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The Impact of Community Service Learning on Community Partners
An Assessment Study

Executive Summary

Introduction

In 1997, San Francisco State University (SF State) established the Office of Community Service Learning (OCSL) in order to provide opportunities for faculty to incorporate CSL into the undergraduate curriculum. In 1998, principles of best practice were created in order to guide future community/university partnerships. In 2003, the OCSL conducted a study to determine the impact of the work SF State students had on community-based organizations (CBOs), and to determine if the program continued to meet the guiding principles developed in 1998. It was very important for our assessment to understand how community partners perceived the work SF State students performed at their organizations, and how student work impacted their operations in order to identify needed improvements in our program and to strengthen community/university partnerships.

Surveys were mailed and numerous focus groups were held with community partner directors or coordinators. Organizations and their leaders were currently engaged in partnerships with SF State faculty teaching community service learning courses (CSL).

Profile of Organizations

CBOs were randomly selected to participate in the survey and focus groups. Surveys were sent to 117 community partners. Fifty-two percent (52%) of those responding had been working with SF State faculty for one to three years; 43% over three years, and 5% under one year. Thirty-three percent (33%) of those responding were social service organizations, 26% were in education; 26% were in health related fields; 7% were agencies working on housing/tenant issues; 4% were environmental organizations; and 4% were organizations that did not meet the above criteria.

Principal Findings

Overall, respondents are extremely satisfied with the quality of SF State student interns. Ninety-two percent (92%) of survey respondents and 100% of the focus group respondents indicated that the micro-level benefits of having an intern significantly improved the quantity and quality of services the organization offered and increased the number of clients served. Other benefits included a renewed sense of creativity and energy from active involvement of SF State in the community, and a bridging of theory and practice.

The long-term, macro-level impact of community service learning in the community was that it: helped leverage grant funding; maintained nonprofit status by utilizing volunteers; and created the perception that attending college was possible for everyone.
Challenges: Respondents indicated that the primary challenge was the demand upon staff time (25%), followed by insufficient project time and little contact with faculty (13% respectively). Focus group respondents ported that the primary challenge of community service learning for them was the need for better communication between the community partner and SF State faculty (80%). Other concerns were that CBOs experienced confusion about their role as community partners, the role of SF State faculty, and students’ learning expectations. Overall, 91% of those responding to the survey indicated that they would continue using SF State students.

Having an SF State intern could make a big difference: it may be one day sooner that a life can be saved...that intern, in whatever small way, is responding to a whole family, and to a community by putting band-aids on sores of major injuries...the more band-aids, the quicker [the wound] heals.

(Program Coordinator of a Free Clinic and Suicide Hotline)

I. INTRODUCTION

The Institute for Civic and Community Engagement (ICCE) at San Francisco State University (SF State) works with SF State faculty to incorporate Community Service Learning (CSL) into the undergraduate curriculum and coordinates community service learning activities on campus. CSL encourages the university to become actively engaged in the community and to join with its community partners in developing solutions to complex problems. ICCE works with community partners to develop appropriate placements for students, depending on community needs and resources.

What is Community Service Learning? CSL is the range of pedagogies that link academic study with community service and provides opportunities for structured reflection on the relationships between theory and experience. The goals of CSL are to provide students with practical work experiences, a sense of civic responsibility, and a deeper understanding of the problems facing the communities in which they live. For students, community service learning contributes to civic and moral understanding, to the development of individual and collective social responsibility, and to the enrichment of professional learning by giving students experience in the world of work. In Academic Year 03-04, when this assessment was conducted, there were 50 departments in all seven SF State colleges that participated in this initiative.

What impact do community service learning student volunteers have on organizations and their clients? In recent years, there had been concern in higher education institutions on how to build effective and sustainable partnerships between community organizations and their institutions. Many studies have provided programs with guidelines, strategies and assessment tools. When the former Office of Community Service Learning (OCSL) was first established at what was then called the Urban Institute, it was recognized that an effective and sustainable service learning program depended on mutually beneficial partnerships between campus and community. Therefore, in 1998, a cadre of faculty developed principles on how to develop mutually beneficial placements for CSL students.
In 2003, the OCSL organized a study to measure the impact of community service learning on community partners. Much of the research at that time focused on measuring the benefits of community service learning for students and educational institutions, but few studies had been conducted on the impact community service learning had on its community partners. The following report describes the findings from this comprehensive assessment.

