Collegiate Community Service

The Status of Public and Community Service at Selected Colleges and Universities

The Survey and Descriptive Directories

COLLEGIATE COMMUNITY SERVICE:

Status of Public and Community Service
at Selected Colleges and Universities

Prepared for Campus Compact:
The Project for Public and Community Service

Marc J. Ventresca and Anna L. Waring,
with Jeanne Wahl Halleck

Public Service Center
Stanford University

and

Saphira M. Baker and Melissa Auchard

Campus Compact: The Project for Public and Community Service
Education Commission of the States

January 1987

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Campus Compact is an organization established by college and university presidents committed to encouraging public service initiatives on their campuses. The Compact undertook this survey to determine the nature and scope of public service activities at its member institutions. The survey was designed to identify the level of student involvement in public service, the "processes" which get students involved and/or discourage their participation, and the way institutions can support student initiatives related to public service. At the time that the census was taken (Spring 1986), Campus Compact had 102 members. The 67 schools that responded to the survey were predominantly small (under 5,000 undergraduates) liberal arts colleges with traditional student populations, ages 18-24. Roughly one-quarter of the respondents were larger (over 10,000 students) state universities and community colleges.

Because this survey is one of the first attempts to document on a nation-wide basis students' participation in public service and describe the organizational arrangements supporting those activities, the data often had to be generated specifically for this effort. Many staff people at Compact institutions made extraordinary efforts to compile the requested information. Indeed, one of the fortunate consequences of the Compact's request was the development of a new consciousness about public service and the initiation of record-keeping at a number of institutions.

The base-line data presented in the following summary and the descriptive directories provide an overview of public service enterprises at colleges and universities. The findings suggest a number of models that have been successful at particular institutions. In the "Descriptive Directories" section, these programs are described in more detail with contact names and phone numbers of their coordinators.

The following points are among the most significant findings of the survey:

*   At all the 67 campuses surveyed, student public service activities are at least nominally supported through programs either coordinated or sponsored by the university.

    -   76% have voluntary groups with some institutional support
    -   66% have an information clearinghouse or a coordinating office
    -   78% offer public service internships through academic departments
    -   84% allow students to receive academic credit for service work
    -   Almost 50% have established public service centers

The survey effort revealed that students are engaged in a wide range of activities, some supported by the institution and others that students design and conduct independently.

* The overall number of students reportedly involved in public service activities at these campuses is low.

    - 34% estimate that slightly more than 20% of their student body are involved
    - 21% estimate that between 10-20% are involved
    - 9% estimate that less than 10% of their students are involved
    - 16% estimate that less than 5% are involved
    - 18% were not able to estimate the percentage of students involved

    Because of the difficulty in tracking public service activities of non-residential older students and independent student efforts, these figures most likely underrepresent actual levels.

* Regarding changes in levels of student participation in public service over the past five years:

    - 43% report an increase in participation
    - Over 40% reported increased student interest as a reason for increased participation

    Even with these increases, these numbers provide a challenge for those seeking to get more students involved in community service on a national level.

* Student-initiated public service efforts are among the healthiest efforts on campus, thereby discrediting popular conceptions of students as indifferent to community problems.

    - As many schools report students working independently in public service activities as are involved with campus-sponsored initiatives led by faculty or administrators.

Almost half the colleges surveyed have taken specific actions, such as centralizing efforts or providing increased funding, in an effort to get more students involved.

* Nearly half of the institutions have established public service centers, and report that centers appear to increase the level of student participation:

    - 19 of the 29 schools reporting an increase in student participation maintain a public service center.

    - 15 of the 23 institutions reporting no change in participation have no formal center.

ii

* Almost every respondent identified factors that prevent more students from participating in public service.

    - 70% cited financial deterrents
    - 49% cited career considerations

* Parodoxically, 43% cited la k of academic credit when survey data demonstrates that 83% of these institutions grant credit for service work. Given this discrepancy, one might ask: Are there obstacles to obtaining credit for service work, even though it is permitted by the institution? Do enough students know about the options? And, finally, how are respondents defining public service for credit?

* Over 50% of the respondents offered no response to a question about how to overcome obstacles. Of those that did answer:

    - 7 said financial resources were critical
    - 6 said centralization of campus efforts would help
    - 11 said combinations of increased funding, centralized efforts, increased credibility, and academic credit were necessary.

Institutional support for public service is not as great as many of the member schools would like. Often institutional policies related to academic quality and financial aid hinder efforts to increase the number of students involved in public service:

- Some schools reported that the number of students involved in service activities has declined as a result of increased academic requirements and the institution's push for increased levels of academic quality.

- A number of schools reported that many students who might volunteer now are required to work to help offset the cost of their education.

Another important consideration is that colleges and universities are not utilizing all available resources for public service. The allocation of work study funds to students interested in public service work is an example of such under-utilization. The Carnegie Report, "Higher Education and the American Resurgence", written by Frank Newman, suggests that twenty percent of work study funds should be used for service work. The members of the Compact fall significantly below this level with most schools reporting fewer than 50 students using work-study funds for public service efforts.

- 8 schools have less than 2.5% of their off-campus work study funds allocated to public service.
- 7 schools have between 2.5% and 5% of their off-campus

work study funds allocated to public service.
- 11 schools have more than 5% of their off-campus
  work study funds allocated to public service.

The best incentive for public service seems to be a commitment to service on the part of the institution from the president on down. The form of the organizational structure for promoting service seems to be unimportant, though successful service efforts seem to be organized in a manner consistent with the individual institution's method of doing things. For example, centralized institutions tend to centralize their public service efforts. Strong institutional support for public service results in increased levels of student participation in service.

PREFACE

Campus Compact: The Project for Public and Community Service (The Compact)[1] is a coalition of over one hundred and twenty college and university presidents committed to increasing the number of students involved in public service and the variety of public service activities and initiatives on campuses across the country. Public service encompasses a wide array of activities, including but not limited to, volunteer or unpaid work. The Compact, while supporting efforts to encourage all forms of public service, has identified the following kinds of public service as its primary focus:

* University-sponsored service projects,

* Service work compensated with financial assistance administered through colleges,

* Work sponsored by a community service agency,

* Church sponsored service work where the goal is meeting secular needs not proselytizing new members,

* Government-sponsored service work, including VISTA and Peace Corps, and work in the public sector,

* Independent community service or volunteer projects not sponsored by any agency.

This report begins with an introduction that describes the number and types of respondents included in the survey. The introductory section is followed by an analysis of public service programs at the Compact schools and of institutional policies that affect public service. The final section, "Descriptive Directories" is composed of program descriptions from some of the respondents. Each description provides general information about the college or university as well as a profile of one of its public service programs. Detailed information on each program is available from the clearinghouse maintained by Campus Compact. For additional information contact:

Campus Compact:
The Project for Public and Community Service
Brown University
Box 1975
Providence, RI 02912
(401) 863-1119

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

An effort such as the Compact Survey builds on the ideas, goodwill, insights, and skills of many people. This final document is a stronger report thanks to their many contributions.

Our debt is particularly great to colleagues at sixty-seven campuses across the country, many of whom made extraordinary efforts to provide us, in timely fashion, the information that forms the basis of the analysis. Many also shared copious supplementary and illustrative materials which underscore the vitality of the public service enterprise on the Compact campuses. These data are now housed at the Compact Clearinghouse on the Brown University campus.

Early in the process of planning the census, we benefitted from the advice of Sally Cole, Director of Research, Office of the Dean of Student Affairs, Stanford University. We are also grateful to Dr. Virginia Hodgkinson, Vice-President for Research at Independent Sector, for sharing the resources of Independent Sector and her own knowledge about the participation of college students in service activities.

Throughout the process of planning, analyzing, and summarizing the survey, many colleagues and friends provided advice, comment, encouragement, and critique, drawn from their varied involvements with college students, post-secondary institutions, and many years of participation in public service initiatives. They include: Michael P. Garet, School of Education, Stanford University; Pat McDonough, School of Education, Stanford University; Catherine Milton, Director, Public Service Center, and Special Assistant to the President, Stanford University; Tim Stanton, Associate Director, Public Service Center, Stanford University; and Susan Stroud, Director, Campus Compact, and Assistant to the President, Brown University.

Others who provided more direct technological and logistical assistance were John Agnew, Marvin Creech, Kim Ford, and Brad Walonick, all at the School of Education, Stanford University.

Located at Owen House, the Public Service Center at Stanford University provided us inspiration, pleasant working conditions, a message center, and at times, the nearest equivalent to home! Many thanks go to our hard-working and talented colleagues there: Dee Allen, Sue Gray, Catherine Jordan, who deserves special thanks for her forebearance (as our endeavors happened around her desk) and for sharing office space and resources.

Lastly, the generous support of the Ford Foundation made possible the Survey and this Report.

INTRODUCTION

Public service -- voluntary and mandatory -- by students is coming to the fore in many discussions.[2] One image of college students of the 1980s is that they are apathetic, careerist and overly specialized. Another is that today's college students have found new ways to become involved with and committed to issues beyond their own personal needs and concerns. The debate about the commitment of college students has raised a number of important questions: Have levels of student interest and involvement in public service work -- as volunteers, in internships, or as careers -- changed in recent years? Do students commit some part of their days to public service activity, above and beyond time needed for coursework, other degree requirements, term-jobs or other employment, and family responsibilities? What can and should institutions of higher education do to encourage and support student initiatives and participation in public service? These and similar sorts of questions led the Campus Compact to undertake a review of the public service enterprise among its institutions.

Campus Compact presidents believed that their students were involved in public service but were convinced that more could be done. The survey[3] was a modest venture to establish some baseline understandings that would inform the discussion about the status of public service and related issues on individual campuses -- financial support, service and experiential learning, and student connections with surrounding communities -- and set the stage for broader, future initiatives.

