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Abstract

Curricular and co-curricular civic engagement activities and programs are analyzed in terms of their capacity to contribute to a common set of outcomes associated with nurturing civic-minded graduates: academic knowledge, familiarity with volunteering and nonprofit sector, knowledge of social issues, communication skills, diversity skills, self-efficacy, and intentions to be involved in communities. Different programs that promote civic-mindedness, developmental models, and assessment strategies that can contribute to program enhancement are presented.

Designing Programs with a Purpose: To Promote Civic Engagement for Life

Increasing numbers of high school seniors and entering college students report that they have volunteered during the past 12 months (e.g., increasing from 67% in 1990 to 76% in 2001; Dote, Cramer, Dietz, & Grimm, 2006; Monitoring the Future, 2008; Sax, 2006-7). The most dramatic increases have been for episodic volunteering, with smaller increases for regular volunteering. For most entering college students, volunteering is situationally determined (e.g., course requirements, involvement in religious organizations, student groups) rather than being activities that are generated by the individual (Bringle & Hatcher, 2011; Sax, 2006-7). Many college campuses have a long tradition of providing opportunities for students to volunteer in communities through student organizations; faith-based activities and organizations; fraternities and sororities; orientation and welcome week activities; and student government. However, according to national surveys of college students (Sax, 2006-7), participation in volunteering is greatest during high school and then drops off during college. In the post-college years, rates of volunteering increase, but the level never returns to rates in high school.

During the past two decades, higher education has been exploring additional ways of structuring civic engagement activities for students both through curricular and co-curricular programs (e.g., Bringle, Games, & Malloy, 1999; Boyer, 1994, 1996; Calleson, Jordan, & Seifer, 2005; Colby, Ehrlich, Beaumont, & Stephens, 2003; Edgerton, 1994; Harkavy & Puckett, 1994; O’Meara & Rice, 2005; Rice, 1996; Sandmann, Jaeger, & Thornton, 2009). The intent of these programs is to build on the community-based experiences entering college students bring to campus, provide multiple opportunities for them to continue being involved in communities, deepen the integrity of those experiences, link service activities to their educational experiences in ways that enrich and inform their preparation for their post-graduate journeys, and develop life-long habits of civic engagement. Each campus considers its community context, the nature of entering students, its institutional strengths, and available resources when determining how program development can best contribute to the overarching goal of producing civically-oriented and civically-involved graduates. The purpose of this article is to detail a case study of multiple interventions at Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis (IUPUI) that collectively contribute to that goal.

**Institutional Description**

IUPUI is a commuter campus of over 30,000 students, approximately two-thirds of whom are undergraduates. IUPUI has multiple professional schools (e.g., medicine, nursing, dentistry, business, law, engineering), emphasizes the life sciences, is a major research university, and is situated in the center of the state’s business, population, and government. Furthermore, IUPUI takes seriously its civic engagement mission. As one means for promoting civic engagement, IUPUI formed the Center for Service and Learning (CSL), a centralized unit in Academic Affairs that parallels a Center for Teaching and Learning and a Center for Research and Learning (see Bringle & Hatcher, 2004; Bringle, Hatcher, & Holland, 2007, for additional descriptions). CSL contains offices focused on service learning, co-curricular service, community-based Federal Work Study, and community partnerships.

**What IUPUI Students Bring to Campus.** Because IUPUI has a large number of professional programs, a survey of a sample of 550 entering IUPUI students was analyzed according to the following groups: prospective business majors, prospective professional school majors, and prospective liberal arts, science, and humanities majors. Consistent with past research by others, 25% of these entering students had not volunteered in the past 5 years. In addition, during the last year, 25% of the students had volunteered 20 hours or more (Bringle, 2005).

The survey included the Volunteer Functions Inventory (VFI) (Clary, Snyder, Ridge, Copeland, Stukas, Haugen, & Miene, 1998), which provides a measure of the following six functions that are served through volunteer activity:

1. Values: the degree to which volunteering expresses altruistic and humanitarian concern for others.
2. Understanding: the degree to which volunteering provides opportunities for new learning experiences and to use knowledge, skills, and abilities.
3. Social: the degree to which volunteering allows the person to be with friends and receive the recognition of others.
4. Career: the degree to which volunteering promotes clarity about vocational choices.
5. Protective: the degree to which volunteering allows the person to avoid guilt and better cope with personal problems.
6. Enhancement: the degree to which volunteering promotes an individual’s sense of personal growth and positive feelings.

