THE UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA ASHEVILLE

FACULTY SENATE

Senate Document Number   SD3724S

Date of Senate Approval   04/04/2024

- -

Statement of Faculty Senate Action:

APC Document 30 (Key Center):   **Change Service-Learning to Community Engaged Learning;**
Change the criteria for Community Engaged Learning designation on courses;
Update the Explanations of Criteria for Community Engaged Learning Designated Courses;
Update the criteria for graduating with the designation of Community Engaged Scholar;
Update the Explanation of Community Engaged Scholars' Community Engaged Projects

Effective Date: Fall 2024

1. **Delete:**   in Senate Document 1911S, entry for **Appendix 1:**

    Appendix 1: Criteria for Service-Learning Designated Courses

    Service-learning courses have the following characteristics, which are based on best practices learned from research on service learning:

    1. The course has as a central feature a required service-learning project that strongly relates to the academic content of the course (i.e., it is not an add-on or afterthought, but rather is integral to the course and its goals) and makes up at least 25% of the course grade.

    2. The project is designed as a joint, equal effort between the faculty member and community partner (or partners), with a clear goal that students' involvement benefits the partner.

    3. The faculty member prepares students to undertake their service learning.

    4. Students regularly reflect on the service-learning experience.

    5. The course requires a *minimum* of five hours of service to the community for each credit hour (e.g., a three-credit course would require a minimum of 15 hours of work in the community).

    6. The professor, students, and community partner complete a pre-, mid- and post evaluation provided by the Key Center.

Add: in place of deleted entry:

Appendix 1: Criteria for Community Engaged Learning Designated Courses

Community engaged learning courses have the following characteristics, which are based on best practices learned from research and practice of community engaged learning:

1. The course has as a central feature a required community engaged learning project that strongly relates to the academic content of the course (i.e., it is not an add-on or afterthought, but rather is integral to the course and its goals) and makes up at least 20% of the course grade.

2. The project is designed as a joint, equal effort between the course instructor and community partner (or partners), with a clear goal that students' involvement benefits the partner.

3. The course offers opportunities for students to learn about and consider historic and contemporary root factors of social conditions and inequities addressed by the community engaged project.

4. The instructor prepares students to undertake their community engaged learning, which may include, but is not limited to assigning relevant readings and resources; engaging in exercises to strengthen interpersonal communication; reviewing roles and expectations; site-based visits/interactions; engaging in training in skill-development, etc.

5. The course includes adequate in-class and structured time for students to reflect upon, share, discuss, and articulate learning related to community engaged experiences, with each other, the instructor, and when possible, community partners.

6. The instructor, students, and community partner complete an assessment provided by the Key Center at the end of the semester.

Impact Statement: The anticipated impact of the above changes on designated course instructors and the Key Center is minimal. There is a small reduction of the course grade percentage (from 25% to 20%) related to community engaged learning activities and the hours requirement for a designated course has been removed. The changes should increase the likelihood that instructors will seek a community engaged learning designation for their course. There is a requirement that explicitly outlines content that should be addressed, related to root factors of societal conditions and inequities, which is typically part of a course in which students are learning about social issues, and so the burden on instructors will be minimal.

The remaining changes are clarifications or reflect changes in terminology that have a small change on resources. The move from SL to CEL will require changes by the registrar, including time to make the changes to the system and in assigning the designation as the transition takes place. There may be a slight increase in the number of courses that are designated and so there may be a small increase in the amount of time to review applications and to enter the designation to the courses in the registrar's systems.

Rationale: The updated requirements include changes in terminology and substance.

Changes in terminology:
1. "Community engaged learning" is the current term used in the community engagement field and is more holistic than service learning.
2. "Instructor" may include staff who teach designated courses, not just faculty.