Sixty-seven (66 percent) of the 102[4] Campus Compact members responded to the census. Detailed characteristics of the institutions that responded can be found in the section entitled "Descriptive Directories". Briefly, the respondents in the sample are primarily small, four-year liberal arts colleges, having student profiles and institutional resources substantially different from those of community colleges, large public universities, or other post-secondary institutions. About one-half (32) of the respondents are small colleges with combined undergraduate and graduate student enrollments of less than 5,000 students. Two-thirds (45) are private, four-year institutions. About one quarter of the respondents have enrollments of over 10,000 (10 percent have over 20,000), and these include many state university campuses and several community college systems. The respondents display broad regional variation, with particularly strong representation from the eastern half of the country (19 from the Northeast; 6 from the Mid-Atlantic states; and 13 from the South).

The presidents of Compact institutions share a common

commitment to fostering public service involvement on the part of their students. It is their interest in public service and their willingness to commit to the goals of Campus Compact that brought these diverse institutions into our sample. Because of this shared concern, generalization beyond this sample to all colleges and universities is not appropriate.

The report is descriptive and interpretive in nature and relies on self-reported data. Material provided by the respondents indicates certain trends in the level and type of commitment to public service, and suggests possible future courses of action on individual campuses and for the Compact.

A few words about the survey questionnaire are also in order. The questionnaire requests detailed and historical information about student participation and organizational arrangements. Much of this information was not easily obtained by the respondents. In many cases, the data simply did not exist. Very large, decentralized institutions appeared to have more difficulty in completing the questionnaire, although staff people at several institutions made extraordinary efforts to compile the requested information.

In addition, institutional definitions of public service informed responses. For some schools, service is what is done by students for the college or university, while for others it is what is done for those outside the school. These local definitions limit potential generalizations about service across all colleges and universities or even across fellow Compact members.

The large number of non-responses for certain questions -- the number of students involved in public service for academic credit, or data on continued participation -- may be a result of several factors including the difficulty in synthesizing the efforts of decentralized programs and departments, the relative newness of formal public service efforts at some schools, staff turnover, lack of records, and the inevitable distance from independent or short-term student initiatives.

The questionnaire was best suited for colleges and universities with a traditional student population, ages 18-24. Many of our respondents noted the increasing diversity of their student populations -- part-time and older students, students supporting families while attending college, commuters, and so forth -- and stressed their belief that many of their students participate in public service activities of an incredible range in their home communities, essentially unknown to the institution. Due to the limitations of the questionnaire, the level of participation among such students was not recorded.

The local interpretation of questions and categories and the high non-response rates on certain questions, make certain reporting conventions desirable. Throughout the text, numbers of schools are reported, often with accompanying percentages.

Unless otherwise noted, the percentages refer to the total sample of 67 responding institutions, even though the particular question may not have been relevant to and/or answered by some number of the schools. When the magnitude of the "not relevant" or "no answer" rates justifies mention, special note is made.

Some questions in the survey focused on faculty and staff involvement in public service. In general most schools (48 or 72 percent) encourage faculty and staff to become involved in service activities. These encouragements most often take the form of informal institutional policies, release time for service work, and consideration of service activities in tenure and promotion processes. It is important to note, however, that public service for faculty may be defined by the institution as serving on a university committee. It is likely that fewer schools evaluate faculty in terms of their off-campus service to the community itself.

Thirty-six schools (54 percent) have created opportunities for service by staff and 28 (42 percent) have opportunities for service by faculty. There appeared to be some confusion about the intent of this question as indicated by the large number of responses in the "not relevant" category. It is likely that these figures underestimate actual campus conditions. Because the intention of the survey was to determine the status of public service activity among college students, little discussion of faculty and staff involvement in public service is included in the analysis section of this report.

The first part of this section, General Dimensions of Public Service Activities, provides a descriptive overview of the following: university coordinated and/or sponsored projects, internships, student-initiated public service efforts, institutional incentives, financial assistance from the institution for service work, presence of a center and estimated levels of student participation in recent years. The section that follows, Public Service Infrastructure, elaborates on institutional policies and programs that foster public service, and their impact on levels of student participation in and commitment to public service.

I. GENERAL DIMENSIONS OF PUBLIC SERVICE ACTIVITIES

University Coordinated and/or Sponsored Projects

In general, all the respondents have well-developed public service programs that are either coordinated or sponsored by the university. Specifically, fifty-one schools (76 per ent)[5] have voluntary student groups with some institutional support that provide service in the community and/or public sector. Forty-five schools (67 percent)[6] have students working in collaboration with faculty and administrators in comparable independent projects. The range, vitality, and success of these efforts are enormous, involving students in everything from traditional fraternity/sorority charity drives to campus governance activities; from Big Brother/Sister programs to highly sophisticated efforts to provide clinical legal services to a disadvantaged surrounding community. In addition, students at twenty-two schools (33 percent)[7] provide service through projects that do not fall neatly under either the categories of independent student group efforts or student /faculty /administration collaboration such as working with agencies and political groups on short-term projects like blood drives or fasts.

Two-thirds of the schools (45) provide an information clearinghouse of public service opportunities at the community or governmental level. These off-campus activities are administered through public service programs at a majority of the schools. Only three schools supported no external opportunities, and 55 percent (37) had at least three.

Internships

Internships provide opportunities for students to engage in independent service learning, contribute in local community agencies, or work in the public sector. Almost four-fifths (52) of the schools offer internships through academic departments, at both the community and government level. In addition, over one-half (38) of the schools have university-sponsored internships as

diverse as work in science museums, centers for the mentally or physically disabled, and the Organization of American States.

Involvement with local, state, and federal government through internships is well developed, with two-thirds of the schools reporting that their students have held internships at all levels of government. There is an impressive range of opportunities, from work with local planning commissions and school districts to summer internships on Capitol Hill. Students at the Compact institutions, for example, work in public health agencies, the Veterans Administration, the juvenile justice system and the Forest Service. Thirty-two schools, nearly half, noted still other sorts of public service internships.

Student-Initiated Public Service Efforts

On most campuses, an especially vibrant part of the public service enterprise is student involvement in community service projects independent of any campus organization or agency. These activities include such things as: organizing voter registration drives, tutoring students in local communities, and collecting food and clothing for the needy during the holiday season. In fact, roughly the same proportion of schools report student involvement in public service through independent mechanisms as through the campus-sponsored initiatives and internships. This indicates that students are involving themselves in the broader community and are not limiting themselves solely to preparation for future careers and personal gratification.

Students at 34 schools (51 percent)[8] work through service organizations affiliated with religious groups seeking to meet secular needs. Fifty-one schools (76 percent) report that students work directly with local community agencies in various capacities, and 45 schools (67 percent) note that students work in independent service projects not affiliated with an agency -- individual or small group projects of varying duration that bring the skills and energy of these students directly into the community. These include such activities as tutoring local school children and assisting the elderly in raking leaves or putting up storm windows.

Twelve schools (18 percent)[9] identify independent programs with which they are closely affiliated that house public service programs for their students. The exemplars for this category are Dwight Hall at Yale, Stiles Hall at the University of California, Berkeley, and Phillips Brooks House at Harvard (see "Descriptive Directories" for further information). Twenty-nine schools (43 percent) offer other types of service activities not detailed in the questionnaire.

5

Institutional Incentives

The Compact schools vary widely in the incentives that they use to encourage public service. Institutional incentives for public service include formal admissions preferences or graduation requirements, scholarships or fellowships, honors and awards, academic credit for service, and residence arrangements for students involved in public service.

The vast majority of schools (61, or 91 percent) have no formal admissions policy giving preference to applicants with public service experience, though many do consider service in determining the achievement and leadership potential of prospective students. Brown University, Radcliffe College, Hood College, and the University of Virginia formally recognize service experience in their admissions processes in various ways. For example, Brown offers the Starr Fellowships which are awarded to students with a demonstrated commitment to public service.

Similarly, 61 schools (91 percent) do not have formal graduation requirements related to public service. Of the five that do, four -- the University of Notre Dame and the Universities of Michigan, Nebraska, and Illinois at Chicago -- only require it for degrees in particular departments or divisions. Alverno College is unique in requiring that its graduates demonstrate service experience and "effective citizenship."

The most common institutional incentive for public service work is the granting of academic credit for service learning. Fifty-six schools (84 percent) allow students to receive academic credit for experiential activities with a service focus. Most schools impose some restrictions on eligible types of activity (41) and allow credits to count either in the major field or as elective credits (39). Only five schools restrict credit to elective courses. Among the 56 schools that grant credit for service work, only 22 reported the percentage of students receiving credit. Nine of those 22 report that less than 5 percent of their students take advantage of the academic credit option. The low percentage of students receiving credit may point to a lack of perceived legitimacy for service-related work, the possible difficulties of arranging for credit, low student interest in service work or in obtaining credit for it, or a lack of awareness about the options.

Institutional Financial Assistance for Support of Service Work

Financial assistance from the institution for service work includes work-study funds, scholarships and/or fellowships awarded in anticipation or recognition of service as well as other forms of monetary or in-kind aid. Twenty-eight schools (42 percent)[10] report that they make use of stipends, fellowships, or

grants as an incentive for public service.

Forty schools (60 percent)[11] allocate some portion of work-study funds to students doing public service work. Thirty-five schools report that work-study students have off-campus jobs, although most report relatively small numbers (60 percent report having less than 50 students) in this category. Thirty schools have students working in off-campus in public service jobs, though most (19) have fewer than 50 students. Twenty schools (30 percent) have no students in off-campus positions.