Results indicated that the Institute met most of its goals in developing reciprocal and mutually beneficial partnerships. Ninety-two percent (92%) of community partners who responded to our survey indicated that having a student intern significantly improved the quantity and quality of the services they were able to offer, and increased the number of clients served. Other benefits included a renewed sense of creativity and energy to the organization, an active involvement of SF State in the community, thereby building a bridge between theory and practice. More importantly, the long-term, macro-level impact of community service learning in the community was that it helped leverage grant funding for service expansion and improvement; helped organization maintain their nonprofit status through the use of volunteers, and as one community partner said, “SF State students are creating a norm among community members that attending college, particularly SF State, is possible for everyone regardless of their socioeconomic status.”

The two most important challenges reported were the demand upon staff time to supervise students, and the need for better communication between the community partner and SF State faculty. Recent surveys conducted in the State of California clearly indicate that grassroots organizations are facing difficult challenges, such as cuts in State and federal funding, while they are facing a 10% increase in demand for services from previous years. Supervising students, therefore, becomes another burden for those over-extended individuals. Respondents reported that better communication with faculty was imperative, especially since they were unclear about expectations regarding student learning outcomes and time requirements.

Based on feedback, the following program recommendations were made:

- The Institute’s website will be restructured to improve student, faculty, and community partners’ understanding of CSL. We will provide more information about SF State departments that refer students into the community (Completed 2005).
- Formal relationships will be developed with our community partners and faculty will be required to use student learning plans for a clear understanding of student learning outcomes, time requirements, and faculty expectations. (Completed in 2006)
- A one-day stakeholder orientation for community partners will take place every summer.
- If possible, funding opportunities will be sought to develop mutually beneficial volunteer management systems at community partners’ sites. (Completed in 2007)
- A newsletter will be developed in order to improve communication among stakeholders.
II. METHODOLOGY

Survey

The survey used was taken from an assessment model developed by Gelmon, Holland, Driscoll, Spring and Kerrigan (Assessing Service-Learning and Civic Engagement: Principles and Techniques, 2001). Modifications were made to better capture the focus of our assessment needs. The survey consisted of 18 questions designed to measure CSL’s impact on the capacity of our partners to meet their organizational mission, and to ascertain areas where programmatic improvement was needed in our CSL program. One hundred seventeen (117) surveys were mailed to community partners during the fall of 2002, and responses were received in the spring, 2003. Seventy-six percent of surveys were returned by community partners (n = 89 or 76%).

Focus Group

Invitations to attend focus group meetings were mailed to 154 agencies. Seventeen agencies responded to the survey during the months of April and May 2003. Five disciplines were represented in the study: Arts and Humanities; Health and Social Services; Education; Urban Studies and Housing; and Criminal Studies and Safety. Approximately one-half of the respondents participated in focus groups; remaining respondents participated in one-on-one interviews. All focus groups and interviews were held at the SF State campus and one interview was conducted by phone. OCSC developed the assessment questions, as well as the recruitment, selection, and organization of the focus groups. An Evaluation Consultant conducted the focus groups, did the analysis and reported on the assessment. The appendices contain the survey and focus group questions used in this study.

III. FINDINGS

The following report is organized in the following areas:

- Benefits
- Challenges
- Impact

**BENEFITS OF COMMUNITY SERVICE LEARNING**

Respondents agreed that the benefits of having SF State students at their sites far outweighed the challenges. The most important benefits were working directly with students; student dedication and commitment; recruitment of new staff; and additional resources for coordinators/staff.
1. Increase Organization’s Capacity to Fulfill Its Mission

CSL students increased the capacity of organizations to provide services to their clients. Thirty-two percent (32%) of respondents reported that students enhanced their services; 17% indicated that using students increased the numbers of clients served by their organizations; 12% felt that students developed new connections/networks with other community groups; 11% felt that CSL increased their ability to leverage other financial resources; and 10% indicated that they gained new insights about their organization’s operations.

Similar questions were asked in the focus groups; however, CBOs felt that additional benefits not included in the survey should be mentioned, such as:

- The building of formal linkages between the university and the community;
- The new ideas, creativity, and energy students brought to the organization; and
- The sharing of knowledge, skills, and current research.

![Figure 1. How did your interaction with the CSL program influence your capacity to fulfill the mission of your organization?](image)

2. Economic Effects of Working with the CSL Program

Twenty-six percent (26%) of the CBOs indicated that they were able to attract additional volunteers, and 20% felt that the relationship with SF State increased their organizational resources. Other responses indicated that CBOs perceived that services had greater value; projects were completed; they were able to identify new staff for their agencies; and they were able to access university technology and academic resources.