The strongest motive for volunteering reported by IUPUI students was Values, followed by Understanding, Enhancement, Career, Protection , and then Social (Bringle, 2005). These results suggest that students arrived at IUPUI with a strong intrinsic interest in helping others. These students reported that their development, both cognitive and personal, were stronger motives than the more pragmatic motives of furthering their career, reducing personal guilt, and making friends. Furthermore, when motives were examined by intended major (Business vs. Professional vs. Humanities/Arts/Science), there were no differences on the motives of Understanding, Protective, Social, Career, or Enhancement. Both business majors and other professional majors scored lower than arts/sciences/humanities on Values, but Values was still the strongest motive for volunteering for those two groups of students (Bringle, 2005).

**Interest in Types of Service**. In the same survey, respondents indicated their interest in different types of service opportunities that colleges might make available. The most interest was in one-time service activities (30% saying “very interested”), followed by service as an option in a course (28%) and paid community service (27%). International service (19%), service learning classes (12%), and long-term immersion community service (8%) had the least interest (Bringle, 2005). These results suggested a range of distribution of interests across types of service-oriented programs and that no one type of service was particularly dominant as a preference.

A separate analysis focused on the students’ preferences among Morton’s (1995) three types of service: Charity (providing direct service to another person), Project (implementing or participating in service programs through community service organizations), and Social Change (transformational models of systemic change) (Bringle, Hatcher, & MacIntosh, 2006). Respondents had the strongest preference for Charity, the lowest preference for Social Change, with Project being intermediate.

There are two contrasting implications for the finding that social change produced the least interest. First, if Morton is correct that a student’s preference should be honored and a student’s preference should not be shifted to another type, then the presence of service activities focused on social change should be proportionately lower than the other two types of service in service-learning courses and community service programming. However, Boyte (1991) has suggested that community service as it is typically structured (i.e. Charity model) is not the best way to have students become familiar with politically-oriented, justice-oriented, and advocacy-oriented activities and outcomes that are aligned with social change. Therefore, to correct for the lack of interest in political change among students, disproportionately more attention could be given to programming that increases IUPUI students’ familiarity with, competency in, and motivation to work towards social change.

These results provided a basis for guiding the modification and development of program designed to develop and enhance the civic orientation of students.

**The Purpose: Civic-Minded Graduates**

As Cunningham (2006) notes for the academy:

One of [the] goals is the broad-based education of students to be effective and engaged citizens in our democratic society, and to be good citizens in our increasingly international world. Civic learning outcomes from higher education are difficult to document, but they are one of the most important social and civic contributions our colleges and universities provide to our society. (p. 4)

IUPUI’s Center for Service and Learning (CSL) designs and implements diverse programs with the goal of providing educationally-meaningful community service activities to students, as well as faculty and staff, in and with the communities. All of the CSL programs described below have been driven by one common purpose: to produce civic-minded graduates. In order to make explicit the nature of civic-mindedness, CSL staff examined the goals of its component offices— service learning, co-curricular service, community-based Federal Work Study, and community partnerships—to determine how best to articulate shared purposes. In addition, the extant literature on civic learning was reviewed, conversations were held with informed scholars in the field, and measurement strategies on civic learning outcomes were examined. This inductive approach led to delineating a set of core elements of the Civic-Minded Graduate. From the perspective of higher education, a *civic-minded graduate* (CMG) is assumed to be “a person who has completed a course of study (e.g., bachelor’s degree), and has the capacity and desire to work with others to achieve the common good” (Bringle & Steinberg, 2010, p. 429). Civic-mindedness includes the disposition to be knowledgeable of and involved in the community and the commitment to act upon a sense of responsibility as a member of that community. Civic-mindedness is viewed as distinct from an internal or self orientation, family orientation, or a corporate/profit orientation.