Substantive changes:
1. The reduction of the minimum percentage of the grade made up by community engaged learning (from 25 to 20) is a small change that will make it easier for instructors to meet the requirement while maintaining engaged learning as a central course feature. Many institutions are now removing quantitative requirements such as this one but in a recent survey of UNCA course instructors and students, there was support for including some percentage of the final grade related to the community engaged learning activities.
2. Though the third requirement is new, it is documenting a course practice that has been implied and practiced in designated courses already. It is critical for student academic learning, and the future of civil society that students learn about the systemic inequities that they and their community partners are working to address. Course instructors may include assigned readings and media, presentations by community partners or community members, or other approaches to help students learn about, internalize, and discuss the root factors of social conditions and inequities that they will work collectively to address.
3. The fourth requirement now provides some examples of ways to prepare students for community engaged learning, which clarifies for the instructor what this requirement may entail.
4. Similarly, the fifth requirement now provides some more specifics about how critical reflection may take place.
5. The final requirement shifts the focus from a requirement to participate in pre- and post-evaluation to a requirement to participate in assessments, allowing for more flexibility in how those assessments may take place. The focus of an assessment is on understanding the process and impact rather than on measuring the course implementation against criteria. This shift more accurately reflects what is practically feasible and desirable. Program-level evaluation may take place periodically and would be separate from requirements for community engaged learning courses.

2. **Delete:**   in Senate Document 1911S, entry for **Appendix 2:**

Appendix 2: Explanations of Criteria for Service-Learning Designated Courses

1. The course has as a central feature a required service-learning project that strongly relates to the academic content of the course (i.e., it's not an add-on or afterthought, but rather integral to the course [theory, research, and/or practice of the course and its goals) and makes up at least 25% of the course grade.

   The centrality of service learning should be evident with a prominent placement in the syllabus, including in the course goals. The service-learning work should be explained as an integral part of the course in the syllabus. The ways that service learning relates to the academic content of the course also should be explicit and clear.

   As for grading, service learning should be academically rigorous. Courses give academic credit to students for learning derived from the service and not for the service alone, as academic credit is given for demonstrated learning. (Any service given to the community should be the top effort a student can give, or in other words "A" work or as close as the student can get to that level.) Thus, the course assesses the learning that students gained from their service. The assessments should account for a *minimum* of

25% of the students' grade. Such assessments can take the form of questions on an examination, academic papers, journals (if a rubric for grading is established), class participation, or other formats.

Most internship courses do not qualify as service learning. The aim of service-learning courses is to have students gain a richer knowledge of theories and academic content in a class, while benefiting the community, whereas an internship's primary goal is for students to get hands-on experience in a field.

2. The project is designed as a joint, equal effort between the faculty member and community partner (or partners), with a clear goal that students' involvement benefits the partner.

The partnership, for which planning typically should begin well before the course begins, should be equal in that the faculty members and community partners have ample opportunities to express their needs and desires for what students will do and how they will do it. (In this process, sometimes faculty and community members will realize that they are not well-matched partners and can avoid a negative outcome by not partnering.) It is vital to avoid the faculty member (or students) coming up with independent visions of what the community needs and then pushing those ideas without collaboration. As Porter Honnet and Poulsen (1989) wrote in their *Principles of Good Practice for Combining Service and Learning:* "An effective program allows for those with needs to define those needs." Good projects also consider people's strengths and possibilities for building on them. But whatever the nature of the project, the community members should define their needs and assets. Students' efforts thus work on matters the community has stated it wants addressed, in ways the community has stated it wants them addressed.

The faculty member's regular involvement with partners is crucial. Faculty members are more experienced and stable than students, and their communication with and availability to partners increases the possibility of longstanding, positive partnerships in which future students will be welcome. Faculty involvement also decreases the possibility of negative events, as well as the damage that occurs when negative events (e.g., an irresponsible student whose presence is detrimental to the agency) occur.

Student involvement in designing projects also is desirable, but given the brevity of a semester, it is not imperative. One way to involve students is to work before the semester begins with those who have enrolled in the course and are interested in helping design the service-learning experience. Another way is to have students in previous service-learning experiences provide feedback that helps improve and design experiences for future students. Even if students are not involved in planning the experience before the semester, faculty and community members should be receptive to student opinions and ideas as the project begins and takes shape.

