources to hire consultants or staff to perform this task. The challenges of creating such materials, however, will be justified by the Center's enhanced ability to serve its target audience (and beyond) in a cost efficient manner.

7. Expand participation in the Center. The development of a diverse cadre of service providers affiliated with the Center will better prepare 5C to meet future challenges and will provide crucial support for the Center Director. By increasing the number of people providing services to community colleges under the auspices of the Center, more variety in services can be obtained, and services may be delivered in a more cost effective fashion. The Center Director -- currently the sole service provider -- can get some relief, possibly avoiding burn-out and at the very least providing time for planning, administration, writing, and other activities that may emerge from the planning process. Further, the Center will be more vital and visible if a number of key leaders in the field feel a sense of ownership or investment in the Center.

Another critical reason to expand participation in 5C is to increase links to faculty. Ideally, the Center might enlist the participation of faculty as service providers, although other approaches may be effective as well. In so doing, the Center will improve its ability to promote organizational change.

A broader base of service providers within 5C could also constitute a valuable resource for the Compact at large, by strengthening Compact ties to the community college sector and building a corps of leaders who can be invited to participate in Compact events and meetings beyond those sponsored by 5C alone.

Some approaches for achieving this recommendation are discussed in the previous section on 5C options and include development of an institute model and development of a regional network of consultants. The Center Director should be consulted about how best to implement this recommendation based on her knowledge of the field. Given concerns about feasibility and cost, efforts to broaden participation in service delivery might begin with a small experiment or demonstration project.

8. Clarify and strengthen Center accountability. 5C currently has no formal accountability to Compact and only limited accountability to Maricopa. Both organizations need some mechanism for intervening if and when concerns about the 5C surface.

Several different models for increasing Center accountability come to mind. First is strengthening the supervisory authority of Compact and Maricopa over 5C. This would not only provide these organizations with more input into the Center activities and

operations but also would provide the Center with more guidance and assistance. On the other hand, the distance between the national Compact office and the Center, the time needed for effective supervision (from either Maricopa or Compact staff), and the management style differences between Compact and Maricopa all increase the challenges of trying to establish and maintain a tight supervisory relationship. Further, the Center must be accountable not only to its sponsors but also to the community college sector at large. Therefore, an alternative model is to re-visit the concept of a center Board of Directors. This was attempted and abandoned some years ago, in part because the role of the Board was never fully defined. At best, a new Board, with a clear sense of purpose, can be a tremendous resource for the Center. At worst, it will provide little tangible assistance and simply compound the difficulties the Center already faces in trying to satisfy the goals and concerns of its co-sponsors. Yet another model is to establish some type of peer review process, perhaps modeled after an academic program review. And still another model is to conduct periodic (e.g., every three years) program evaluations -- including both process and impact evaluations -- to determine if the Center is achieving its goals. In addition to these actions, Campus Compact and 5C may want to modify or renew their affiliation agreement to include some language about accountability.

Discussions of accountability should distinguish between process or implementation on the one hand and outcomes on the other. 5C cannot be held accountable for the growth of service learning within the community college sector. On the other hand, the Center can be held accountable for developing and implementing a plan for promoting collegiate community service that is rooted in some concept of how service learning programs originate and grow. Further, the Center can be held accountable for monitoring the outcomes of its efforts.

9. Implement operational planning. Whatever the feasibility of engaging in strategic planning at this time, the Center should be charged with developing a written operational plan on a yearly basis. This plan should (a) provide goals and measurable objectives for the next year, and (b) describe a set of strategies for reaching these objectives.

This plan should be circulated in draft form to Center sponsors and revised in response to feedback from sponsors. Further, the Director should report on a yearly basis (at minimum) on progress toward achieving this plan. The Director should not be held accountable for achieving every goal and objective -- in fact, 5C should be encouraged to put forward ambitious goals and objectives -- but should instead be held accountable for systematic pursuit of these goals and objectives and for monitoring their progress and self-correcting as needed.

The primary purpose of the operational plan is to ensure that the Center moves systematically toward a strategic vision. It will keep all parties informed about Center activities and provide a common foundation for evaluating the Center's performance. In so doing, it will enhance Center services and relieve some of the organizational ambiguities it has faced.

46

10. Clarify 5C Resources. Campus Compact and Maricopa/Mesa College should consider the level of financial support they expect to provide for 5C over the next one to three years, and should clarify 5C responsibilities for raising funds and/or generating fees. The operational plan developed by the Center, then, should reflect the financial realities it faces.

Conclusion

Over the past three years, 5C has provided valuable services to the community college sector. Recently, however, changes within both the external environment (e.g., National Service) and organizational environment for 5C (e.g., the growth in state Compacts) led to a need to review the fit between Center services and community college needs. Despite a strong performance to date, this analysis suggests several directions for the future including developing more focused and comprehensive services, building the base of 5C service providers, and clarifying the 5C target audience, goals, and objectives. In addition, 5C will benefit from stronger planning and accountability mechanisms.

APPENDIX A:

SOME FUTURE OPTIONS FOR 5C

Some Options for the Future

Previous discussions about future directions for the Center have suggested three broad options: (1) closing 5C as a Campus Compact enterprise and either incorporating the function within other components of the Compact and/or transferring the Center fully under Maricopa sponsorship; (2) Building and developing the Center, particularly by increasing the base of service providers; and (3) implementing some relatively small, incremental changes in services and management. Although the selection and implementation of these, or any other, options should await the results of the planning process, brief reviews of these options are provided here.