Twenty-five schools reported committing some proportion of work-study funds to public service: 8 institutions have less than 2.5 percent of work-study funds allocated for public service[12], 7 have between 2.5 and 5 percent[13], and 11 have over 5 percent.[14] Several small colleges use substantial portions of their work-study allocation for service work.

Twenty-six schools (39 percent)[15] provide scholarships or fellowships recognizing public service, and thirteen schools provide some other type of assistance for service work. Six schools[16] have loan forgiveness programs for students who enter public service work after college. These programs tend to be restricted to students in graduate and professional schools, for example Stanford University Law School's loan forgiveness program. Dartmouth College offers a loan forgiveness program for graduating students working in lower-paying public service jobs and Berea College has no-interest loans for students working in the mountain areas of Kentucky.

Regarding public service opportunities after graduation, 36 schools (54 percent)[17] have specialized career advisory programs that routinely provide current information on public service employment, careers in the public sector, or opportunities for "entrepreneurs in the public interest," as one university termed it.

Presence of a Center

Nearly one-half of the colleges and universities have established public service centers which play key roles in supporting student public service efforts on campus. 33 schools (49 percent)[18] have centers, 11 of them in existence for eight or more years[19] -- 10 of which go back fifteen or more years[20] and a few of which count their tenure in multiple decades. Where there is no formal center, one office often takes a primary or coordinating responsibility, most commonly the offices of student affairs (9 schools) or career counseling (7 schools).

The focus of the public service centers tends to be on encouraging service work in the local community (17 schools) or on a combination of local community service and work in the public sector (15 schools). Most of the centers (20 schools) perform multiple functions, such as coordinating activities and

projects, career advising, serving as a resource center and library of information as well as housing student-initiated efforts.

Of the 34 schools with centers, 22 have both paid directors and staff,[21] 6 have only paid directors,[22] 2 have only paid staff,[23] and 2 have other personnel arrangements. Center directors most commonly report to a university officer such as a provost, dean, or vice-president for academic affairs (10 schools); to a dean or vice-president for student affairs (9 schools); to some other officer such as dean of the chapel or vice-president for community relations (7); or to the university president (5).

Of the 33 schools with a more decentralized model of administrative support for public service, most report multiple offices with some responsibility for or contribution to student opportunities for service. Even many of the schools with formal centers have vigorous programs located throughout the university in the offices of student affairs, religious centers and career service departments. This suggests that, even on campuses where there is a center, additional service opportunities are created and used.

Overall, respondents reported a role in the public service endeavor for the career counseling center/staff (39 schools, or 58 percent),[24] for academic departments or individual faculty (37 schools, or 55 percent), for campus religious organizations or independent student organizations (both 33, or 49 percent), for student affairs (31, or 46 percent),[25] for other university offices (22 schools, or 33 percent) and for co-op or field study programs (20, or 30 percent).

Participation

Slightly more than one-third of the schools (23) estimate that over 20 percent of their students participate in one or more forms of public service.[26] More than half the schools have over 10 percent of their students involved in public service efforts (see Appendix B, section 12, "Trends" for detailed information). Another 14 schools estimate that between 10 and 20 percent of their students are involved.[27] Therefore, 70 percent of the schools have a core of more than 100 students involved in service activities. In absolute numbers, twenty-seven schools (40 percent)[28] indicate that more than 500 students participated in some form of public service in 1985-86 while 19 schools (28 percent)[29] indicate that between 100 and 500 students did so.

Changes Over the Past Five Years

In reviewing public service activity over the last five years, 29 schools report an increase in student participation,[30] while another 23 have at least maintained the same level of

student participation during that time. Only three schools reported decreases. Of the 29, all cited renewed student interest and changes in the institutional program -- usually both -- as factors in the shift.

In the group reporting increased activity over five years, over half had more than twenty percent of their students involved, and reported the overall largest number of participants. Although these are encouraging signs, more than one-quarter of the schools report that less than 10 percent of their students engage in some form of service work.

What has changed, at least for some schools, is the reasons why students are involved and the form that involvement takes. Over forty percent of the schools cited improved student attitudes, or institutional or societal change as the reason for increased public service on their campuses. Many noted, however, that students are involved for shorter periods of time because of financial constraints and increasingly rigorous academic requirements.

In addition to changes in society and students' outlook regarding community service, 26 colleges and universities (39 percent)[31] have taken specific actions which coincided with an increased number of students involved in public service on their campuses. Fourteen schools (21 percent)[32] have changed formal policies to encourage public service, twenty (30 percent)[33] have provided increased levels of funding or other financial support, and fourteen (21 percent)[34] have centralized their public service effort.

9

II. PUBLIC SERVICE INFRASTRUCTURE

This section describes the resources that support and build commitment to public service, including incentives and deterrents, governance structures of public service projects and the degree of coordination among relevant college or university departments. Infrastructure does not necessarily imply centralization of programs. The organizational culture at each college or university, and the unique history of public service at each institution, make it impossible to generalize about the effectiveness of any model overall, yet each offers an approach for building institutional commitment.

Participation and its Relation to Infrastructure

Schools reporting upturns in participation tended to have a more-diversified infrastructure than those reporting no changes at all. They offer more university coordinated or sponsored projects and have multiple decentralized offices with service opportunities. Some programs had clear sponsorship by the institution while others had very little; some collaborated with a number of other departments while others worked independently.

Schools that reported increases in student participation were also more likely to identify a greater number of institutional disincentives to public service, such as financial considerations, lack of academic credit or information about opportunities, student career concerns, or diminished public support and esteem for service, than schools maintaining participation. The high rate of perceived institutional disincentives may reflect a number of factors, including younger, more aggressive programs, renewed interest on the part of students, or staff eager to increase the resources available to students at their schools. In this respect, it is possible that increased activity may generate awareness of institutional constraints.

The schools reporting little or no change in levels of participation account for many strong projects and levels of participation, as well. They tend to identify a less-diversified program infrastructure, a wider array of types of internships, fewer changes in the character of their programs, and fewer institutional disincentives. This may be consistent with the idea that these are established programs, maintaining themselves, and further suggests that they have chosen to concentrate resources in a relatively focused way.

Presence of a Center and Levels of Participation

In general, schools with centers report that having a center tends to increase students' participation in public service, though the presence of a center does not guarantee increased levels of public service participation. Nineteen[35] of the twenty-

nine[36] schools reporting increased levels of participation maintain a formal public service center. Twelve of the nineteen have both a paid director and staff people. Fifteen of the twenty-three schools reporting no change in participation do not have a formal center.[37] However, all three of the schools reporting decreased participation have formal centers, two with a paid director and staff. The centers in all cases tend to have significant tenure: eight or more years in place at eleven of nineteen schools reporting increased levels, five years at seven schools reporting no change, and three years at the three schools with decreased levels.

Disincentives to Public Service

Almost every institution identified at least one factor that inhibited participation in public service and most (63) identified at least two. Perceived deterrents to public service were varied, but the most commonly cited (47 schools, or 70 percent) were financial considerations--the need for students to work as part of their financial aid package, the high cost of college, the expectation of summer earnings, etc. Indeed, thirty-five of these schools said they had evidence that these were real disincentives to participation.[38]

The next most common obstacles mentioned (33 schools, or 49 percent) were career considerations -- the perceived need to find a track early and stay with it. In addition, the lack of academic credit was cited by 29 schools (43 percent) as a key disincentive. Lack of an organized program, lack of information about service opportunities, diminished public support and esteem for public service, and other factors were all cited by approximately 30 to 35 percent of the schools.

When asked how to overcome these obstacles, seven of the 34 institutions that responded said financial resources were critical, six said centralization of the campus effort would help, and eleven said that various combinations of money, centralized efforts, increased credibility, and academic credit were necessary.

FINAL THOUGHTS: HOW IS PUBLIC SERVICE DOING?

Evidence from the survey is encouraging in its documentation of both a wide variety of public service activities and trends in student participation at selected Campus Compact institutions. As demonstrated by the magnitude and variety of service opportunities at these schools, students are willing and anxious to connect with issues and concerns beyond their personal ones. Indeed, many institutions have witnessed an increase in student participation in public service over the last five years and a corresponding change in students' attitudes toward such activities. At institutions where a conscious effort has been made to facilitate students' involvement in community service, the increase in participation is greater still.

Students at the Compact schools are participating in public service ventures and activities in substantial numbers, and about one-third of the schools report increased levels of participation in recent years. The kinds of endeavors students engage in tend to complement or enhance their classroom learning and are consistent with educational and service missions central to the idea of a college or university. Often, the work is directly related to academic training--"lab" work, field experiences, or clinical training.

The Compact schools show wide variation in the university structures supporting student initiatives. The challenge for an institution is to provide a supportive but not intrusive infrastructure -- one that coordinates and increases available resources, while building on the pockets of local talent and initiative found around the college or university. It is also clear that students are continuing to take the initiative in performing community service and organizing efforts independent of the university.

The best incentive for public service seems to be an institutional commitment to service regardless of the structural form that this commitment takes. The variety of programs and approaches to public service indicate that there is no single best way to increase commitment to service on the part of students. Some colleges and universities have centralized efforts, while others support a more decentralized approach.

The institutional commitment to service can occur in a variety of ways. Some schools have formal admissions or graduation requirements. Others have a commitment to service as a part of the school's mission. Those schools with the highest level of commitment to public and community service also report the highest levels of student participation in service. There is nothing mysterious about the process. Supporting service, financially and symbolically, results in increased levels of activity.