CMG is comprised of a set of knowledge outcomes (cognitive), dispositions (affective), skills, behavioral intentions, and behaviors. This set includes seven elements that were identified as defining of civic-mindedness and that can be fostered through an undergraduate educational experience that includes service learning and community service. The core elements of the CMG include:

1. *Academic Knowledge and Technical Skills*: In receiving a college education, civic-minded graduates will have acquired advanced knowledge and skills in at least one discipline that is relevant to their involvement in community issues.
2. *Knowledge of Volunteer Opportunities and Nonprofit Organizations*: Civic-minded graduates will understand ways they can contribute to society, particularly through nonprofit organizations and volunteering.
3. *Knowledge of Contemporary Social Issues*:Civic-minded graduates have an understanding of the complex issues encountered in modern society, both at the local and national levels.
4. *Listening and Communication Skills*:In order to help solve problems in society, civic-minded graduates have the ability to communicate well with others. This includes written and spoken proficiency as well as the art of listening to divergent points of view.
5. *Diversity Skills*: Civic-minded graduates have a rich understanding of, sensitivity to, and respect for human diversity in the pluralistic society in which they live. This is presumed to be fostered by students’ interactions with persons in the community who are different from themselves in terms of racial, economic, religious, or other background characteristics.
6. *Self-Efficacy*:Civic-minded graduates have a desire to take personal action, and also have a realistic view that the action will produce the desired results.
7. *Behavioral Intentions → Civic Behavior*:Behavioral intentions can be viewed as predictors of behaviors. Civic-minded graduates have intentions to be involved in community service in the future. One of the clearest ways that students can manifest these attributes is by choosing a service-based career, or by manifesting civic dimensions to a career in any field.

Given this understanding of CMG, CSL has been developing and refining multiple methods of assessing outcomes. These include a CMG Scale, CNG Narratives scored with a rubric, and a CMG Interview scored with a rubric, all of which can provide information for participants in CSL programs, for faculty teaching service learning courses, and for institutional-level assessment of outcomes across degree programs, including graduate and professional programs. Evidence of the validity of these measures of CMG includes convergence across methods, higher scores for students with more community service involvement, correlations with a measure of integrity (Bringle, Hatcher, & MacIntosh, 2006), and non-significant correlations with a measure of social desirability (Steinberg, Hatcher, & Bringle, in press).

**Developmental Models of CMG**

Although there are many ways in which individuals can develop civic habits (e.g., Colby & Damon, 1992; Flanagan & Levine, 2010), education-based programs provide an opportunity to have tremendous, but underdeveloped and underutilized, influence on the civic development of many if not all students. Research demonstrates that collegiate community-based experiences have a lasting consequence because students are most likely to continue volunteering after college (Sax, 2006-7). CSL views CMG as a useful and meaningful benchmark in the journeys of students through their post-secondary educational experiences.

The developmental model for the CMG is grounded in the expectation that civic-minded can be represented as the integration of the (a) self with both (b) civic activities and (c) student activities (see Figure 1). The degree of overlap of the circles in the Venn diagram is indicative of the degree of integration. Greater integration is indicative of persons who see themselves as being defined by their role as a student (i.e., pursuing studies to improve their capacity to engage in a career or profession; the studies are part of their life-long journey) and by involvement in their communities in ways that intentionally contribute to the public good (i.e., the activities of student/professional/career are engaged in and committed to making a difference and improving the lives of others and these are seen as part of one’s self). From the perspective of this model, the task of faculty and staff is to design and refine interventions that will lead to increasing the intersection of the three circles—in other words, to result in greater integration. Numerous theories are applicable to this task of deepening the civic journey of students, and three that are particularly relevant are highlighted here.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Insert Figure 1 about here

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**Self-Determination Theory**. CMG aspires to having students demonstrate internalizationof civic skills and motives in a manner that is integrated with their sense of being educated persons. Deci and Ryan’s Self-Determination Theory (SDT) provides a framework for examining the internalization of motivation (Deci et al. 1999; Deci & Ryan, 2000)**.** They posit a continuum of different types of motivation:

1. Amotivation: the activity is not interesting, there are no skills that lead to the behavior, or the behavior will not lead to a desirable outcome.
2. External regulation: behaviors are performed to meet external demands or to obtain an external reward; behaviors are externally regulated. Thus, for this type of motivation, extrinsic rewards can modify responses and control behavior. However, the behavior is likely to cease when the contingencies are discontinued.
3. Introjected Regulation**:** behaviors are performed to avoid guilt, or to enhance the ego and feelings of self-worth. There may be some internal regulation, but the behavior is not an integrated part of the self.
4. Identification:behavior is performed because the person identifies with its importance, indicating more internalization of motive.
5. Integrated Regulation: behaviors are fully assimilated with the self-concept and are consistent with other values and needs (i.e., other goals) but are still done because of their relationship to other outcomes.
6. Intrinsic Motivation: behaviors are self-determined, fully integrated, and inherently satisfying.