It is desirable for faculty members, community members and students to sign a contract detailing responsibilities and expectations for each. This can help avoid misunderstandings and make it easier to solve any problems that arise.
A good goal, if possible, of service learning is to leave behind significant, demonstrable, and sustainable community benefits. If possible, the faculty member or students should assess community benefits during, and after, the service learning takes place.

Partnerships typically take place between the faculty member and a non-profit organization or governmental agency. Exceptions to that practice will be considered.

3. The faculty member prepares students to undertake their service learning. The overarching point is that faculty members should bear in mind that most students are novices in community work, and therefore benefit from guidance. Without it, there is the risk of negative experiences for students and community members with whom they work.

   This means discussing and providing readings on topics such as:
   · being professional representatives of the university and fitting in with the culture of their placements
   · respecting cultural norms of people different from themselves
   · understanding how students' cultural norms have influenced them and their views
   · understanding students' assumptions and expectations about service-learning as they head into the experience
   · being open to learning from community members (their supervisors and others)
   · understanding that change and progress on issues and problems usually takes time
   · understanding the role of reflection in service learning
   · understanding how they will bring their service into the classroom
   · understanding typical problems that can occur and solutions for them
   · understanding ethical considerations, such as confidentiality
   · understanding the agency where students will work, its role and place in the community

   One vital area to cover is risk assessment and management. Faculty members should assess any risks that students are likely to face and develop a plan for minimizing them. Part of that plan should include faculty members communicating regularly with students about risks or concerns they have.

   This does not mean that all risks have to be eliminated. Rather, it means that a project assessed as too risky might need alterations. It also means that students and faculty members should be in regular communication before and during service learning to ensure that no one's safety is in jeopardy.

4. Students regularly reflect on the service-learning experience.

   As Eyler and Giles (1999), emphasize, reflection is a critical element of good service learning. It should help students connect the service experience with academic content. It should be challenging, asking them to use critical thinking. It also should be regular, which typically means an average of at least one reflection activity at least every other week (which would mean a minimum of roughly six to eight in a semester in which the project lasted most of the course). Ideally, reflection begins before students enter the field, as that gives faculty members a chance to understand and address any concerns, anxieties, and other views students may have and address them as needed. A final reflection should occur after the work is done. Reflection also should give students a chance to learn from each other, as well as from the instructor and community partners.

   The reflection can be in multiple formats (e.g., class discussions, class activities, journals, papers, wikis). If graded, a rubric with clear criteria should be used.

5. The project requires a *minimum* of five hours of service to the community for each credit hour. Hence, a three-credit course would have a minimum of 15 hours of service.

Ideally, courses will go past this minimum. Although agencies vary, when students come for very short stints, the organization spends more time orienting the student than receiving service from him/her. The hours of service may be divided over a number of service sessions, at the discretion of the faculty member and the community partner. Faculty should try to ensure that the arrangement works well for the partner as well as for students. Service means work done directly for the partner; it does not mean journaling, paper writing for the course, or other academic parts of the project that do not directly benefit the partner.

6. The professor, students, and community partner complete a pre-, mid- and post evaluation provided by the Key Center. The results will be provided to professors, students, and, if appropriate, community partners. Professors and partners are welcome to do additional evaluations, but may not do their own in lieu of the Key Center evaluations. The evaluations are designed both to help professors keep their courses on track and understand ways to improve them, as well as help the university as a whole understand the overall impact of its service-learning efforts.

References

Eyler, J. & Giles, D. (1999). *Where's the learning in service-learning?* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Porter Honnet, E. & Poulsen, S. (1989). *Principles of good practice for combining service and learning.* Racine, WI: Johnson Foundation.

Add: in place of deleted entry:

Appendix 2: Explanations of Criteria for Community Engaged Learning Designated Courses

1. The course has as a central feature a required community engaged learning project that strongly relates to the academic content of the course (i.e., it is not an add-on or afterthought, but rather is integral to the course and its goals) and makes up at least 20% of the course grade.

The centrality of community engaged learning should be evident with a prominent placement in the syllabus, including in the course goals. The community engaged learning activities should be explained as an integral part of the course in the syllabus. The ways that service learning relates to the academic content of the course also should be explicit and clear.