Option 1: Close 5C as a Campus Compact Center

The 5C has provided important assistance to community colleges at a critical juncture in the development and growth of service learning models. The Center has increased the visibility of the community college sector within the Compact specifically and the collegiate community service movement more generally. It has educated state and national Compact staff about the needs of the community college sector. It has given a boost to many institutions, some of which are now ready to take on leadership roles in collegiate community service.

In the years ahead, the focus of the sector will shift from the initial establishment of community service programs to improving quality. More technical assistance resources will be available within the sector, as more faculty and staff accumulate experience in this field. And the state Compact directors, in particular, will gain class knowledge about community colleges as they serve increasing numbers of two-year institutions. Further, the training and technical assistance mission of the Corporation for National and Community Service raises the possibility that new technical assistance resources will become available to the community college sector.

Financial sustainability of 5C continues to be a major concern. Funders that provide support for new enterprises may not be able to continue funding Compact, or the Center. Competition for grant support continues to be fierce, while higher education continues to experience budgetary constraints. In other words, the conditions that stimulated the development of the Center are changing. This raises the question of whether the Center should continue, at least within the auspices of the Compact.

One option is to release Center ties to Compact, so that the Center would become fully the project and responsibility of the Maricopa Community College District. This would reduce the difficulties of a co-sponsor arrangement. It would resolve issues about the Center's responsibilities to members versus non-members, since the Center would no longer be affiliated with the Compact. It would maintain the identification of the Center with a community college district that is seen as a national model. Further, Maricopa has already established several successful centers, which gives some cause for optimism about the prospects for 5C under these conditions.

Although this is an option that bears careful consideration, there are several drawbacks. The Compact will still face the challenge of how to serve the community college sector and how to assure the sector that it is important to and valued by the Compact. At worst, the Compact will need to re-create a Center for their members in the future, which would then potentially compete with the Maricopa Center. Further, Maricopa, in choosing to accept responsibility for the Center, would probably be accepting a substantial financial obligation, since the likelihood that the Center can generate revenue sufficient to cover its expenses within the next few years is low. Further, Maricopa leaders would need to carefully consider the desirability of accepting responsibility for a unit that conducts the majority of its work outside the District.

Another option, then, is to close the Center and either (a) move the function into the national Compact office, and/or (b) assign responsibility for community colleges to state Compact directors. These choices could also be pursued if the Center remains open, but is transferred fully into the Maricopa District. This approach offers the advantages of cost effectiveness and better integration of community colleges into the Compact. It also would reduce the difficulties of a co-sponsor arrangement. On the other hand, the Compact is striving to develop a decentralized structure, and this change would be counter to that trend. Further, the visibility that the Center gives to the community college sector would be lost. Similarly, one of the strengths of the Center is its location within a pre-eminent Community College District -- moving the Center to Providence might reduce the credibility of this function within the two-year sector. Finally, the Center is, to some degree, symbolic of the Compact's commitment to community colleges. Closing the Center would be perceived as a lessening of this commitment.

Option 2: Build and strengthen the Center by involving others

For three years, the Center has operated with one staff person. It has, perhaps, done as much as possible given its resource constraints. For it to continue to serve as a leader in the field, it needs to expand its repertoire of services and continue growing.

The Center might strive to extend its reach, broaden its services, and increase its effectiveness by including others besides the Director in service delivery. This would have the added, albeit secondary, benefit of increasing the Center's stability by decreasing its reliance upon any single individual.

Several models are possible for achieving this transition. In each case, the Center Director would need to become actively involved in seeking out experts on service learning that could serve the community college sector. The Director also would need to spend less time on direct service and more time on accessing and organizing services to be delivered by others.

Under an "institute model," a cadre of identified experts would converge at the Center periodically to deliver intensive training and instruction to community college

representatives. Both Compact and Maricopa already have successful institutes within their organizations. Instructors would receive stipends for their service, ideally covered by participant registration fees. Another model is the development of a regional network of consultants who would affiliate with the Center by invitation and agree to spend up to a specified amount of time per year assisting colleges in their region. Again, consultants would ideally be stipended in recognition of the time they spend.

This option offers a number of advantages. It builds upon the foundation that 5C has already established and enables the Center to expand in a cost effective manner. It will strengthen support for the Center within the sector by building a core of leaders and experts who feel ownership in the Center. It gives the Center flexibility to adapt its curricula and services to emerging needs, responds to concerns that the Center has inadequate ties to faculty, and enables the Center to work on multiple levels (e.g., serving both administrators and line staff; addressing both philosophical issues and "nuts and bolts").

On the other hand, the feasibility of this option needs to be carefully examined. At worst, the financial and human resources needed to implement one of these models may be unavailable. For example, the likelihood that an Institute could break even, much less generate revenue, is questionable. Further, there may be a lack of individuals with expertise in collegiate community service at the community college level -- and those that have accumulated this expertise may already be so besieged with requests for help that they may be unable to participate in the Center at the level needed for success. Another risk is that this approach might inadvertently segregate (or appear to segregate) community colleges from other Compact institutions. The Compact does not want to send the message that four-year institutions have access to one set of services while two-year institutions have access to a different set of services. Rather, their goal is to ensure that all institutions get their needs met in a cost efficient manner. Finally, this option does not in itself resolve the organizational issues described in earlier chapters of this report.

Option 3: Maintain the 5C current structure

Prior to making major structural or systemic changes to 5C, sponsors might attempt some incremental modifications that directly address some of the major problems facing 5C. A major benefit of this approach is that it preserves the original vision of the "Center" which was itself the outcome of considerable planning and discussion. It recognizes the contributions and accomplishments of the Center to date and strives to adjust these without unnecessary disruption. The major risk of this approach is that it simply delays, rather than addresses, difficult decisions about the future of 5C.

5 1