A number of schools suggest that the creation of public service centers and centralized resources can be associated with increased levels of participation. The benefits of a center are many, including: identifiable programs, visibility on campus and in the community, minimal duplication of resources, incentives for coordinated action, and fund-raising to support more ambitious projects. The survey also demonstrates that well-coordinated but decentralized models work equally well. In fact, organizational overlap may be effective in reaching diverse student constituencies.

Issues for further discussion and research include how institutional policies interfere with attempts to increase the level of student participation in public service. The confusion around the issue of academic credit for service activities and the failure to allocate substantial amounts of work study funds to students interested in public service work may limit the number of students participating in service efforts. Also, some schools suggested that rising costs and increased academic standards may result in students limiting their involvement in public service activities.

With this survey, we have begun a process of documentation that will help us better understand the ways in which institutions can create an environment that facilitates and encourages college students' involvement in public service. In addition, as more and more of these institutions maintain records of student public service activity and provide these figures to Campus Compact for its information clearinghouse, we will have statistics available to measure the effects of policies over time. In the following "Descriptive Directories," we have identified a number of community service programs and policies at Campus Compact institutions that might serve as guides for people seeking to encourage student participation in service. The cummulative record from these 67 schools is inspiring, for the sheer variety as much as for the enthusiasm it reflects.

ENDNOTES

1.   Campus Compact is an organization established by college and university presidents committed to encouraging public service initiatives on their respective campuses and to raising the issue of service in the national policy dialogue.   Under the executive directorship of Dr. Frank Newman, President of the Education Commission of the States, the Compact was first known as The Presidents' Project for Civic Responsibility and then as the Project for Public and Community Service.

2.   Several national surveys have been done on the subject of voluntarism, generally and specifically among young people. Numerous other studies concentrate on service activity on only one or a few campuses.   Few of them, however, consider a broad sampling of activities at the collegiate level.   See Appendix A for a more detailed discussion of the existing literature.

3.   The word "survey" may connote a more formal inquiry than this project represents.   In fact, the survey questionnaire asked staff contact persons on each campus to do a census of programs and participation.   The questionnaire itself was not an easy document to work through for several reasons (see later discussion), among them matters of organization and substance for which we take some responsibility.   The sample was one of "convenience," as our statistician friends say -- the member institutions of the Campus Compact.   Finally, we performed exploratory analyses appropriate to the impressionistic nature of data.

4.   When the survey was initiated, the presidents of 102 colleges and universities had been invited and agreed to participate in Campus Compact.

5. University of California, Berkeley
    San Francisco Community College District
    University of San Diego
    Westmont College
    Los Angeles Community Colleges
    Colorado College
    Trinity College, Connecticut
    Brevard Community College
    Eckerd College
    University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign
    University of Notre Dame
    University of Iowa, Iowa City
    Berea College
    Hood College
    Radcliffe College
    Wheaton College
    Brandeis University
    Wellesley College
    University of Missouri, Kansas City
    Dartmouth College
    Princeton University

14

Davidson College
University of Pennsylvania
Brown University
Vanderbilt University
Trinity University, Texas
University of Virginia
California State University, Bakersfield
San Francisco State University
Stanford University
Miami-Dade Community College
Spelman College
University of Kentucky
University of Maryland, College Park
University of Massachusetts, Amherst
Harvard University
University of Michigan, Ann Arbor
Carleton College
Mankato State University
University of Nebraska, Omaha
Barnard College
Fordham University
Wells College
University of North Carolina, Asheville
Wofford College
Bennington College
Seattle University
Georgetown University
Yale University
Cornell University
Susquehanna University

6. University of California, Berkeley
San Francisco Community College District
University of San Diego
Mills College
Los Angeles Community Colleges
Colorado College
Trinity College, Connecticut
Brevard Community College
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign
University of Notre Dame
Grinnell College
University of Iowa, Iowa City
Berea College
Hood College
Radcliffe College
Wheaton College
University of Missouri, Kansas City
Dartmouth College
Davidson College
Ohio Wesleyan University
Lafayette College
University of Pennsylvania
Brown University
Vanderbilt University

University of Virginia
Alverno College
California State University, Bakersfield
California State University, Chico
Stanford University
Spelman College
University of Kentucky
University of Massachusetts, Amherst
Harvard University
Carleton College
Mankato State University
University of Nebraska, Omaha
Barnard College
Vassar College
Oberlin College
Reed College
Bennington College
Southwestern University
Yale University
Cornell University
University of Illinois at Chicago

7. University of California, Berkeley
University of San Diego
Trinity College, Connecticut
Eckerd College
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign
Grinnell College
University of Iowa, Iowa City
Berea College
Hood College
Wellesley College
University of Missouri, Kansas City
Dartmouth College
Princeton University
Davidson College
Vanderbilt University
Trinity University, Texas
University of Massachusetts, Amherst
University of Nebraska, Omaha
Barnard College
Bennington College
Yale University
University of Illinois at Chicago

8. University of San Diego
Westmont College
Trinity College, Connecticut
Brevard Community College
Eckerd College
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign
University of Notre Dame
Berea College
Brandeis University

University of Missouri, Kansas City
Dartmouth College
Bard Colllege
Davidson College
Lafayette College
University of Pennsylvania
Vanderbilt University
University of Virginia
Alverno College
California State University, Bakersfield
Stanford University
University of Kentucky
University of Massechusetts, Amherst
Harvard University
University of Nebraska, Omaha
Barnard College
Fordham University
Vassar College
Wells College
University of North Carolina, Asheville
Oberlin College
Seattle University
Yale University
Cornell University
University of Illinois at Chicago

9. University of California, Berkeley
   University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign
   University of Notre Dame
   Berea College
   University of Virginia
   Harvard University
   University of Michigan, Ann Arbor
   Carleton College
   Barnard College
   Bennington College
   Yale University
   Cornell

10. University of Notre Dame
    Grinnell College
    Berea College
    Radcliffe College
    University of Missouri, Kansas City
    Dartmouth College
    Princeton University
    Bard College
    Davidson College
    Brown University
    Trinity University, Texas
    University of Vermont
    Alverno College
    California State University, Bakersfield
    Stanford University
    Miami-Dade Community College

17

University of Maryland, College Park
University of Massachusetts, Amherst
Harvard University
University of Michigan, Ann Arbor
Mankato State University
University of Nebraska, Omaha
Barnard College
Fordham University
Bennington College
Yale University
Cornell University
University of Illinois at Chicago

11. University of California, Berkeley
San Francisco Community College District
Westmont College
Los Angeles Community Colleges
Trinity College, Connecticut
Brevard Community College
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign
University of Notre Dame
University of Iowa, Iowa City
Berea College
Radcliffe College
Brandeis University
Wellesley College
University of Missouri, Kansas City
Dartmouth College
Davidson College
Ohio Wesleyan University
University of Pennsylvania
Brown University
University of Virginia
University of Vermont
California State University, Bakersfield
California State University, Chico
San Francisco State University
Stanford University
Miami-Dade Community College
University of Massachusetts, Amherst
Harvard University
University of Michigan, Ann Arbor
Carleton College
Mankato State University
University of Nebraska, Omaha
Barnard College
Oberlin College
Bennington College
Trinity College, Vermont
Yale University
Cornell University
University of Illinois at Chicago
Susquehanna University

12. Trinity College, Connecticut
    University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign
    Berea College
    Stanford University
    Mankato State University
    Oberlin College
    Bennington College
    University of Illinois at Chicago

13. University of San Diego
    University of Notre Dame
    Dartmouth College
    University of Virginia
    University of Massachusetts, Amherst
    University of Nebraska, Omaha
    Cornell University

14. University of California, Berkeley
    San Francisco Community College District
    Westmont College
    University of Iowa, Iowa City
    Brandeis University
    Brown University
    San Francisco State University
    University of Kentucky
    Trinity College, Vermont
    Seattle University
    Yale University

15. University of California, Berkeley
    San Francisco Community College District
    Westmont College
    Trinity College, Connecticut
    Eckerd College
    University of Notre Dame
    University of Iowa, Iowa City
    Hood College
    Radcliffe College
    Brandeis University
    Wellesley College
    University of Missouri, Kansas City
    Dartmouth College
    Bard College
    Davidson College
    Brown University
    University of Virginia
    Alverno College
    Stanford University
    University of Massachusetts, Amherst
    Mankato State University
    University of Nebraska, Omaha
    Bennington College
    Yale University
    Cornell University
    University of Illinois at Chicago

19

16. Berea College
    Dartmouth College
    California State University, Chico
    Stanford University
    University of Kentucky
    Yale University

17. University of California, Berkeley
    San Francisco Community College District
    Westmont College
    Trinity College, Connecticut
    Brevard Community College
    University of Notre Dame
    Grinnell College
    University of Iowa, Iowa City
    Hood College
    Radcliffe College
    Wheaton College
    Brandeis University
    University of Missouri, Kansas City
    Dartmouth College
    Princeton University
    Bard College
    Davidson College
    University of Pennsylvania
    University of Virginia
    Alverno College
    California State University, Chico
    Stanford University
    University of Kentucky
    Harvard University
    University of Michigan, Ann Arbor
    Carleton College
    Mankato State University
    University of Nebraska, Omaha
    Barnard College
    Bennington College
    Trinity College, Vermont
    Seattle University
    Georgetown University
    Yale University
    Cornell University
    University of Illinois at Chicago

18. Westmont College
    Trinity College, Connecticut
    Eckerd College
    University of Notre Dame
    University of Iowa, Iowa City
    Hood College
    Radcliffe College
    Brandeis University
    Wellesley College
    Dartmouth College