As for grading, community engaged learning should be academically rigorous. Courses give academic credit to students for learning derived from the service and not for the service alone, as academic credit is given for demonstrated learning. (Any community engagement should be the top effort a student can give, or in other words "A" work or as close as the student can get to that level.) Thus, the course assesses the learning that students gained from their service. The assessments should account for a *minimum* of 20% of the students' grade. Such assessments can take the form of questions on an examination, academic papers, journals (if a rubric for grading is established), class participation, or other formats.

Most internship courses do not qualify as community engaged learning. The aim of community engaged learning courses is to have students gain a richer knowledge of theories and academic content in a class, while benefiting the community, whereas an internship's primary goal is for students to get hands-on experience in a field.

2. **The project is designed as a joint, equal effort between the course instructor and community partner (or partners), with a clear goal that students' involvement benefits the partner.**

The partnership, for which planning typically should begin well before the course begins, should be equal in that the instructors and community partners have ample opportunities to express their needs and desires for what students will do and how they will do it. (In this process, sometimes instructor and community members will realize that they are not well-matched partners and can avoid a negative outcome by not partnering.) It is vital to avoid the instructor (or students) coming up with independent visions of what the community needs and then pushing those ideas without collaboration. As Porter Honnet and Poulsen (1989) wrote in their *Principles of Good Practice for Combining Service and Learning:* "An effective program allows for those with needs to define those needs." Good projects also consider people's strengths and possibilities for building on them. But whatever the nature of the project, the community members should define their needs and assets. Students' efforts thus work on matters the community has stated it wants addressed, in ways the community has stated it wants them addressed.

The instructor's regular involvement with partners is crucial. Instructors' communication with and availability to partners increases the possibility of longstanding, positive partnerships in which future students will be welcome. Instructor involvement also decreases the possibility of negative events, as well as the damage that occurs when negative events (e.g., an irresponsible student whose presence is detrimental to the agency) occur.

Student involvement in designing projects also is desirable, but given the brevity of a semester, it is not imperative. One way to involve students is to work before the semester begins with those who have enrolled in the course and are interested in helping design the service-learning experience. Another way is to have students in previous service-learning experiences provide feedback that helps improve and design experiences for future students. Even if students are not involved in planning the experience before the semester, instructor and community members should be receptive to student opinions and ideas as the project begins and takes shape.

It is desirable for instructors, community members and students to sign a contract detailing responsibilities and expectations for each. This can help avoid misunderstandings and make it easier to solve any problems that arise. A good goal, if possible, of community engaged learning is to leave behind significant, demonstrable, and sustainable community benefits. If possible, the instructor or students should assess community benefits during, and after, the community engaged learning takes place.

Partnerships typically take place between the instructor and a non-profit organization or governmental agency. Exceptions to that practice will be considered.

3. **The course offers opportunities for students to learn about and consider historic and contemporary root factors of social conditions and inequities addressed by the community engaged project.**

Most non-profit and community-based organizations endeavor to reduce or eliminate inequities and improve social conditions, such as reducing the opportunity gap for students of color or improving access to quality health care for people who identify as transgender. These and other social conditions and inequities are rooted in historic and contemporary factors that include racism, classism, and other forms of discrimination, and have often manifested through major socio-political forces such as internal displacement of populations, enslavement, and colonialism. It is critical for student academic learning, and the future of civil society that students learn about and understand some of the root factors and forces involved in the social conditions and inequities that they are joining with community partners to work to address. Without this understanding and perspective, there is a greater likelihood of replicating oppressive logic and perpetuating inequities.

Course instructors may include assigned readings and media, presentations by community partner or community members, or other approaches to providing opportunities for students to learn about, and to internalize and discuss, when possible, the root factors of social conditions and inequities that they will work collectively to address.