Assuming that college students are well distributed across this motivational continuum for civic matters as well as for their educational preparation for careers (Flanagan & Levine, 2010), educators need to be aware that different interventions may be appropriate for motivating students at different points on the continuum. For example, students otherwise unmotivated to participate in community service may be motivated by external rewards, instrumental value, and external requirements. However, because these inducements only produce temporary involvement, the critical issue for educators concerns how to design activities that produce the development of autonomous regulation of civic engagement for unmotivated students. Furthermore, educators do *not* want to create circumstances (e.g., external contingencies that are viewed as controlling the person’s activities) that undermine intrinsic motivation that already exists in students (Deci et al., 1999; Deci & Ryan, 2000).

According to Deci and Ryan (Deci et al., 1999; Deci & Ryan, 2000), there are three factors that lead to internalization:

1. Relatedness: developing a sense of belongingness and connectedness to other persons, groups, and society.
2. Competence: developing an understanding of the activity and goal, and seeing that they have the relevant skills to succeed and sense satisfaction.
3. Autonomy: Controlling environments can promote relatedness and competence, and yield introjected motivation. However, intrinsic motivation, according to self-determination theory, only occurs when autonomy is present.

Applying this theory to CMG, the circles in the Venn diagram will increasingly overlap (i.e., integration will increase) when curricular and co-curricular educational experiences are guided by these qualities. Concerning relatedness, Eyler and Giles’ (1999) research found that service learning produced higher levels of student/student and student/faculty interaction than traditional classes. This can also happen in other community service programs. Furthermore, students in community service programs can develop social connections to community service providers and to persons served, supporting the movement of motives from extrinsic to intrinsic.

Identifying community service activities that are appropriate for the skills and knowledge of students is also a critical element to developing self-efficacy and intrinsic motivation. Activities that promote perceptions of choice and autonomy among students will produce greater internalization of motivation (Morgan & Streb, 2001). However, according to SDT, autonomy does not have to be present throughout the entire experience for all students. Competence and relatedness are more important when starting and supporting movement toward internalization and integration; autonomy is most important for completing the move to integration. Furthermore, choice can influence the perception of autonomy is various ways. For example, *requiring* community service in a service learning course may be *perceived* by students as involving choices among option (e.g., students can choose where they do their service; students can choose to drop the class or switch sections). In contrast, voluntary or optional service in a class may not be perceived as an option, depending on the attractiveness of the alternative choice (Bringle, 2005).

**Intergroup Contact Hypothesis**. One of the key determinants of future helping and altruism is empathy. How can empathy be developed to the point that persons regularly engage in their communities in constructive ways? Curricular and co-curricular community service activities typically place students in unfamiliar community settings in which they interact with persons with whom they differ on several characteristics (e.g., age, class, race, education) and about whom they may have prejudices and stereotypes. The intergroup contact hypothesis posits that interactions between individuals who are different can produce empathy, understanding, and more positive attitudes if certain conditions are present in the context and in the interactions: (a) pursuit of common goals; (b) interactions provide a basis for friendship; (c) there is equal status among the participants; (d) the individuals contradict stereotype; (e) long-term contact occurs; and (f) norms support non-prejudicial orientations (Hewstone & Brown, 1986). When community service activities can be designed to incorporate these qualities, then college students may develop greater interest in, empathy for, and motivation to continue interacting with these persons and their communities (Astin, Vogelgesang, Ikeda, & Yee, 2000). How reflection activities are designed can contribute to the salience of these qualities that will produce empathy. However, community service activities do not necessarily contain these elements (Bringle, 2005; Erickson & O’Connor, 2000) and the activities could therefore potentially produce the opposite effects.

**Self-Authorship and Learning Partnerships Models.** Baxter-Magolda and King (2004) suggest that college learning outcomes should include: (a) cognitive maturity; (b) an integrated identity; and (c) mature relationships. Effective student development in these three areas enables effective citizenship. The developmental foundation for achieving maturity in these outcomes lies in self-authorship, the “capacity to internally define a coherent belief system and identity that coordinates mutual relations with others” (Baxter-Magolda & King, 2004, p. 8). At the beginning of the developmental journey toward self-authorship, persons are dependent on others for values, answers, decisions, and identity. In the middle phase, they begin to form their own views and their own identities, questioning authority but still relying heavily on external sources for knowing and decision-making. Self-authorship is achieved when individuals “view knowledge as contextual, view identity as internally constructed, and achieve the capacity for mutual negotiation in relationships” (Hodge, Baxter Magolda, & Haynes, 2009, p. 18).