Focus group members remarked that CSL was significant was the community agencies because it directly affected their ability to continue providing services, especially during hard economic times when more people need already scarce services and resources. Respondents also indicated that CSL helped leverage much needed grant funding. In-kind resources, especially from an institution of higher
education, demonstrate a collaborative effort that may help to sustain services well after a grant period ends. In addition, many nonprofit agencies are required to utilize volunteers to maintain their nonprofit status. Over two-thirds of respondents reported that a formalized, regular influx of SF State students helped them in that regard. The long-term outcome of this impact is an increase in the quality and quantity of services a CBO can provide, thereby increasing the number of clients they serve.

Figure 2. What are some of the economic effects of your work with the CSL program?

In the next five questions, community partners were asked to rank their satisfaction with several aspects of our program. In this section, 22% of respondents did not complete the survey.

3. Communication with Students and Faculty

Respondents were asked to rank their satisfaction of overall communication with students and faculty. Thirty-seven percent indicated that they were satisfied, while 22% indicated that they were very satisfied. Although 2% of the respondents indicated that they were very dissatisfied, this is not consistent with findings from the focus groups. Eighty percent (80%) of those attending the focus groups reported that the primary challenge of CSL was the need for better communication between community partners and SF State faculty. Post analysis indicated that the CBOs thought they had very little communication with faculty after the student was placed at the site. Further discussion about this can be found under “Challenges.” In the future, this question should be asked separately to determine if dissatisfaction might be either with one group or with both groups.

Figure 3. Rate level of satisfaction with overall communication with students and faculty.
4. **Satisfaction with Level and Quality of Interaction with Students and Faculty**

Respondents were asked to comment on their satisfaction with the level and quality of interactions with students and faculty. Thirty-seven percent (37%) responded that they were satisfied and 24% indicated that they were very satisfied. Again, in future assessments, this question should be separated into two separate questions.

![Figure 4. Rate level of satisfaction with level and quality of interaction with students and faculty.](image)

5. **Satisfaction with Quality of Student Work**

We wanted to know how the CBOs perceived the quality of the students’ work. Forty-one percent (41%) said that they were very satisfied and 26% were satisfied.

![Figure 5. Rate level of satisfaction with quality of student work.](image)

6. **Satisfaction with Scope and Timing of Activity**

The graph below illustrates how satisfied the respondents were with scope and timing of CSL activities. Twenty percent (20%) indicated that they were very satisfied, 19% satisfied, and 2% not satisfied. Some
of the CBOs that expressed dissatisfaction wanted students to start earlier and end their placements later in the semester. This area of concern was articulated at the inception of the program, demonstrating a lack of understanding about the limitations of semester-based courses.

Figure 6. Rate level of satisfaction with scope and timing of activity.

7. Logistics of CSL Placement

Figure 7 depicts who handled the logistics of placing CSL students. Forty percent (40%) said that the CBO and faculty collaborated on making the arrangements; 28% indicated that students made the arrangements; 9% indicated that the faculty made the arrangements; and 4% said that the agency was responsible for logistical placements. Since faculty and organizations collaborated on making site placements, the lack of communication reported earlier between faculty and agencies under "Challenges," likely occurred after the placement was made.

Figure 7. How did you handle the logistics of your CSL placements?
8. Level of Trust with Faculty and Students

Community agencies were asked about their level of trust with faculty and students. As many studies indicate, this issue is extremely important since trust is essential for developing sustainable community/university partnerships. In Figure 8, thirty percent (30%) indicated that they were very satisfied with levels of trust, and 20% were satisfied.

![Figure 8. Rate level of satisfaction with level of trust with faculty and students.]

9. Community Partner Influence

When asked in which ways they believed they were able to influence the university as a result of their connection with the CSL course, 52% of respondents thought they influenced student learning; 29% thought they influenced faculty by making them more aware of community needs; and 8% felt they influenced course content. No one (0%) thought that they had influenced university policies.

![Figure 9. In what ways do you believe that you are able to influence the University as a result of your connection with a CSL course?]

---

1 Building Sustainable Partnerships, Linking Communities and Educational Institutions, National Society for Experiential Education, Sigmon, Robert L. Learnings from NSEE’s National Community Development Program (1996-1998) Page 7
10. Awareness of SF State Resources

Respondents were asked how their awareness of University programs and resources had changed as a result of their connection to the CSL course. Thirty-nine percent (39%) indicated they learned more about SF State academic programs after the CSL course; 19% indicated they knew who to contact for information and assistance; and 10% said they had an increased knowledge of University resources.

