


# 2014 Campus Compact Member Survey

*Summary of All Private Institutions*



Campus Compact



## 2014 Service Statistics: Campus Compact Membership Survey Summary Results for ALL Private Higher Education Institutions

### Purpose and Methodology

Campus Compact conducted an online member survey for 11 weeks beginning October 2014 in order to calculate student and faculty involvement in community engagement, assess institutional support/culture, identify community-campus partnerships and tracking mechanisms on campus, and assess satisfaction with Campus Compact programs and services. The survey is the most comprehensive and widely distributed review of service, service-learning, and community engagement in higher education and provides the clearest reflection on the changes in institutional commitment to community-based teaching, learning, and research over time.

Of 1,080 member institutions in 2014, 434 responded to the survey, with a national response rate of 40%. This report contains a summary of the findings for Campus Compact members in the private higher education institutions, compared to the national data.

	<b>Number of Campus Compact members</b>	<b>Number of survey respondents</b>	<b>Response rate</b>
National	1,080	434	40%
Private	N/A	206	48%

### Institutional Information

	<b>Private four-year</b>	<b>Public four-year</b>	<b>Private two-year</b>	<b>Public two-year</b>
National	47%	37%	1%	15%

<b>Other institutional characteristics</b>	<b>National</b>	<b>Private</b>
Business	21%	17%
Community College	17%	1%
Commuter	31%	17%
Early College	8%	2%
Faith-based/Religiously Affiliated	25%	52%
Historically Black	2%	0%
Land Grant	9%	0%
Liberal Arts	60%	83%
Minority-serving	18%	11%
Professional	30%	33%
Research/Comprehensive	26%	19%
Residential	52%	65%
Technical	8%	2%

<b>Carnegie Basic Classification</b>	<b>National</b>	<b>Private</b>
RU/VH: Research Universities (very high research activity)	9%	6%
RU/H: Research Universities (high research activity)	6%	2%
DRU: Doctoral/Research Universities	5%	6%
Master's/L: Master's Colleges and Universities (larger programs)	16%	17%
Master's/M: Master's Colleges and Universities (medium programs)	9%	10%
Master's/S: Master's Colleges and Universities (smaller programs)	5%	5%
Bac/A&S: Baccalaureate Colleges—Arts & Sciences	18%	25%
Bac/Diverse: Baccalaureate Colleges—Diverse Fields	7%	10%
Bac/Assoc: Baccalaureate/Associate's Colleges	2%	1%
Assoc/Pub-R-S: Associate's—Public Rural-serving Small	2%	0%
Assoc/Pub-R-M: Associate's—Public Rural-serving Medium	9%	0%
Assoc/Pub-R-L: Associate's—Public Rural-serving Large	1%	1%
Assoc/Pub-S-SC: Associate's—Public Suburban-serving Single Campus	2%	0%
Assoc/Pub-S-MC: Associate's—Public Suburban-serving Multicampus	4%	1%
Assoc/Pub-U-SC: Associate's—Public Urban-serving Single Campus	1%	0%
Assoc/Pub-U-MC: Associate's—Public Urban-serving Multicampus	4%	0%
Assoc/PrivNFP: Associate's—Private Not-for-profit	1%	2%
Assoc/Pub2in4: Associate's—Public 2-year Colleges under Universities	2%	0%
Assoc/Pub4: Associate's—Public 4-year, Primarily Associate's	1%	0%
Assoc/PrivNFP4: Associate's—Private Not-for-profit 4-year, Primarily Associate's	1%	1%
Spec/Faith: Theological seminaries, Bible colleges, and other faith-related institutions	1%	1%
Spec/Medical: Medical schools and medical centers	1%	1%
Spec/Health: Other health profession schools	1%	2%
Spec/Bus: Schools of business and management	1%	1%
Spec/Arts: Schools of art, music, and design	1%	1%
Spec/Other: Other special-focus institutions	1%	1%

<b>Carnegie Community Engagement Elective Classification</b>	<b>National</b>	<b>Private</b>
Have the classification	36%	34%
Never applied	51%	49%
Number planning to reapply in 2020	15%	15%

<b>Institutional numbers</b>	<b>National</b>	<b>Private</b>
Average FTE Undergraduate Enrollment	7,192	3,036
Average FTE Graduate Enrollment	1,453	1,119
TOTAL Average FTE Enrollment	8,645	4,155
Average FTE Faculty	577	405

### **Community Service/Service-Learning/Civic Engagement on Campus**

<b>How student participation is tracked</b>	<b>National</b>	<b>Private</b>
Track only curricular engagement	8%	7%
Track only co-curricular engagement	5%	4%
Track both curricular and co-curricular engagement together	20%	22%
Track both curricular and co-curricular engagement, but separately	48%	47%
Don't track either curricular or co-curricular engagement	19%	19%

