S-Designation Course Review Rubric Feedback

Your feedback from the s-designation process is below. Items that should be addressed are highlighted in yellow. Please see the reviewer's comments below for additional guidance.

Content Area	Excellent (5-4 points)	Sufficient (2-3 points)	Insufficient (1-0 points)	R1	R2	R3
Student Service Activities (3)	Service activities are well-articulated.	Documentation shows specific service activities.	Service activities are not detailed, or are poorly articulated.	3	5	5
Service Activities Addressing Community Need (4)	Activities were planned with community partners and have connection to their mission.	Community partner or potential community partner is identified, and activities that are connected to their mission are described.	Community needs are not met, or are not met in a way that is relevant to the community partner indicated.	2	5	5
Goals, Expectations, and Responsibilities for Instructors (5a)	There are clearly articulated goals, expectations, and responsibilities outlined for instructors. Logistics such as orientation, transportation and supplies have been included in planning.	Some detailed goals, expectations, and responsibilities are articulated for instructors. Acknowledgement of logistic concerns is evident.	Goals, expectations, and responsibilities for instructors are vague or not described. Logistics are not addressed. Serious questions as to how instructors will support service-learning.	3	5	3
Goals, Expectations, and Responsibilities for Students (5b)	There are clearly articulated goals, expectations, and responsibilities outlined for students. Service and learning goals for students are accomplishable.	Some detailed goals, expectations, and responsibilities for students. Service and learning goals can be accomplished if all expectations and responsibilities are met.	Goals, expectations, and responsibilities for students are vague or unlisted. Serious questions as to how students will meet service and learning goals.	3	5	5
Goals, Expectations, and Responsibilities for	There are detailed goals, expectations, and responsibilities for community partners that are appropriate, easily achievable in the scope	Some detailed goals, expectations, and responsibilities for community partners that are appropriate and can potentially be achieved in the scope of their	Goals, expectations, and responsibilities for community partners are not shared. Serious questions as to how community partner supports service-	3	5	5

Community Partners (5c)	of their mission and agreed upon by the community partner.	mission.	learning.			
Sustainability and Departmental Support (6)	Documentation indicates firm support from department, community partners and other sources dedicated to sustaining the course.	Documentation indicates some support from department, community partners or other sources to make course sustainable.	Documentation indicates little to no support for course from department or community partners.	4	5	5
Connections between service and academic content (7)	Service activities are clearly connected to academic content	Service activities are connected to academic content.	Connections between service activities and academic content are unclear.	5	5	5
Student Reflection (8a)	Students are given significant opportunities for structured reflection. Connections between service and academic content are repeatedly reinforced.	Students are given some opportunities for structured reflection, where connection between service and academic content is made.	Opportunities for student reflection are not detailed in documentation. Connections between service and academic content are not reinforced.	4	5	4
Community partnership (8b)	Students have opportunity to become culturally competent service providers through a substantial orientation to the community, with multiple opportunities to learn about issues, assets, and resources and the context of the service activity.	Students are prepared to engage with sites in a culturally competent manner through an introduction to the community, and critical thinking about community issues, assets, resources and the content of the service activity is encouraged.	Course provides little to no orientation or context for the community in which students will be working, and cultural competence is not covered.	2	5	3
Evaluation of impact (8c)	Students are given significant opportunities to reflect on and assess the impact of their activities on their community.	Students are given some opportunities to reflect on and assess the impact of their activities.	Students are not given opportunities to reflect on or evaluate the impact of their actions.	3	5	3
Evaluation of student	Documentation lays out clear strategy for assessing the	Documentation provides sufficient indication that student	Documentation provides little to no indication on how student	5	5	5

learning (9)	learning outcomes listed below. There are well-defined metrics and methods of assessment.	learning will be assessed for the learning outcomes listed below. There are defined metrics and a basic assessment strategy.	learning will be assessed for the learning outcomes listed below. Assessment strategy is unclear or completely absent.			

The following general Expected Learning Outcomes are defined for students in Service-Learning courses:

- **Students make connections between concepts and skills learned in an academic setting and community-based work**

- **Students demonstrate an understanding of the issues, resources, assets, and cultures of the community in which they are working.**

- **Students evaluate the impacts of the service learning activity.**

Please give this course an overall score from 1 to 5.

Reviewer 1	Overall score is a 3.
	• I am frankly a bit concerned about the ephemeral and short term nature of the partner contacts. The instructor speaks in a convincing way about the benefits of this, but provides limited arguments for why this would indeed be beneficial to the partners. I feel that there should be some more substantial evidence to go outside proven approaches for effective service learning. I don't mind experimenting and researching the effectiveness but I am not sure an S/GE course is the right place for such research.
	• Logistics around field trips are not articulated but are probably routine, given the longevity of the course. It is unclear who (instructor or partners) will introduce students to the issues and prepare them for service in the specific settings they will encounter. It seems from the current website that many assignments are student-led fieldtrips with limited partner contact or engagement.
	• Looking at the responses to all three responses to 5a, b, and c, I get a feeling of a lopsided partnership where the benefits to the community partners are less clear than for students.
	• Students are given ample opportunity through the course blog to provide reflections on their work. The prompt is good but I does not seem to provide scaffolding to help students achieve the skills required of the final assignment. I

	would recommend some of the blog assignments and prompts to specifically target the four questions that is the focus of the final assignment. • There are weekly readings that introduce the academic content around each focus area, but I find limited contextual information and activities to promote cultural competency. • Some opportunity given in the last assignment. This could be improved by scaffolding in the blog assignments though. • Evaluation of student learning is clear and appropriate
Reviewer 2	My overall score for this course is a 5. It is well developed and should have a tremendous impact on student learning. I hope the community partners are in a position to implement some of the students' findings and recommendations. A fresh perspective from young minds with no employment ties could be refreshing and of benefit to the city!
Reviewer 3	Overall score is a 4. This seems like a very well thought out experiential education opportunity. Given the number of different service activities and the quantity of community partners, it does seem that it will be difficult to provide students with background orientation and sensitivity training for all these communities in all these cases. When I purused the required readings, I didn't see any material that might stimulate a collective reflection on how one deals with issues of power and privilege in city planning. In other words, it seems that students might form a bridge between city planners and planning organizations and "ordinary" citizens, and that might have a social justice dimension, but students are also a privileged group relative to others within the city. I would encourage the faculty and TAs to consider hosting a conversation with students about issues of power: who gets to decide how the city develops? how can students work contribute to opening up a democratic space within city planning? The reflective essay at the end seems more solutions- than reflection-oriented. And there is a long history of professional "developers" providing solutions that have not been adequately vetted by target communities, so it would be nice if there were some mechanism in this service-learning course for opening up a conversation about that. These comments are suggestions only, not meant to delay the approval process. Overall, this looks like an excellent offering.