4. **The instructor prepares students to undertake their community engaged learning, which may include, but not limited to: assigning relevant readings and resources; engaging in exercises to strengthen interpersonal communication; reviewing roles and expectations; engaging in training in skill-development, etc.**

This means discussing and providing readings on topics such as:
- being professional representatives of the university and fitting in with the culture of their placements
- respecting cultural norms of people different from themselves
- understanding how students' cultural norms have influenced them and their views
- understanding students' assumptions and expectations about community engaged learning as they head into the experience
- being open to learning from community members (supervisors and others)
- understanding that change and progress usually takes time
- understanding the role of reflection in community engaged learning
- understanding how they will bring their community engagement into the classroom
- understanding typical problems that can occur and solutions for them
- understanding ethical considerations, such as confidentiality
- understanding the agency where students will work, its role and place in the community
- learning skills necessary to carry out the activities for the community partner

One vital area to cover is risk assessment and management. Instructors should assess any risks that students are likely to face and develop a plan for minimizing them. Part of that plan should include instructors and students communicating regularly about risks or concerns they have.

5. **The course includes adequate in-class and structured time for students to reflect upon, share, discuss, and articulate learning related to community engaged experiences, with each other, the instructor, and when possible, community partners.**

As Eyler and Giles (1999), emphasize, reflection is a critical element of good service learning. It should help students connect the service experience with academic content. It should be challenging, asking them to use critical thinking. It also should be regular, which typically means an average of at least one reflection activity at least every other week (which would

mean a minimum of roughly six to eight in a semester in which the project lasted most of the course). Ideally, reflection begins before students enter the field, as that gives instructors a chance to understand and address any concerns, anxieties, and other views students may have and address them as needed. A final reflection should occur after the work is done. Reflection also should give students a chance to learn from each other, as well as from the instructor and community partners.

The reflection can be in multiple formats (e.g., class discussions, class activities, journals, papers, wikis). If graded, a rubric with clear criteria should be used.

6. **The instructor, students, and community partner complete an assessment provided by the Key Center at the end of the semester.**

    End-of-semester assessments provide valuable information about the perceived benefits and challenges of community engaged learning activities. This information may be utilized by course instructors and summarized and shared with the public and key leaders by the Key Center, demonstrating impact and value of community engaged learning.

<div align="center">References</div>

Eyler, J. & Giles, D. (1999). *Where's the learning in service-learning?* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Porter Honnet, E. & Poulsen, S. (1989). *Principles of good practice for combining service and learning.* Racine, WI: Johnson Foundation.

Impact: There is little to no anticipated impact of updating the explanations above. It may take some time to update processes and communicate the new information and then after that we anticipate that the impact will be positive, reducing burden on instructors and increasing marginally the number of courses that will be community engaged learning designated. As such, there may be a slight increase in the registrar's time to change and assign CEL designation.

Rationale: The rationale for making the changes to the requirements was provided in the previous section. The explanations here update the rationale for the updated requirements. There are some shifts in language in this section to reflect assets-based framing, such as shifting from "problems" to "conditions".

3. **Delete:**   in Senate Document 1911S, entry for **Appendix 3:**

    Appendix 3: Criteria for Graduating with the Designation of Community Engaged Scholar

    Students who graduate as Community Engaged Scholars must:

    1. Complete at least six academic credit hours in Service-Learning Designated Courses, with a minimum grade of B- in each course.

    2. Take a workshop at the Key Center on best practices in service learning. This must be completed before undertaking the Public Service Project (described below). The student must pass a quiz after the workshop with a grade of 70% correct or higher.

3. Complete a Public Service Project for a community organization. [See Appendix 4 for more information on the project.]

Add: in place of deleted entry:

Appendix 3: Criteria for Graduating with the Designation of Community Engaged Scholar

Students who graduate as Community Engaged Scholars must:

1. Complete at least six academic credit hours in Community Engaged Learning Designated Courses, with a minimum grade of B- in each course.

2. Take a workshop at the Key Center on best practices in community engaged learning. This must be completed before undertaking the Community Engaged Project (described below).

3. Complete a Community Engaged Project for a community organization. [See Appendix 4 for more information on the project.]

Impact: The impact of changing the name of the project from public service project to community engaged project is minimal, including mostly making changes in the communication materials. The impact of removing the requirement of the workshop quiz grade is positive since it reduces the burden on Key Center staff to administer and keep track of a quiz and results.