The Learning Partnerships model (Baxter-Magolda & King, 2004; Hodge, Baxter-Magolda & Haynes, 2009; King, Baxter-Magolda, Barber, Brown & Lindsay, 2009) aspires to structure students’ experiences in college in support of their developing self-authorship. This cognitive development model views learners as intellectual partners with faculty and staff. In the Learning Partnerships model, university personnel intentionally design programs and curricula to move students from relying on external authority for information and decisions to defining their self-identity (beliefs, values, and social relations) by assuming more responsibility for themselves, accepting more challenges, and sharing authority and expertise.

**Integration Across Developmental Models**. Our analysis of these models led us to conclude that no one of these developmental models provided a singular guide for designing programs that contribute to civic growth. However, each model has qualities that are relevant to analyzing and improving existing civic engagement programs, can be applied to developing new programs, and provides a basis for developing testable hypotheses about why change occurs in the degree of overlap between the three domains in Figure 1. All three of the models stress the importance of relationships in student development. In addition, they highlight particular qualities that are important features of those relationships (e.g., norms and expectations about the nature of the relationships; connections; cooperative relationships that have common goals). However, even though relationships are important, students will grow and change when they also attribute a sense of autonomy and choice for what they are undertaking and view themselves as intrinsically responsible for their learning. Furthermore, these theories highlight the importance of putting students in activities in which they can have successful experiences (e.g. interpersonally rewarding, achieve service objectives) that contribute to outcomes. Finally, self-determination theory explicitly posits that different interventions need to be designed for students who are at different stages in their civic development.

**Center for Service and Learning: Service Learning**

As a commuter campus, the frequent and most important educational activities for IUPUI students occur in the classroom, in contrast to co-curricular activities. National Survey of Student Engagement results for IUPUI students indicate that they spend significantly fewer hours per week participating in co-curricular activities, compared to students at peer institutions and at research universities. Thus, the best way for IUPUI to engage the most students in educationally meaningful community service is through the classroom. Therefore, a central focus on enhancing civic-mindedness is through service learning.

Because service learning is curricular, the primary approach to increase service learning courses that are available to students has been through faculty development activities (Bringle & Hatcher, 1995; Bringle, Hatcher, & Games, 1997; Bringle, Hatcher, Jones, & Plater, 2007: Bringle, Games, Ludlum, Osgood, & Osborne, 2000) that were shaped primarily by the experiential learning theory of Kolb (1984). Accordingly, faculty development activities have included abstract conceptualization (e.g., lectures, workshops, symposia), active experimentation by faculty (e.g., Engaged Department Institutes, 3-year Engaged Department grants), concrete community-based experiences (e.g., participation in campus-wide community service activities, faculty displays at an annual Civic Engagement Showcase), and reflective activities by faculty (e.g., presenting at professional conferences, scholarship on service learning, conducting research on service learning).

Well-designed service learning courses are assumed to reflect qualities contained in the developmental models that produce a civically-oriented graduate. But do they? Faculty in some service learning courses have used the CMG Scale as a feedback mechanism. They have given the scale at the end of service learning courses and used the information to strengthen components of their courses so that they more evenly contribute to the different components of the CMG construct.

**Center for Service and Learning: Work in the Community**

IUPUI undergraduate students work at high levels (e.g., 15% work on campus; 57% indicated they work off campus; ~20% report holding two or more jobs) and significantly more than students at peer institutions. In addition, IUPUI surveys of students indicated that some are interested in community service that is compensated. Because work is so important to IUPUI’s undergraduate students and because research indicates that campus-based employment is related to increased student retention (Cermak & Filkins, 2004; Leonard, 2008), IUPUI created the Office of Community Work-Study within CSL to coordinate the use of Federal Work-Study (FWS) funds to support campus-related employment in the community.

Community Work-Study provides FWS-eligible students with a type of employment opportunity that emphasizes the civic aspects of their work in local non-profits and government agencies in roles that may traditionally be filled by volunteers. The opportunity to work in the community provides students with the ability to do service-related work while also receiving the funds they need to go to school. Community Work-Study does not involve students in “voluntary service,” because students receive financial compensation for their work. However, the arrangement creates a different relationship between the agency and the student from that of a volunteer (which is discretionary and can be easily terminated by the student) to one of an employee that entails accountability, sustained immersion in the organization, and an expectation of professionalism. The work performed, however, occurs in a service-related non-profit or government agency, giving students insight into organized community service and social issues. Many area non-profit organizations hire IUPUI work-study students who assist in coordinating or planning events that reach out and bring volunteers to that organization. By working in the community, students are able to learn about service and see public or non-profit sector work as a viable career option.