Figure 10. As a result of your connection to a CSL course, how has your awareness of the University changed?

CHALLENGES OF COMMUNITY SERVICE LEARNING

Community partners, in both the survey and focus groups, responded that they had similar challenges. CBOs responding to our survey were asked what their most important challenge was to hosting a CSL student. Respondents (25%) indicated that demand upon staff time was their greatest challenge. In the focus groups, respondents said that their organizations lacked the resources (space, money, and time to hire additional staff) to supervise interns. All respondents expressed a need and desire for more SF State students to participate at their sites, but given the current economic environment and increased community needs, they did not have the time to recruit them.

Communication with faculty was also a challenge. In the survey, 13% indicated that they had very little contact with faculty. However, in the focus groups the percentage was higher—80%. In our survey, 41% reported that they collaborated with faculty in making placement arrangements (see Benefit Section, #7 for more details); therefore, the lack of communication between the CBOs and faculty possibly surfaced after the placement had taken place.
Another challenge reported in the survey was insufficient project time (13%). Community partners would like to have interns at their sites earlier, and for longer periods of time. CBOs, especially those providing tutoring services, offered their services earlier in the semester than SF State students were able to participate and that created a volunteer shortfall early on.

Figure 11. What are some of the challenges you encountered?

Consistent with UCLA’s findings (1999)\(^2\), respondents in our focus group reported feeling “disconnected” from SF State faculty as the one of the challenges of community service learning. They felt that a more formalized relationship would help.

One surprising challenge was **Student Demographics**. In the focus groups, CBOs said that participating CSL students did not match the ethnic, linguistic, and socioeconomic needs of the populations they served. One CBO that runs an after-school program for middle and high school students in the Western Addition neighborhood of San Francisco remarked that her kids “need mentors who can empathize with the challenges they face...[they are] black, young and most of their dads are in prison...they need someone just like them to show them they can go to college too.”

SF State student body demographics closely match the demographics of San Francisco. In Academic Year 2002-03, SF State undergraduate demographics were as follows: American Indian 0.8%; Pacific Islanders 1%; African American 7.1%; Chicano-Mexican American 7.5%; Other Hispanic/Latino 7.2%; Filipino 11.7%; Asian American 29.4%; White Non-Hispanic 31.2%; Female 60.7%; and Male 39.3%. Since we do not know which students elect to take the CSL option, we cannot predict or assign students who will match the diversity of CBO clientele. Anecdotal data indicates that the students who generally participate in CSL are mostly Caucasian women.

---

\(^2\) In 1999, a survey was conducted by The UCLA Higher Education Research Institute Service-Learning Clearinghouse Project, a partner organization of the Learn and Serve America National Service-Learning Clearinghouse, to gather information about community service learning needs. They conducted an electronic survey that was administered to grantees of the Corporation for National Service (CNS) to determine the needs of service-learning practitioners in colleges and universities nationwide.
IMPACT ON OTHERS

During focus group sessions, community partners were asked what impact CSL had on their agencies. On a micro-level, they described a plethora of benefits that CSL had, not only on their organizations and the communities in which they served, but also to the students and SF State. Respondents listed numerous benefits to all stakeholders: the following are themes that arose throughout data collection.

Micro-Level Impacts

A. Benefits to the Community Partners and Community Members
   - Active involvement of higher education institutions in the community;
   - Sharing of knowledge, skills, and current research;
   - Able to serve more clients without having to expend dwindling resources;
   - Increased meaningful service in the community; and
   - SF State students acted as role models for clients, i.e., “Each student leaves the client with a very important message: that education is very valuable and is possible for everyone.”

   Respondents overwhelmingly agreed that partnering with institutions of higher education creates this norm.

B. Benefits to the Student
   - Transfer knowledge and skills learned in the classroom to a real –world setting (connect theory with practice);
   - Exposure to a variety of occupations with their field;
   - Awareness of the needs of the community;
   - Development of work ethics within an academic setting;
   - Ability to problem solve and think critically (find solutions); and
   - Fosters a commitment to community involvement.

C. Benefits to the University and Faculty
   - Connection to current community issues and needs;
   - Active involvement with community agencies and efforts;
   - Develops a formal process of civic engagement; and
   - Impacts communities in need.