Rationale: The change in name of the project from public service project to community engaged project aligns it with other materials and processes for the students, including the title of Community Engaged Scholar. The quiz and grade requirement was not useful as they do not reflect a student's ability to understand the process or predict the success of the project.

4. **Delete:**   in Senate Document 1911S, entry for **Appendix 4:**

Appendix 4: Explanation of Community Engaged Scholars' Public Service Projects

The Public Service Project is usually the final work students undertake in becoming a Community Engaged Scholar. The project must have the student work on a problem, issue or need in the community via an effort involving the student's academic expertise. The project must be developed as a collaboration between the student and community, with each side working as partners. Students should become experts on the problems on which they are working by the end of their projects. Students should strive to create projects having sustainable impacts that do not depend on their continued presence.

The project must follow either the:

A. Product model: Students create a product (e.g., work of art, video, ad campaign, documentary, software, database, handbook or manual) for a group or agency, with the goal of solving a problem or helping the organization with its mission. Community members can create the product with students (e.g., children and a college student paint a mural), but this is not required.

or the

B. Community-Based Research model: Students conduct archival research (e.g., reviewing scientific literature or existing documents) and/or collect and analyze data for an agency, with the goal of understanding a problem or how well the organization is doing in its efforts to combat a problem. Typically, students write a final report on findings for the agency.

A project that does not fall into the above categories may be used if the student writes a brief proposal for his or her project. Such proposals, which should be written after consultation with the Key Center, must be approved in advance of the project by the Key Center Advisory Council.

Because the project must be both beneficial to the community and academically rigorous, the student must have a faculty and community agency advisor. The student must complete a brief form describing the project and obtain the signatures of both the faculty and community agency advisors. To avoid problems and promote good outcomes, it is desirable that both advisors come into contact with each other at regular intervals. The form must be on file with the Key Center before the project begins. The form must be completed whether or not the project is done in a course.

After the project is complete, students must write a report on their project that is a minimum of 10 double-spaced pages. The report, which begins with an abstract, should explain the project's origins, the methods and work undertaken, how the work ties to the student's academic field(s), challenges faced and methods used to deal with them, the results, the likelihood of sustainability of the work, and a conclusion discussing implications of the project for the community partner and for the student's field of study. The papers are published in a Key Center journal. If the project involves writing a report for the agency or class, parts of it may be adapted for the Key Center report, but such reports may not be copied or extensively quoted for the Key Center journal paper.

The community advisor, academic advisor and department chair must endorse the student's completed product. The report and overall project also must be approved by a UNCA faculty member who was not the student's advisor.

Finally, students must publicly present their project at an end-of-semester service-learning poster session on campus. Multiple presentations (e.g., for the agency or others in the community) are encouraged.

The project may be completed as part of a course, but the course cannot be one of the courses used to complete the first requirement of becoming a Community Engaged Scholar (i.e., two Service-Learning Designated Courses). The course in which a Public Service Project originates does not have to be a Service-Learning Designated Course. If the work is done for a course, the final grade on the project must be a B- or higher.

The project may be done with a partner or partners if all partners are UNCA students. In the case of partnerships, each partner must write a separate report for the Key Center. Each partner also must do a separate presentation, or each must have a major role in a single presentation.

The project may not be used to complete other university requirements (e.g., a thesis or project required for the student's major). Thus, it cannot be a duplicate or mostly unrevised work from a previous effort. It also cannot be duplicated or revised slightly for credit on a

subsequent project. However, the project may grow out of the student's previous academic work or service, and it may lead to subsequent academic projects or service efforts.

Add: in place of deleted entry

Appendix 4: Explanation of Community Engaged Scholars' Community Engaged Projects

The **Community Engaged** Project is usually the final work students undertake in becoming a Community Engaged Scholar. The project must have the student work on a problem, issue or need in the community via an effort involving the student's academic expertise. The project must be developed as a collaboration between the student and community, with each side working as partners. Students should become experts on the topics on which they are working by the end of their projects. Students should strive to create projects having sustainable impacts that do not depend on their continued presence.