Princeton University
        Bard College
        Lafayette College
        University of Pennsylvania
        Brown University
        Vanderbilt University
        University of Virginia
        University of Vermont
        California State University, Chico
        Stanford University
        University of Maryland, College Park
        University of Massachusetts, Amherst
        Harvard University
        Carleton College
        University of Nebraska, Omaha
        Barnard College
        Fordham University
        Vassar College
        Reed College
        Bennington College
        Trinity College, Vermont
        Georgetown University
        Yale University

19. Trinity College, Connecticut
        Eckerd College
        University of Iowa, Iowa City
        Wellesley College
        Brown University
        Vanderbilt University
        University of Maryland, College Park
        University of Massachusetts, Amherst
        University of Nebraska, Omaha
        Reed College
        Georgetown University

20. Westmont College
        Radcliffe College
        Brandeis University
        Dartmouth College
        Princeton University
        University of Vermont
        California State University, Chico
        Vassar College
        Bennington College
        Yale University

21. Westmont College
        Trinity College, Connecticut
        Eckerd College
        University of Notre Dame
        University of Iowa, Iowa City
        Hood College
        Wellesley College
        Dartmouth College

21

Bard College
University of Pennsylvania
Brown University
University of Virginia
University of Vermont
Stanford University
University of Maryland, College Park
University of Massachusetts, Amherst
Harvard University
Barnard College
Vassar College
Bennington College
Georgetown University
Yale University

22. Radcliffe College
    Brandeis University
    Vanderbilt University
    California State University, Chico
    Carleton College
    Fordham University

23. Reed College
    Trinity College, Vermont
    Susquehanna University

24. University of California, Berkeley
    University of San Diego
    Westmont College
    Mills College
    Colorado College
    Brevard Community College
    Eckerd College
    University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign
    Grinnell College
    University of Iowa, Iowa City
    Berea College
    Hood College
    Radcliffe College
    Wheaton College
    Brandeis University
    Wellesley College
    University of Missouri, Kansas City
    Dartmouth College
    Bard College
    Davidson College
    University of Pennsylvania
    Brown University
    Vanderbilt University
    University of Virginia
    University of Vermont
    Alverno College
    San Francisco State University
    Stanford University
    Harvard University

University of Michigan, Ann Arbor
Carleton College
Barnard College
Wells College
Reed College
Wofford College
Trinity College, Vermont
Seattle University
Yale University
Cornell University

25. San Francisco Community College District
    University of San Diego
    Los Angeles Community Colleges
    Colorado College
    Brevard Community College
    University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign
    University of Iowa, Iowa City
    Radcliffe College
    Brandeis University
    University of Missouri, Kansas City
    Dartmouth College
    Davidson College
    Ohio Wesleyan University
    Lafayette College
    Vanderbilt University
    Trinity University, TX
    University of Virginia
    University of Vermont
    Alverno College
    Stanford University
    Spelman College
    University of Kentucky
    University of Massachusetts, Amherst
    Harvard University
    University of Michigan, Ann Arbor
    Mankato State University
    Wells College
    Wofford College
    Yale University
    Cornell University
    University of Illinois at Chicago

26. Westmont College
    Trinity College, Connecticut
    Brevard Community College
    Eckerd College
    University of Notre Dame
    University of Iowa, Iowa City
    Hood College
    Davidson College
    Ohio Wesleyan University
    Trinity University, Texas
    University of Virginia
    Alverno College

23

Stanford University
Spelman College
University of Kentucky
Harvard University
Mankato State University
Barnard College
Vassar College
Wofford College
Southwestern University
Yale University
Susquehanna University

27. University of San Diego
Grinnell College
Brandeis University
Wellesley College
Dartmouth College
University of Pennsylvania
Brown University
University of Vermont
California State University, Chico
University of Maryland, College Park
Carleton College
Bennington College
Trinity College, Vermont
Cornell University

28. University of San Diego
Westmont College
Brevard Community College
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign
University of Notre Dame
Dartmouth College
Davidson College
Lafayette College
University of Pennsylvania
Brown University
Trinity University, Texas
University of Virginia
University of Vermont
Alverno College
California State University, Chico
San Francisco State University
Stanford University
University of Kentucky
University of Maryland, College Park
University of Massachusetts, Amherst
University of Michigan, Ann Arbor
Mankato State University
Barnard College
Vassar College
Georgetown University
Yale University
Cornell University

29. University of California, Berkeley
    San Francisco Community College District
    Colorado College
    Trinity College, Connecticut
    Eckerd College
    Grinnell College
    Hood College
    Brandeis University
    Wellesley College
    Princeton University
    Ohio Wesleyan University
    Spelman College
    Carleton College
    University of Nebraska, Omaha
    Fordham University
    Oberlin College
    Wofford College
    Trinity College, Vermont
    Southwestern University

30. University of San Diego
    Trinity College, Connecticut
    Eckerd College
    University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign
    University of Iowa, Iowa City
    Hood College
    Brandeis University
    University of Missouri, Kansas City
    Dartmouth College
    Princeton University
    Davidson College
    Ohio Wesleyan University
    Brown University
    University of Virginia
    California State University, Chico
    San Francisco State University
    Stanford University
    Miami-Dade Community College
    Harvard University
    Carleton College
    University of Nebraska, Omaha
    Barnard College
    Fordham University
    Vassar College
    Wells College
    Wofford College
    Trinity College, Vermont
    Yale University
    Susquehanna University

31. University of California, Berkeley
    University of San Diego
    Trinity College, Connecticut
    Eckerd College
    University of Notre Dame

Grinnell College
University of Iowa, Iowa City
Hood College
Brandeis University
University of Missouri, Kansas City
Dartmouth College
Davidson College
Brown University
University of Virginia
California State University, Chico
University of Pennsylvania
Stanford University
Miami-Dade Community College
University of Maryland, College Park
Harvard University
Fordham University
Carleton College
University of Nebraska, Omaha
Trinity College, Vermont
Georgetown University
Yale University

32. University of San Diego
Trinity College, Connecticut
Eckerd College
University of Notre Dame
Grinnell College
Hood College
University of Missouri, Kansas City
Dartmouth College
Brown University
Stanford University
University of Maryland, College Park
Harvard University
Fordham University
Trinity College, Vermont

33. University of California, Berkeley
Trinity College, Connecticut
University of Notre Dame
Grinnell College
Hood College
Brandeis University
University of Missouri, Kansas City
Dartmouth College
Davidson College
University of Pennsylvania
Brown University
University of Virginia
California State University, Chico
Stanford University
Miami-Dade Community College
Carleton College

University of Nebraska, Omaha
Fordham University
Georgetown University
Yale University

34. University of California, Berkeley
    Trinity College, Connecticut
    Eckerd College
    University of Notre Dame
    University of Iowa, Iowa City
    Dartmouth College
    University of Pennsylvania
    Brown University
    California State University, Chico
    Stanford University
    Miami-Dade Community College
    Fordham University
    Georgetown University
    Yale University

35. Trinity College, Connecticut
    Eckerd College
    University of Iowa, Iowa City
    Hood College
    Brandeis University
    Dartmouth College
    Princeton University
    Brown University
    University of Virginia
    California State University, Chico
    Stanford University
    Harvard University
    Carleton College
    University of Nebraska, Omaha
    Barnard College
    Fordham University
    Vassar College
    Trinity College, Vermont
    Yale University

36. University of San Diego
    Trinity College, Connecticut
    Eckerd College
    University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign
    University of Iowa, Iowa City
    Hood College
    Brandeis University
    University of Missouri, Kansas City
    Dartmouth College
    Princeton University
    Davidson College
    Ohio Wesleyan University
    Brown University
    University of Virginia
    California State University, Chico

27

San Francisco State University
Stanford University
Miami-Dade Community College
Harvard University
Carleton College
University of Nebraska, Omaha
Barnard College
Fordham University
Vassar College
Wells College
Wofford College
Trinity College, Vermont
Yale University
Susquehanna University

37. University of California, Berkeley
San Francisco Community College District
Colorado College
Brevard Community College
Grinnell College
Berea College
Trinity University, Texas
California State University, Bakersfield
Spelman College
University of Kentucky
University of Michigan, Ann Arbor
Mankato State University
University of North Carolina, Asheville
Oberlin College
Southwestern University

38. University of San Diego
Westmont College
Mills College
Trinity College, Connecticut
Brevard Community College
Eckerd College
Grinnell College
Berea College
Radcliffe College
Wheaton College
University of Missouri, Kansas City
Dartmouth College
Bard College
Davidson College
Brown University
Trinity University, Texas
University of Virginia
University of Vermont
Alverno College
California State University, Bakersfield
California State University, Chico
Stanford University
Harvard University
University of Michigan, Ann Arbor

Carleton College
Mankato State University
University of Nebraska, Omaha
Barnard College
Fordham University
Reed College
Wofford College
Bennington College
Georgetown University
Cornell University
University of Illinois at Chicago

. . .