This is consistent with survey findings. Thirty-two percent (32%) of respondents indicated that their services had been enhanced because of the CSL students. Seventeen percent (17%) indicated that they were able to serve more clients.

Long Term Benefits

- CSL helps leverage much needed grant funding. In-kind resources, especially from institutions of higher education, demonstrate a collaborative effort that may help to sustain services well after a grant period ends. The number of CSL volunteers was also used to continue their nonprofit status. The long-term outcome of this impact is an increase in the quality and quantity of services community programs can provide, as well as the number of clients served.
• Encourages community building and builds strong linkages. Student commit to understanding and serving the needs of the community; faculty provide a forum for bridging theory and practice; and the community partner provides an important entré into the community. Together, these three entities become well positioned to build strong linkages to improve services and improve the quality of life for community members.

• SF State students can act as role models.

The above macro-level benefits are viewed as particularly significant for CBOs as they directly affect their ability to continue providing services to the community, especially during hard economic times when resources are scarce.

IV. CONCLUSIONS

Participating community based organizations overwhelmingly agreed that partnering with SF State’s CSL program added value to their mission and to local stakeholders, especially community members served.3 Survey results indicated that SF State’s CSL program is meeting most of its goals of developing reciprocal and mutually beneficial partnerships. Overall, respondents were extremely satisfied with the quality of SF State student interns. Ninety-two percent (92%) of survey respondents and 100% of focus group members indicated that the micro-level benefits of having an intern significantly improved the quantity and quality of services CBOs were able to offer and increased the number of clients they were able to serve. Other benefits included a renewed sense of creativity and energy within organizations, active involvement of SF State within the community, and a bridging of theory and practice.

More importantly, respondents reported that the long-term, macro-level impact of community service learning in the community was that it helped leverage grant funding for service expansion and improvement; maintained nonprofit status through the use of CSL volunteers; and created a norm among community members that attending college, particularly SF State, was possible for everyone, regardless of their socioeconomic status.

3 In September 2002, the Council of Independent Colleges, an association of 500 colleges and universities, in cooperation with the Consortium of the Advancement of Private Higher Education’s Engaging Communities and Campuses Grant program convened 21 leaders of community organizations from the around the country. The goals of the meetings were to document perceptions of their experience in maintaining partnerships between community organizations and higher education institutions. Results of this assessment survey were very consistent with OCSL assessment results.
The two most important challenges were the demands on staff time to supervise students, and the need for better communication with faculty. However, 91% of the community partners also indicated that despite the challenges associate with CSL, they would continue utilizing SF State students in their programs.

Figure 12. Will you continue to use SF State students?

V. RECOMMENDATIONS

The following recommendations were suggested in order to mitigate some of the most pressing challenges encountered in this partnership.

- **Restructure the OCSL website to improve communication and to better match students and faculty with community agencies.** It was clear that faculty, students, and CBOs rely on OCSL’s Community Connections Database to identify appropriate internship opportunities. By developing an interactive, online resource that contains detailed information about participating SF State departments and community agencies, OCSL can improve the efficiency of student searches and facilitate mutually satisfactory placements. (Completed in 2005)

- **Develop a newsletter,** which will not only increase the visibility of CSL, but also improve communication among stakeholders.

- **Formalize and facilitate relationships between SF State departments and CSL organizations.** A formal relationship will clarify expectations and better match students with appropriate sites.
• Continue with the planning and implementation of a one-day stakeholder orientation for community service learning agencies. One of the challenges when working with community partners is that there is often a chasm between the (unrealized) expectations and (mis)understandings of the community partners and the services/resources the University can provide. There are many reasons for this misunderstanding, such as the constant changing of volunteer coordinators and/or staff. It is important, therefore, that CSL offices clarify abilities and expectations, ensure that students and faculty work closely with community liaisons to develop genuine understandings of each other’s contextual perspectives, and better respond to needs.

• Seek funding to help CBOs build their capacity to develop more effective volunteer management systems, including community service learning students. (Pilot project completed in 2007)
APPENDIX A
ASSESSMENT SURVEY

The Office of Community Service Learning has a strong commitment in improving SF State’s community service learning program, therefore, we would like to better understand the impact that community service learning has on our community partners. Please assist us by taking five (5) minutes to complete this survey, and return it to us in the enclosed self-stamped envelope.