IUPUI commits nearly 33% of FWS funds to community service positions. Approximately 33% of those community service FWS funds support student tutors in the America Reads\*America Counts program, for which FWS funds 100% of their compensation. The America Reads\*America Counts experience provides students with more than just a job in the community. As part of this program, students regularly attend training sessions and participate in reflection on a weekly basis in order to connect their work-based activities to elements of the CMG.

Falling within the category of Morton’s (1995) second type of service (projects; implementing or participating in service programs through community service organizations), Community Work-Study gives students the opportunity to spend a semester or an academic year delving more deeply into a specific organization’s mission as well as the social issue the organization addresses. Working daily alongside staff members who are experts in a particular social issue can be a significant learning experience for a student and can encourage a student’s personal desire to engage in future service either as a community volunteer or through choosing a public service career—components of the CMG.

According to the Volunteer Functions Inventory (Clary et al., 1998), six functions are served through volunteer activity. One of those functions is Career. Understanding that clarification of vocational choices is one of six key motivators for volunteering, Community Work-Study not only allows students to participate in community service, but it does so in an environment that encourages examination of themselves and their future career and civic involvement.

**Center for Service and Learning: Co-Curricular Community Service Programs**

Due to IUPUI’s largely commuter-based student population, co-curricular volunteer programs have had to be shaped by not only the basic interests of these students but also pragmatic issues (school schedule, work schedule, family). In addition to a full course-load, many students at IUPUI hold at least one job. Therefore, the Office of Community Service in CSL has implemented several different ways for students to be able to participate in community service. One example is a student-run program called “Jaguars in the Streets” (JITS). Each month, JITS plans three to four volunteer activities for 10-50 students that focus around a common social issue. In order to offer as many students as possible the ability to volunteer, these events are held at several different times (e.g., some on a weekday during the lunch hour, others on weekends or evenings). Consistent with IUPUI students’ interest in one-time service events, CSL also offers large-scale days of community service each year, which are planned at different times and days of the week, like JITS activities. Through these community service activities, students have the opportunity to serve with 200 to 550 other students, staff, and faculty. These events are planned by students with staff support, affording students the opportunity to develop leadership and professional skills. To accommodate students without cars—many of whom are international students—on-campus volunteer opportunities are also offered. One benefit of IUPUI’s metropolitan location is that there are service sites within walking distance from campus that can be accessed by these students. Students who have children are accommodated at a location that either allows younger volunteers or creates other activities for children of volunteers. The Office of Community Service also provides opportunities for students to participate in Alternative Breaks each fall and spring, which allow students to become immersed in a social issue during the three to seven days of the trip by offering education, action through volunteering, and reflection.

To increase opportunities for students to become politically involved and focused on social change, IUPUI joined the American Democracy Project, coordinated by the American Association of Colleges and State Universities, and the Political Engagement Project, coordinated by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching and Learning. Both of these opportunities make more explicit the importance of civic learning to increase participation in democratic processes, political activities, and seeking social change.

Each of these programs is different, but one common thread that runs through them all is the strong emphasis placed on understanding and appreciating diversity and social justice by allowing students the opportunity to learn about who they are and how they can become change agents. Students are asked to evaluate and analyze who they are as a person and their privileges and oppressions. In doing this, they can comprehend how they are working for or against the betterment of others on various social issues. To help students come to these realizations, reflection activities and educational and interactive presentations that focus on a variety of topics (e.g., dominant and subordinated group patterns, responding to cross-cultural conflicts and triggering events) are built into some programs. These intentional programmatic components allow students to find their passion and explore their roles as social change agents. These aspects of programming also contribute to the goal of developing Civic-Minded Graduates by increasing students’ knowledge of contemporary social issues, improving communication skills across diverse populations, and strengthening self-efficacy to implement changes in society.