RESPONDENTS BY STATE

CALIFORNIA

California State University, Bakersfield
California State University, Chico
California State University, Sacramento
Los Angeles Community Colleges
Mills College
Mount St Mary's College
San Francisco Community College District
San Francisco State University
Stanford University
University of California, Berkeley
University of San Diego
Westmont College

COLORADO

Colorado College

CONNECTICUT

Trinity College
Yale University

FLORIDA

Brevard Community College
Eckerd College
Miami-Dade Community College

GEORGIA

Spelman College

ILLINOIS

Roosevelt University
University of Illinois at Chicago
University of Illinois at Urbana Champaign

INDIANA

DePauw University
University of Notre Dame

IOWA

Grinnell College
University of Iowa, Iowa City

KENTUCKY

Berea College

University of Kentucky

MARYLAND

Hood College
University of Maryland, College Park

MASSACHUSETTS

Brandeis University
Harvard University
Radcliffe College
University of Massachusetts, Amherst
Wellesley College
Wheaton College

MICHIGAN

University of Michigan, Ann Arbor

MINNESOTA

Carleton College
Mankato State University

MISSOURI

University of Missouri, Kansas City

NEBRASKA

University of Nebraska, Omaha

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Dartmouth College

NEW JERSEY

Princeton University

NEW YORK

Bard College
Barnard College
Cornell University
Fordham University
Vassar College
Wells College

NORTH CAROLINA

Davidson College
University of North Carolina, Asheville

31

OHIO

Oberlin College
Ohio Wesleyan University

OREGON

Reed College

PENNSYLVANIA

Lafayette College
Susquehanna University
University of Pennsylvania

RHODE ISLAND

Brown University

SOUTH CAROLINA

Wofford College

TENNESSEE

Vanderbilt University

TEXAS

Southwestern University
Trinity University

VERMONT

Bennington College
Trinity College
University of Vermont

VIRGINIA

University of Virginia

WASHINGTON

Seattle University

WASHINGTON, D.C.

Georgetown University

WISCONSIN

Alverno College

Appendix A

Literature on Public Service and Volunteerism
by Traditional College Age Persons

Appendix B

Descriptive Statistics from the
Campus Compact Survey

DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS FROM THE CAMPUS COMPACT SURVEY

I.   NUMBER OF SCHOOLS RESPONDING: 67

II. GEOGRAPHICAL REGIONS:

WEST	14	21 percent
MIDWEST	14	21
NORTHEAST	19	28
SOUTH	13	19
MIDATLANTIC	7	11

III. TYPE OF SCHOOL

PUBLIC	21	31 percent
PRIVATE	46	69
TWO YEAR	4	6 percent
FOUR YEAR	63	94

IV. SIZE OF INSTITUTION

    A.   UNDERGRADUATE POPULATION

LESS THAN 1,000	5	7 percent
1,000 - LESS THAN 5,000	31	46
5,000 - LESS THAN 10,000	12	18
10,000 -LESS THAN 20,000	9	14
OVER 20,000	6	9
NO ANSWER	4	6

    B.   UNDERGRADUATE AND GRADUATE POPULATION

LESS THAN 1,000	5	7 percent
1,000 - LESS THAN 5,000	27	40
5,000 - LESS THAN 10,000	9	14
10,000 -LESS THAN 20,000	12	18
OVER 20,000	11	16
NO ANSWER	3	4

V.   UNIVERSITY COORDINATED AND/OR SPONSORED PROJECTS

    A.   VOLUNTARY STUDENT GROUPS WITH MINIMAL INSTITUTIONAL SUPPORT

COMMUNITY	18	27 percent
GOVERNMENT	2	3
COMMUNITY AND GOVERNMENT	4	6
YES, NOT SPECIFIED	27	40
NONE	16	24

B. STUDENTS WORKING WITH MEMBERS OF INSTITUTION'S
ADMINISTRATION OR FACULTY

COMMUNITY	18	27 percent
GOVERNMENT	1	1
COMMUNITY AND GOVERNMENT	8	12
YES, NOT SPECIFIED	22	33
NONE	18	27

C. CENTRALIZED CLEARINGHOUSE/COORDINATING OFFICE IN WHICH
PUBLIC SERVICE OPPORTUNITIES ARE LISTED

COMMUNITY	11	16 percent
GOVERNMENT	0	0
COMMUNITY AND GOVERNMENT	10	15
YES, NOT SPECIFIED	25	37
NONE	21	31

D. OTHER ACTIVITIES

COMMUNITY	4	6 percent
GOVERNMENT	1	2
COMMUNITY AND GOVERNMENT	9	14
YES, NOT SPECIFIED	8	12
NONE	45	67

VI. INTERNSHIPS

A. SPONSORED BY ACADEMIC DEPARTMENT

COMMUNITY	3	5 percent
GOVERNMENT	3	5
COMMUNITY AND GOVERNMENT	12	18
YES, NOT SPECIFIED	33	50
NONE	15	23

B. OTHER UNIVERSITY SPONSORED

COMMUNITY	4	6 percent
GOVERNMENT	2	3
COMMUNITY AND GOVERNMENT	10	15
YES, NOT SPECIFIED	22	33
NONE	28	42
NO ANSWER	1	1

C. LOCAL GOVERNMENT INTERNSHIPS

NO	22	33 percent
YES	45	67

D.   STATE GOVERNMENT INTERNSHIPS

```
NO    21          31 percent
YES   46          69
```

E.   FEDERAL GOVERNMENT INTERNSHIPS

```
NO    21          31 percent
YES   46          69
```

F.   OTHER PUBLIC SERVICE INTERNSHIPS

```
NO    34          51 percent
YES   33          49
```

VII. SERVICE WORK REWARDED BY FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE FROM INSTITUTION

A.   WORK STUDY

```
COMMUNITY                       6        9 percent
GOVERNMENT                      0        0
COMMUNITY AND GOVERNMENT        7        10
YES, NOT SPECIFIED              26       39
NONE                            28       42
```

B.   SCHOLARSHIP OR FELLOWSHIP AID

```
COMMUNITY                       4        6 percent
GOVERNMENT                      0        0
COMMUNITY AND GOVERNMENT        5        7
YES, NOT SPECIFIED              17       25
NONE                            41       62
```

C.   OTHER

```
COMMUNITY                       3        5 percent
GOVERNMENT                      0        0
COMMUNITY AND GOVERNMENT        3        5
YES, NOT SPECIFIED              7        10
NONE                            54       81
```

VIII. LINKAGES WITH EXTERNAL COMMUNITY

A.   SERVICE ORGANIZATIONS AFFILIATED WITH RELIGIOUS GROUPS

```
NO    33          49 percent
YES   34          51
```

B. DIRECT STUDENT INVOLVEMENT WITH COMMUNITY AGENCIES

```
NO    16          24 percent
YES   51          76
```

C. INDEPENDENT SERVICE PROJECTS NOT AFFILIATED WITH AN AGENCY

```
NO    22          33 percent
YES   45          67
```

D. INDEPENDENT OFF-CAMPUS PROGRAMS CLOSELY AFFILIATED WITH INSTITUTION THAT HOUSE PUBLIC SERVICE PROGRAMS

```
NO    55          82 percent
YES   12          18
```

IX. OTHER ACTIVITIES CONSIDERED PUBLIC SERVICE

```
NO    38          57 percent
YES   29          43
```

X. INSTITUTIONAL INCENTIVES

A. FORMAL ADMISSION POLICY GIVING PREFERENCE FOR PUBLIC SERVICE

```
NO                61          91 percent
YES               4           6
NO ANSWER         2           3
```

B. FORMAL GRADUATION REQUIREMENT

```
NO                61          91 percent
YES, SOME SORT    5           7
NO ANSWER         1           1
```

C. STIPENDS, FELLOWSHIPS, OR GRANTS FOR PUBLIC SERVICE

```
NO                39          58 percent
YES               28          42
```

D. NUMBER OF WORK STUDY STUDENTS IN OFF-CAMPUS POSITIONS

```
NONE              20          30 percent
LESS THAN 15      7           19
LESS THAN 50      10          15
MORE THAN 50      18          27
NO ANSWER         12          18
```

E. NUMBER OF WORK STUDY STUDENT OFF-CAMPUS IN PUBLIC
    SERVICE ACTIVITIES

LESS THAN 15	7	10 percent
LESS THAN 50	12	18
MORE THAN 50	11	17
NOT RELEVANT	20	30
NO ANSWER	17	25

F. PERCENTAGE OF WORK STUDY FUNDS TO PUBLIC SERVICE

LESS THAN 2.5%	8	12 percent
LESS THAN 5%	7	10
MORE THAN 5%	11	17
NOT RELEVANT	20	30
NO ANSWER	21	31

G. ACADEMIC CREDIT FOR PUBLIC SERVICE

NO	11	16 percent
YES	56	84

H. CREDIT IN MAJOR

NO	5	8 percent
YES	40	60
NOT RELEVANT	11	16
NO ANSWER	11	16

I. ELECTIVE CREDIT ONLY

NO	39	58 percent
YES	5	8
NOT RELEVANT	11	16
NO ANSWER	12	18

J. PERCENT RECEIVING CREDIT

LESS THAN 5%	9	13 percent
5 - 10%	3	5
MORE THAN 10%	11	16
NOT RELEVANT	11	16
NO ANSWER	33	49

K. RESTRICTIONS FOR CREDIT

NO	6	9 percent
YES	41	62
NOT RELEVANT	11	16
NO ANSWER	9	13

L. SPECIALIZED CAREER ADVISORY PROGRAMS

    NO   31   45 percent
    YES 36   55

M. LOAN FORGIVENESS

    NO   61   91 percent
    YES   6   9

N. CATEGORIES FOR LOAN FORGIVENESS

    GRADUATE STUDENTS   2   3 percent
    TARGETED ACTIVITIES   2   3
    NOT RELEVANT   53   79
    NO ANSWER   10   15

O. ARE FACULTY AND STAFF ENCOURAGED IN PUBLIC SERVICE

    NO   19   28 percent
    YES 48   72

P. HOW ARE FACULTY AND STAFF ENCOURAGED

    INFORMAL INST'L POLICY   13   19 percent
    TENURE PROCESS   7   10
    OTHER ACTIVITIES   5   7
    MULTIPLE WAYS   15   22
    MISSION STATEMENT   2   3
    FORMAL POLICY   1   1
    NOT RELEVANT   15   22
    NO ANSWER   8   15