I. First we would like to get some information about your organization.

1. How long has your organization been working with SF State students?
   - □ Less than one year
   - □ 1-3 years
   - □ More than 3 years

2. What are the benchmark areas addressed by your organization? (Check the most appropriate)
   - □ Education
   - □ Housing
   - □ Safety/Law Enforcement
   - □ Health
   - □ Environment
   - □ Social Services
   - □ Other

II. The next set of questions relates to your most recent experiences with our university.

3. How did your interactions with this program influence your capacity to fulfill the mission of your organization? Please mark the most important one.
   - □ New insights about the organization/its operation
   - □ Increase in number of services offered
   - □ Increase in number of clients served
   - □ Enhanced offerings of services
   - □ New connections/networks with other community groups
   - □ Increased leverage of financial/other resources
   - □ Other (please specify)

4. What are some of the challenges you encountered? Please mark the most important one.
   - □ Demands upon staff time
   - □ Mismatch between course goals and organization
   - □ Project time period insufficient
   - □ Little contact/interaction with faculty
   - □ Students not well prepared
   - □ Student did not perform as expected
   - □ Number of students inappropriate for size of organization
   - □ Other (please specify)

5. What are some of the economic effects of your work with this program? Please mark the most important one.
   - □ Increased value of services
   - □ New products, services, and materials generated
   - □ Increased organizational resources
   - □ Increased funding opportunities
   - □ Completion of projects
   - □ Identification of new staff
   - □ Access to university technology and expertise
   - □ Identification of additional volunteers
   - □ Other (please specify)
6. In what ways do you believe that you are able to influence the university as a result of your connection with one of our community service learning courses? Please mark the most important one.

☐ Influence on course content ☐ Influence on faculty awareness of community
☐ Influence on university policies ☐ Influence on student learning experience
☐ Other (please specify) __________________________________________

7. As a result of your connection to this community service learning course, how has your awareness of the university changed? Please mark the most important one.

☐ I learned more about university academic programs
☐ I know whom to call upon for information and assistance
☐ I have an increased knowledge of university resources
☐ I have more interactions with faculty and the Office of Community Service Learning
☐ I have taken or plan to take classes at the university
☐ Other influences (please specify) __________________________________________

8. Will you continue to use SF State students?

☐ Yes ☐ No

III. Please rate your level of satisfaction with your connection to a community service learning course in the following areas:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Very Satisfied</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Very Dissatisfied</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9. Overall communication with students and faculty</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Level and quality of interaction with students/faculty</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Quality of student work</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Feedback and input into planning of experiences</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Scope and timing of activity</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Level of trust with faculty and students</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. How did you handle the logistics of your community-based service learning placements?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

☐ Our staff made the arrangements and placements.
☐ The faculty member made the arrangements and placements.
☐ The student(s) made the arrangements and placements.
☐ We handled the arrangements and placements collaboratively.
16. What was the best aspect of this experience for you or your organization?

17. What aspects of the experience would you change?

18. Please add any other additional comments.

19. Would you be interested in attending a focus group in your neighborhood to address community/university partnership issues? (Such as understanding university and community calendars and partnership structures, fundraising collaborations, grant writing workshops, technical training, etc.)

☐ Yes    ☐ No

If yes, please list the best person to contact:

Name: _______________________________ Title: _______________________________

Phone: (Area Code)_______ (Phone Number) __________________________

Thank you for your comments.

Please return this by August 15th in the enclosed self-stamped envelope or to OCSL, 1600 Holloway Avenue, Lakeview Center, Room 121, San Francisco, CA 94132—4027
APPENDIX B
FOCUS GROUP ASSESSMENT QUESTIONS

Focus Groups Questions (break them into groups of five)

1. Introductions and nature of partnership with Univ.
2. If presently partnering with the Univ. what has gone well? Why has it been successful?
3. What have been the benefits of the partnership, from your perspective?
   - After partnering did your agency had new insights into operating your volunteer program or into operations?
   - What was the impact on capacity to serve clients? Did it increase or decrease?
   - How important is the faculty-member supervisor? How would you describe the working relationship with supervising faculty?
4. What are the burdens, obstacles or barriers of the partnership? (How did you cope with this?)
   (i.e., What are the advantages and disadvantages of incorporating students, such as preparation, ability, adaptability, time available? If you work with college students from other universities, how do SF State students compare?)
5. What would you do differently next time? What would you change?
6. What might the university do differently next time?
7. What do you know about the university that you did not know before?
8. What is the most important thing you like the university to hear from you? What we have not discussed?
9. Do you see any changes that this partnership has made on the community or its residents, directly or indirectly? What specifically?