**Center for Service and Learning: Community-Based Scholarships**

Colleges and universities typically choose to honor predominately only two types of merit with student scholarships: academic excellence and athletic excellence. To reflect its strong commitment to civic engagement, IUPUI has allocated institutional scholarship funds to recognize students for community service. Named after a prominent Indianapolis community leader, the mission of the Sam H. Jones Community Service Scholarship program is (a) to recognize students for previous service to their high school, campus, or community; and (b) to support their continued involvement in educationally meaningful service in and with communities. Goals of the program are to retain students at IUPUI, support academic achievement and success, provide opportunities for involvement in community service, provide financial support, and promote leadership development. Over $400,000 of base institutional funds have been committed to fund two major programs: (a) students who, as part of the program, may take a service learning course, participate in community service, and organize events that involve other IUPUI students in community service; or (b) students who have successfully completed a service learning class and who are selected by an instructor as an assistant to support service learning course activities. Students receiving these scholarships provide important leadership to the campus and community, benefit their community partners through their service, develop strong community partnerships, and grow as students and persons. Each program strengthens components of the CMG framework and the intrinsic motivation of those students who have a commitment to community service.

**Center for Service and Learning: Community Partnerships**

Many faculty members and departments at IUPUI have examples of community partnerships that contribute to their teaching, research, or service activities. As a centralized unit, the Office of Neighborhood Partnerships in CSL was created to build long-term strategic partnerships with a specific geographic area in Indianapolis. Rather than being a “mile wide, but an inch deep” all over central Indiana, with the help of grants from the Department of Housing and Urban Development, a Community Outreach Partnership Center (COPC) was created to focus activities on the near-Westside neighborhoods adjacent to campus. The activities have focused on various community issues including re-establishing public schools in the neighborhoods, economic development, strengthening the neighborhood association, health issues, programs for youth and the elderly, and contributing to a neighborhood quality of life plan. When possible, CSL staff direct programming (e.g., service learning courses, volunteer activities, tutoring) toward these near-Westside neighborhoods.

The COPC activities contains many of the qualities that are exemplary of good civic engagement partnerships (Bringle, Clayton, & Price, 2009; Bringle, Officer, Grim, & Hatcher, 2009). For example, prior to the first HUD grant proposal, campus and community leaders began to forge relationships, conducted asset mapping of the community, and identified community issues for which a partnership was most appropriate. Community members have reported in two formal evaluations that the relationship between IUPUI and the near-Westside neighborhoods is developing qualities that have been identified as underlying good partnerships: (a) closeness, which is a function of frequency of interactions, diversity of interactions, and interdependency; (b) equity; and (c) integrity (Bringle et al., 2009; Bringle, Officer, et al., 2009).

As evidence of the success of this strategy to develop a sound partnership, the first school to re-open in the near-Westside neighborhood, George Washington Community High School, was awarded the Inaugural National Community School Award by the National Coalition for Community Schools in 2006 and was recognized by the Knowledge Works Foundation of Cincinnati, Ohio in 2004 as one of the nation’s best examples of a school as central to a community. In 2008, the U.S. Department of Education notified the school’s partners that they were one of ten community schools – the only one in the Midwest – to be awarded $2.4 million over five years in the nation’s first federal full-service community schools funding authorized by Congress. The grant’s 5-year evaluation is led by IUPUI’s Center for Urban and Multicultural Education.

Concentrating civic engagement activities in a geographic area and on particular themes provides faculty and students with many opportunities to deepen their understanding of a particular community, its social issues, and how responses are being planned and implemented. Students also become aware that other university groups are committed to activities to improve the quality of life in these neighborhoods. Through service learning courses, FWS-supported tutoring, volunteer activities, and faculty engagement in participatory research projects, students learn about the complexity of facing social issues in these neighborhoods, the progress that has been made and is being made through these activities, and the benefits of a model university-community partnership. In this way, the concept of concentrating activities in a geographic area contributes to community outcomes in meaningful ways and develops civic-minded graduates.