XI. ADMINISTRATIVE RESOURCES FOR PUBLIC SERVICE

    A. CENTRAL COORDINATING OFFICE

        NO   33   49 percent
        YES, WITH PAID DIRECTOR   6   9
        YES, WITH PAID STAFF   3   4
        YES, WITH BOTH   22   33
        YES, OTHER   2   3
        NO ANSWER   1   1

B. **DIRECTOR REPORTS TO**

PRESIDENT	5	7 percent
STUDENT AFFAIRS	9	14
OTHER	7	10
PROVOST, ACADEMIC AFFAIRS	11	16
NOT RELEVANT	33	49
NO ANSWER	2	3

C. **SOURCES OF FUNDING**

OPERATING BUDGET	14	21 percent
STUDENT FEES	2	3
MULTIPLE SOURCES	13	19
STATE FUNDS	2	3
NOT RELEVANT	33	49
NO ANSWER	3	4

D. **FOCUS OF THE OFFICE**

COMMUNITY	18	27 percent
COMMUNITY AND GOVERNMENT	15	22
NOT RELEVANT	33	49
NO ANSWER	1	1

E. **FUNCTIONS OF THE OFFICE**

COORDINATION	4	6 percent
CAREER ADVISING	3	5
LIBRARY, RESOURCES	2	3
MULTIPLE FUNCTIONS	21	31
NOT RELEVANT	33	49
NO ANSWER	4	6

F. **HOW LONG THIS OFFICE HAS BEEN COORDINATING ACTIVITIES**

3 OR FEWER YEARS	7	10
4 - 7 YEARS	2	3
8 OR MORE YEARS	11	16
MORE THAN 15 YEARS	11	16
NOT RELEVANT	33	49
NO ANSWER	3	4

G. **OPPORTUNITIES FOR SERVICE DEVELOPED BY STUDENTS**

NO	4	6 percent
YES	39	58
NOT RELEVANT	21	31
NO ANSWER	3	4

H. OPPORTUNITIES FOR SERVICE DEVELOPED BY STAFF

NO	4	6 percent
YES	36	54
NOT RELEVANT	21	31
NO ANSWER	6	9

I. OPPORTUNITIES FOR SERVICE DEVELOPED BY FACULTY

NO	9	13 percent
YES	28	42
NOT RELEVANT	21	31
NO ANSWER	9	13

J. SPECIFIC MECHANISMS FOR EVALUATING THE COMMUNITY SERVICE PROGRAMS

NO	29	43 percent
YES	24	36
NOT RELEVANT	14	21

XII. DECENTRALIZED OPPORTUNITIES FOR PUBLIC SERVICE

A. CAREER COUNSELING CENTER/STAFF

NO	27	40 percent
YES	40	60

B. DEPARTMENT OF STUDENT AFFAIRS

NO	35	52 percent
YES	32	48

C. CO-OP/FIELD STUDY PROGRAM

NO	46	69 percent
YES	21	31

D. ACADEMIC DEPARTMENTS/INDIVIDUAL FACULTY

NO	29	43 percent
YES	38	57

E. CAMPUS RELIGIOUS ORGANIZATION

NO	33	49 percent
YES	34	51

F. INDEPENDENT STUDENT ORGANIZATIONS

NO	34	51 percent
YES	33	49

G. OTHER

```
NO   45        67 percent
YES  22        33
```

H. MAJOR RESPONSIBILITY FOR THESE ACTIVITIES

```
CAREER COUNSELING          7        10 percent
STUDENT AFFAIRS            9        13
CO-OP PROGRAM              3         4
ACADEMIC DEPT             1         2
RELIGIOUS GROUP           1         2
INDEPENDENT               1         2
OTHER                     5         7
NO ONE/NOT RELEVANT       22        33
NO ANSWER                 18        27
```

XII. TRENDS

A. STUDENTS

1. STUDENT PARTICIPATION IN PUBLIC SERVICE

```
LESS THAN 50          5         7 percent
LESS THAN 100         3         5
LESS THAN 500        20        30
MORE THAN 500        27        40
NO ANSWER            12        18
```

2. PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS INVOLVED

```
LESS THAN 5%         11        16 percent
LESS THAN 10%         6         9
LESS THAN 20%        14        21
MORE THAN 20%        23        34
NO ANSWER            13        19
```

3. CHANGE IN LEVEL OF PARTICIPATION IN THE LAST FIVE YEARS

```
INCREASED            29        42 percent
DECREASED             3         5
NO CHANGE            23        35
NO ANSWER            12        18
```

4. FACTORS INFLUENCING THIS TREND

```
STUDENTS NOT INTERESTED IN SERVICE    4     6 percent
STUDENTS POSITIVE ABOUT SERVICE       6     9
INSTITUTIONAL CHANGE                 10    15
STUDENT AND INSTITUTIONAL CHANGE      9    13
OTHER                                 6     9
NO ANSWER                            32    48
```

5. SURVEY OF ATTITUDES TOWARD VOLUNTEERISM IN THE
    LAST FIVE YEARS

    NO   54   81 percent
    YES   12   18
    NO ANSWER   1   1

B. INSTITUTIONAL CHANGE

    1. CHANGE IN THE CHARACTER OF PUBLIC SERVICE IN THE
        PAST FIVE YEARS

        CHANGE   32   48 percent
        NO CHANGE   20   30
        NO ANSWER   15   22

    2. CHANGE IN THE CENTRALIZATION OF PUBLIC SERVICE
        ACTIVITIES

        MORE CENTRALIZED   15   22 percent
        LESS CENTRALIZED   3   4
        NOT RELEVANT   20   30
        NO ANSWER   29   44

    3. CHANGE IN FUNDING FOR PROGRAM

        MORE   20   30 percent
        LESS   1   2
        NOT RELEVANT   21   31
        NO ANSWER   25   37

    4. CHANGE IN FORMAL POLICY/INSTITUTIONAL SUPPORT

        NO   11   16 percent
        YES   15   22
        NOT RELEVANT   17   26
        NO ANSWER   24   36

    5. OTHER CHANGES

        NO   19   28 percent
        YES   9   14
        NOT RELEVANT   16   24
        NO ANSWER   23   34

XIII. INSTITUTIONAL DISINCENTIVES

A. FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS

    NO   20   30 percent
    YES   47   70

B. EVIDENCE OF FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS BEING A
    DISINCENTIVE

    NO   8   12 percent
    YES   35   52
    NOT RELEVANT   24   36

C. LACK OF AN ORGANIZED PROGRAM

    NO   44   66 percent
    YES   23   34

D. EVIDENCE OF LACK OF ORGANIZED PROGRAM BEING A
    DISINCENTIVE

    NO   23   34 percent
    YES   12   18
    NOT RELEVANT   32   48

E. LACK OF ACADEMIC CREDIT

    NO   38   57 percent
    YES   29   43

F. LACK OF INFORMATION ABOUT SERVICE OPPORTUNITIES

    NO   46   69 percent
    YES   21   31

G. CAREER CONSIDERATIONS

    NO   34   51 percent
    YES   33   49

H. DIMINISHED PUBLIC SUPPORT AND ESTEEM FOR PUBLIC SERVICE

    NO   42   63 percent
    YES   25   37

I. OTHER FACTORS

    NO   46   69 percent
    YES   21   31

J. HOW TO OVERCOME OBSTACLES

    CREDIBILITY AND SUPPORT   2   3 percent
    CENTRALIZED CAMPUS EFFORT   6   9
    MONEY   7   11
    ACADEMIC CREDIT   2   3
    MULTIPLE NEEDS   11   16
    NO ANSWER   32   48

Appendix C

Copy of the Survey

PROJECT FOR PUBLIC AND COMMUNITY SERVICE
SURVEY

_____

Name of Institution

Number of Students:
graduate _____
undergraduate _____

INTRODUCTION:
Thank you for taking time to complete this questionnaire. The information will be of enormous value in informing all of us involved in the Project for Public and Community Service of the state of affairs and trends within collegiate public service, identifying the incentives and disincentives to public service, informing public policy, and encouraging colleges and universities throughout the nation to strengthen their campus service programs. We are surveying the one hundred institutions in the Coalition for Civic Responsibility and intend to compile a descriptive directory, accompanied by a section of analysis and observations, based on the data.

WE ASK THAT YOU RETURN THE SURVEY BY FEBRUARY 5, 1986.
The term "public service" in the following questions refers to the work students might do for non-profit service organizations and for all levels of government, either as interns or unpaid volunteers.

I. NATURE OF PROGRAM/PROGRAM DESCRIPTIONS
   A. We are interested in capturing the nature and range of public service efforts in which your students are involved. Which of the following types of programs or activities do you have? <u>Check all that apply.</u> Please give their names and indicate with a (G) and/or (C) if the programs in which students provide service are government agencies or community service programs or both. We recognize that the categories may not be mutually exclusive.

_____* University coordinated and/or sponsored service projects (e.g. programs sponsored by a
     student volunteer center)
_____   voluntary student groups with minimal institutional support.
     NAMES:_____

_____   student groups working with member(s) of institution's administration or faculty.
     NAMES:_____

_____   a centralized clearinghouse/coordinating office in which public service opportunities are listed;
     students are linked with community service opportunities. NAME:_____

_____   other_____
     _____

_____* Internship programs
_____   academic department sponsored internships/field study programs.
     NAME of department:_____

_____   other university sponsored internships. Coordinated by whom?
     _____

_____   government internships
     ___ local level NAME_____
     ___ state level NAME_____
     ___ national level NAME_____

_____   other public service internships. NAME_____
     _____

1

_____* Service work rewarded by financial assistance from institution

_____ work study (federal or state) students with community service jobs

_____ students doing/have done service work for which they were rewarded with scholarship aid or a fellowship. NAME OF SCHOLAR/FELLOWSHIP/S_____

_____ other_____

_____* Service organizations affiliated with religious groups(e.g. Catholic Social Service). Service activities which includes proselytizing new members are not included in this definition of public service.