The project must follow either the:

A. Product model: Students create a product (e.g., work of art, video, ad campaign, documentary, software, database, handbook or manual) for a group or organization, with the goal of solving a problem or helping the organization with its mission. Community members can create the product with students (e.g., children and a college student paint a mural), but this is not required.

     or the

B. Community-Based Research model: Students conduct archival research (e.g., reviewing scientific literature or existing documents) and/or collect and analyze data for an organization, with the goal of understanding a topic or condition or how well the organization is doing in its efforts to address an issue. Typically, students write a final report on findings for the organization.

A project that does not fall into the above categories may be used if the student writes a brief proposal for his or her project. Such proposals, which should be written after consultation with the Key Center, must be approved in advance.

Because the project must be both beneficial to the community and academically rigorous, the student must have a faculty and community organization advisor. The student must complete a brief form describing the project and obtain the signatures of both the faculty and community organization advisors. To avoid problems and promote good outcomes, it is desirable that both advisors come into contact with each other at regular intervals. The form must be on file with the Key Center before the project begins. The form must be completed whether or not the project is done in a course.

After the project is complete, students must write a paper on their project that is 8-10 double-spaced pages. The paper, which begins with an abstract, should explain the project's origins, the methods and work undertaken, how the work ties to the student's academic field(s), the challenges faced and the methods used to deal with them, the results, the likelihood of sustainability of the work, and a conclusion discussing implications of the project for the community partner and for the student's field of study. The papers are published in a Key Center journal. If the project involves writing a report for the organization or class, parts of it

may be adapted for the Key Center journal paper, but such reports may not be copied or extensively quoted for the Key Center journal paper.

The community advisor and faculty advisor must endorse the student's completed project. The paper also must be reviewed by a UNCA faculty member or Key Center director who was not the student's advisor.

Finally, students must publicly present their project at an end-of-semester community engaged learning poster session on campus. Multiple presentations (e.g., for the organization or others in the community) are encouraged.

The project may be completed as part of a course, but the course cannot be one of the courses used to complete the first requirement of becoming a Community Engaged Scholar (i.e., two Community Engaged Learning Designated Courses). The course in which a project originates does not have to be a Community Engaged Learning Designated Course. If the work is done for a course, the final grade on the project must be a B- or higher.

The project may be done with a partner or partners if all partners are UNCA students. In the case of partnerships, each partner must write a separate paper for the Key Center. Each partner also must do a separate presentation, or each must have a major and distinct role in a single presentation.

The project may not be used to complete other university requirements (e.g., a thesis or project required for the student's major). Thus, it cannot be a duplicate or mostly unrevised work from a previous effort. It also cannot be duplicated or revised slightly for credit on a subsequent project. However, the project may grow out of the student's previous academic work or service, and it may lead to subsequent academic projects or service efforts.

Impact: The impact of changing the name of the project from public service project to community engaged project is minimal, including mostly making changes in the communication materials. The substantive changes reduce paperwork and streamline processes so hopefully will have a positive impact on resources. The remaining changes are primarily shifts in wording and do not have an impact on resources, after updating communication materials.

Rationale: There are three updates to terminology in this section and four substantive changes.

Changes in terminology:
1. "Community engaged learning" is the more current term used in the community engagement field and is more holistic than service learning.
2. "Organization" (rather than "agency") is consistent with other community engaged materials and reflects better the types of entities with which students work.
3. "Paper" (rather than "report") better reflects the type of document that students create for the Key Center journal.

Substantive changes:
1. The project will no longer need to be approved at application stage by the Key Center advisory committee. Since project applications are accepted on a rolling basis, it is challenging to respond quickly and to respect the time of advisory committee members. The advisory committee members do review the papers, which has a more structured timeline.
2. The project will no longer need to be endorsed by the department chair. The department chair would not typically be involved until this last step, and it is more of an endorsement that both the faculty advisor and community advisor sign off at the end of the project.

3. The paper guidelines will now be 8-10 pages rather than a minimum of 10 pages. This takes into account that this is a mostly reflective paper that, while still requiring academic rigor and integrated scholarly references, is focused on the content and learning.
4. When students work in partners or teams, each student's contribution to the final presentation should be distinct, not just major, so as to be able to clearly identify the work of each student.