**Center for Service and Learning Programs and Civic-Minded Graduates**

Through service learning and other community-based courses, volunteer activities, the Jones scholarship programs, community-based work study, and developing strategic partnerships with the community, CSL has aspired to develop programs that contribute to the civic education of students as well as faculty and staff. Although each component of CSL programming was developed historically to meet its own particular goals, we now view CMG as an integrative aspiration for all programs focused on civic education. As a reflective exercise, each program has been periodically reviewed to determine if the CMG conceptual domain is still viewed as aligned with program goals and activities. This process has led to enhancement of many aspects of CSL’s current and future programming: (a) common understanding of and appreciation by the staff of the strengths of individual programs; (b) a delineation of knowledge, skills, and dispositions associated with civically-oriented programs; (c) development of assessment procedures (scale, narrative analysis with rubrics, interviews) to evaluate CMG (Steinberg et al., in press); (d) the capacity to evaluate CSL programs and provide feedback to coordinators for program improvements; (e) a framework for enhancing civic learning in service learning courses by more intentionally designing course activities in terms of CMG elements; (f) a procedure for obtaining institutional assessment of students’ civic outcomes across majors; (g) a way of communicating and discussing civic learning outcomes with various internal and external audiences; (h) a means for conducting research associated with civic growth that can evaluate components of developmental models as programmatic or mediating variables; (i) thinking and planning more intentionally and coherently about civic development; and (j) deepening partnerships with and contributions to the community (Bringle, Officer, et al., 2009). CMG has become the “north star” that guides the planning, implementation, and evaluation of all CSL programs and, potentially, all campus civic engagement activities.

Although the CMG was developed within the context of CSL programs, its implications are applicable to programs at other institutions of higher education that intend to contribute to civic growth. The diversity of CSL programs that provided a basis for the development of CMG (e.g., curricular, co-curricular) and the levels of analysis (individual, course, program, major, institution) that provided a contextual basis for its development all contribute to the generalizability of the work to other institutions. Furthermore, the developmental models that are aligned with CMG also provide a basis for program design and research that can contribute to understanding how individuals change over time. The nature of the CMG (e.g., how it encompasses a conceptual framework, measurement, guide to programming, developmental theories, basis for assessment and research) provides a model for how other educational goals (e.g., moral and ethical development, political involvement, international education) can be approached across diverse curricular and co-curricular programs.

The perspective of the CMG is focused on individual students; however, the developmental models each emphasize the importance of relationships in developing integration of the self with the student’s educational experiences and civic experiences. These relationships are important because they can enhance skills, knowledge, and empathy associated with working with diverse groups. Also, the analysis to date has focused primarily on the student’s experiences in individual courses or programs. An additional way of thinking about the developmental journey for students is how they can grow as a result of participating in a wide range of curricular and co-curricular activities that have the cumulative effect of increasing their engagement in the life of the campus and in the community. Considering how students can progressively enhance their self-awareness of their civic identity and their academic work as preparation for subsequent civic involvement after graduation makes salient the possibility of scaffolding programs sequentially in a coherent, integrated manner (Jameson, Clayton, & Bringle, 2008). When this is done, then assessment can consider additional ways of longitudinally capturing growth that operate at a level that works across programs and courses (e.g., student ePortfolios).

To date, most of the consideration concerning CMG has been focused on students; hence “graduate.” Building on this work, however, Hatcher (2007) developed a conceptual analysis and a scale to measure the Civic-Minded Professional, extending the analysis of civic-mindedness after graduation. One of the strengths of delineating components of civic-mindedness is that, even though it was developed with student growth and outcomes in mind, its applicability is not limited to students. Thus, civic-mindedness can be a developmental goal for constituencies other than students who are involved in service learning and civic engagement—for example, faculty, administrators, nonprofit staff, and community residents (Bringle et al., 2009). How can faculty, administrators, nonprofit staff, and community residents grow and develop as civic-minded individuals as a result of intentionally designed interventions? These could include formal programs (e.g., credit courses, continuing education), acquiring resources to support their growth (e.g., grant-funded program for strengthening a neighborhood association), creating opportunities for growth (e.g., grassroots organizing events for residents, collaborative grant writing for faculty), and developing infrastructure (e.g., community task force focused on a community issue). The design of any of these strategies can –and arguably should—involve the basic values of working with diverse others in a collaborative, democratic manner to produce growth in a way that reflects integrity (willing to recruit and work with others, commitment to making a difference across time and place, empathy for others, internalized). Furthermore, as appropriate, these strategies should each involve critical reflection as a means for generating civic learning and for capturing learning (Ash & Clayton, 2009; Ash et al., 2005). Determining how CLS programs can contribute to the deepening of civic-mindedness in each of these constituencies has interesting promise for broadening the examination of the developmental journey beyond students and for greatly enhancing planning new programs, revising existing programs, and evaluating civically-oriented work (Jameson et al., 2008).
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Figure 1.

Civic-Minded Graduate as a Function of the Identity, Educational Experiences, and Civic Experiences