_____* Direct student involvement with local community service agencies, rather than through campus volunteer center.

_____* Independent service projects (e.g. escort service for the elderly, community gardens, voter registration drives), not through an organized agency. NAMES:_____

_____* Independent off-campus programs that are closely associated with your institution that house student public service programs and/or provide community service placements, e.g., Stiles Hall (UC Berkeley), Phillip Brooks House (Harvard), Dwight Hall (Yale). NAMES:_____

ARE THERE ADDITIONAL ACTIVITIES YOUR INSTITUTION MIGHT CONSIDER "PUBLIC SERVICE"? (We are exempting such activities as student government from our notion of public service, although we recognize their value and importance.) Please list other activities your institution considers public service. _____

B. The information requested in this survey provides important base-line data. In addition, to record the enthusiasm and energy that exists in your programs, we would like short descriptions (2 or 3 paragraphs or already prepared material) of all of your public service programs--including how the program began, its best features and results of any evaluation. We are interested in anecdotal material that will breathe life into program descriptions. Attached are forms that you can give to individual programs to assist in compiling information. Please return the forms with this questionnaire. All the descriptive material will be maintained in the PPCS Clearinghouse files, but cannot be included in the Report. Please choose 2 or 3 of these programs to be profiled.
NAMES: _____

II. INSTITUTIONAL INCENTIVES

We are interested in incentives that encourage student involvement in public and community service.

A. Does your institution have a formal policy of giving preference in admissions to students applying who have performed public service work? yes___ no___ If yes, please attach a copy of any of the materials in which this policy is stated.

B. Does your institution have a formal graduation requirement related to public service? yes___ no___ If yes, please describe._____

2

C. Are there programs that provide stipend support, fellowships, or grants for students to perform public service activities? yes___ no___ If so, please describe briefly including amount of support, number of students involved and funding source. Enclose any already prepared information, if available._____

_____

_____

D. How many students in academic year 1984/85 held off-campus work study positions?____ Of these students, how many were directly engaged in public service activities? ____ What percentage of work study funds does that represent?_____

E. Can students receive academic credit for their public service activities? yes ___no___ In major? yes___ no ___ Elective credit only? ____ What percentage do? ____ Any restrictions? yes___ no___ If yes, please describe. _____

_____

F. Does your institution have specialized career advisory programs for public service careers? yes___ no___ If yes, please describe._____

_____

_____

G. Some law schools have developed "loan forgiveness" programs. Do any of your schools or does the institution as a whole have any policies to forgive or defer loan payments for those students who pursue public service jobs before or after graduation? _____ (If so, please describe or enclose information.)_____

_____

_____

H. Does your institution encourage faculty and staff activity in public service? yes___ no___How?_____

_____

III. ADMINISTRATIVE RESOURCES FOR PUBLIC SERVICE

We are interested in the administrative structure which supports public service acitivities of students and faculty. At some institutions these functions are highly centralized, at others they are decentralized.

A. Does your institution have a central coordinating office for public and community service? yes___ no___ If so, does this office have:
___ Paid director
___ Paid staff (student and/or professional)

To whom does the director report?_____

Sources of funding for this office (e.g., school operating budget, external funding, bequests, student fees, etc.) Please indicate in spaces below. _____

_____

_____

Does this office focus on community activities ___ or government internships ___ or both ___?

What functions does this office perform? (please describe) _____

_____

Are there opportunities for service, developed by students? yes___ no___; by staff? yes___ no___; by faculty? yes___ no___.

How long has this office coordinated activities?_____

Does your institution or any of its specific service programs have a mechanism for evaluating the community service programs? yes____ no____ If yes, please describe._____
_____
_____

B. If service opportunities at your institution are decentralized, we would like to know about the relationship between public service programs or activities and the parent department or office. Please check the departments that house service programs at your institution, and name the public service components.

____ Career Counseling Center/Staff. NAME:_____
_____

____ Dean of Student Affairs Office/Staff. NAME:_____
_____

____ Centralized Co-op/Field Study Program. NAME:_____
_____

____ Academic department/individual faculty members. NAME:_____
_____

____ Campus religious organizations. NAME:_____
_____

____ Independent student organizations (on or off campus). NAME:_____
_____

____ Other (please describe)_____
_____

Which office/organization of the above has the major responsibility?_____
_____

IV. TRENDS
It may be helpful to refer back to Section I (Nature of Program) for examples of public service activities.

A. Students
Estimate how many students participate in public service activities at your institution _____
What percentage of the student body does this represent? _____

How does the current level of student participation differ from five years ago?
higher____ lower____ about the same____

In your estimation, what factors influenced this trend?_____
_____
_____

Has your institution surveyed students' attitudes towards volunteerism in the last five years?
yes ____ no____ If yes, results._____
_____

B. Institutional

Referring back to Section I, (Nature of Program) how has the character of public service on your campus changed in the past five years? (check all that apply)

_____ not at all
_____ more _____less centralization of public service activities
_____ increased _____decreased funding for public service activities
_____ change in formal policy/institutional support (please describe)_____
_____
_____ other_____

VI. INSTITUTIONAL DISINCENTIVES

Much of the information we have asked for has focused on program incentives. In program planning, it is also helpful to know what's on the other side of the coin. In your opinion, what are disincentives or obstacles to students participation in community and/or public service activities? Please check all that act as disincentives at your institution.

_____ Financial considerations (e.g. loan burden). Do you have any evidence that such considerations discourage students at your institution from public service? yes _____ no_____ (please explain) _____
_____

_____ Lack of an organized program. Do you have any evidence that such a lack deters students from public service? yes_____ no_____.

_____ Lack of academic credit.

_____ Lack of information about service opportunities.

_____ Career considerations.

_____ Diminished public support and esteem for public service.

_____ Other. Please explain_____
_____

In your estimation how could these obstacles best be overcome?_____
_____

Thank you very much for your help in filling out this survey. Please be sure to enclose Individual Program Description forms. Please don't hesitate to call if you have any questions.

DEADLINE: FEBRUARY 5, 1986

The Survey is being conducted for the PPCS by Stanford University. Surveys and other descriptive material are to be returned to: Jeanne Wahl Halleck

> Public Service Center/Owen House
> Stanford University
> Stanford, CA 94305
> (415) 497-0992 or 723-0992

Name of person filling out survey_____ Address _____
_____

Date_____   Phone (_____)_____

5

Appendix D

Respondents

RESPONDENTS

Alverno College
Bard College
Barnard College
Bennington College
Berea College
Brandeis University
Brevard Community College
Brown University
California State University, Bakersfield
California State University, Chico
California State University, Sacramento
Carleton College
Colorado College
Cornell University
Dartmouth College
Davidson College
DePauw University
Eckerd College
Fordham University
Georgetown University
Grinnell College
Harvard University
Hood College
Lafayette College
Los Angeles Community Colleges
Mankato State University
Miami-Dade Community College
Mills College
Mount St Mary's College
Oberlin College
Ohio Wesleyan University
Princeton University
Radcliffe College
Reed College
Roosevelt University
San Francisco Community College District
San Francisco State University
Seattle University
Southwestern University
Spelman College
Stanford University
Susquehanna University
Trinity College (Connecticut)
Trinity College (Vermont)
Trinity University (Texas)
University of California, Berkeley
University of Illinois at Chicago
University of Illinois at Urbana Champaign
University of Iowa, Iowa City
University of Kentucky
University of Maryland, College Park
University of Massachusetts, Amherst
University of Michigan, Ann Arbor

University of Missouri, Kansas City
University of Nebraska, Omaha
University of Notre Dame
University of North Carolina, Asheville
University of Pennsylvania
University of San Diego
University of Vermont
University of Virginia
Vanderbilt University
Vassar College
Wellesley College
Wells College
Wesleyan
Westmont College
Wheaton College
Wofford College
Yale University

REFERENCES

"A College Consortium Approach to Student Volunteer Community
Service," Synergist, Spring, 1976.

"A Report: University of Delaware Study of Student Volunteer
Attitudes," Synergist, Spring, 1974.

"A Summary Report," Independent Sector, American Volunteer,
1981 and 1985. Summary of survey results.

"Charitable Activities," The Gallup Organization, March, 1985.
Survey.

"How to Create a Successful School/Community Partnership," Phi
Delta Kappan, February, 1984.

"Importance of Helping People in Need," The Gallup Organization,
March, 1982, Survey.

"Liberalism Makes Campus Comeback," U.S. News and World Report,
January 21, 1985. Survey results.

"Making Volunteer Work Pay Off," Changing Times, August, 1981.

"NSVP Survey Profiles a Growing Student Volunteer Movement,"
Synergist, Fall, 1974. Survey results.

"Opportunities for Service," Today's Education, 1982/83.

"Profile of Postsecondary Study-Services," Synergist, Spring,
1977.

"Study Proves Hypotheses--And More," Synergist, Spring, 1980.

"The Charitable Behavior of Americans: Findings From a National
Survey," Independent Sector, 1986

"Toward a Tradition of Caring," American Education, September,
1983.

"Voluntarism in America," United States Senate Committee on
Labor and Human Resources, Subcommittee on Aging, Family, and
Human Services,97th Congress, 2nd Session, April 22, 1982.

"Visions, Values, and Declining Support," Commonweal, April 19,
1985.

"Voluntarism," The Gallup Organization, February, 1982. Survey.

"Voluntarism and Education," American Education, September, 1982.

"Volunteerism and Service Learning: The Twentieth Century,"
Synergist, Spring, 1978.