<b>Student numbers</b>	<b>National</b>	<b>Private</b>
Average number of students <b>per campus</b> involved in Community Service, Service-Learning and Civic Engagement Activities	3,299 (1,382,145 total at 419 institutions)	1,872 (357,572 total at 191 institutions)
% of student FTE involved	39%	45%
Average hours per week/per campus	3.5 (based on 398 institutions)	3
Total # of hours served by all students in 2013-2014 (based on 32-week academic year and the average student FTE enrollment at 419 institutions)	4,837,508/week: 154,800,240/year	1,115,774/week: 35,704,781/year
Overall Value of Service (based on Independent Sector's 2013 value of volunteer time of \$22.55 per hour)	\$3,490,745,412	\$805,142,813

<b>Service-Learning courses</b>	<b>National</b>	<b>Private</b>
Overall # offered by all institutions	30,885	10,486
Average # offered per campus	78	51
Average # of FTE faculty teaching a SL course per campus	77	32
Average % of FTE faculty	13%	8%
Average # of staff per campus supporting both student curricular and co-curricular engagement	21	17

<b>Issue areas addressed through service</b>	<b>National</b>	<b>Private</b>
Access and retention in higher education	74%	68%
Agriculture/nutrition	64%	61%
Animal welfare	52%	51%
College student preparation for career and society	74%	69%
Civil rights/human rights	73%	76%
College readiness in K to 12 education	77%	73%
Conflict resolution	41%	39%
Crime/criminal justice	55%	49%
Disability issues	69%	65%
Disaster preparedness	42%	37%
Economic development	72%	68%
Environment/sustainability issues	85%	87%
Global citizenship	75%	78%
Health care, general	80%	80%
HIV/AIDS	41%	39%
Housing/homelessness	85%	93%
Hunger/food insecurity	92%	95%
Immigrant/migrant worker rights	54%	62%
International issues	65%	69%
K-12 education	89%	93%
Legal aid	33%	33%
Mental health	62%	61%
Mentoring	88%	91%
Multiculturalism/diversity	82%	82%
Parenting/child	50%	39%
Poverty	85%	89%
Public arts/theater	67%	62%
Reading/writing	80%	80%
Senior/elder services	73%	76%
Sexual assault	65%	61%
Substance abuse	51%	43%
Tax form preparation	55%	48%
Technology	50%	41%
Transportation	27%	20%
Tutoring	91%	93%
Voting	64%	55%
Women's issues	74%	75%
Other	6%	17%

## Infrastructure

<b>Reported # of offices or centers on campus that coordinate curricular and/or co-curricular engagement</b>	<b>National</b>	<b>Private</b>
Institutions reporting one office/center	175	93
Reporting two offices/centers	104	48
Reporting three offices/centers	38	11
Reporting four offices/centers	27	16
Reporting five or more offices/centers	16	26

### Summary results for Office 1 information

<b>Office annual budget including salaries</b>	<b>National</b>	<b>Private</b>
Less than 20%	12%	9%
\$20,000-\$49,999	9%	10%
\$50,000-\$99,999	16%	17%
\$100,000-\$249,999	27%	25%
\$250,000-\$499,999	17%	18%
\$500,000-\$999,999	9%	11%
\$1,000,000 plus	6%	6%

<b>Primary purpose of this office</b>	<b>National</b>	<b>Private</b>
Academic service-learning	35%	32%
Other	33%	33%
Volunteering	25%	29%
Public Service	6%	6%

<b>The office to which the center/office reports</b>	<b>National</b>	<b>Private</b>
Academic Affairs	40%	41%
Student Affairs	37%	35%
Both Academic and Student Affairs	8%	9%
President's office	6%	8%

<b>Responsibilities of the office (check all that apply)</b>	<b>National</b>	<b>Private</b>
Community partnership development	80%	87%
Civic engagement	76%	79%
Community service	76%	82%
Academic service-learning	74%	79%
Student leadership development	60%	68%
Experiential learning	56%	64%
Federal programming	44%	46%
Community work study	39%	50%

<b>Office/Center leaders</b>	<b>National</b>	<b>Private</b>
Most common title: Director	320	170
Average number of years in the position	6	6
Average number of years working for the institution	10	10
Percent of time focused on supporting curricular and/or co-curricular community engagement	70%	74%
Highest level of education:		
Ph.D. or equivalent, Professional degree (J.D.)	31%	31%
Master's	55%	51%
Bachelor's	11%	12%

### **Institutional Support/Culture**

	<b>National</b>		<b>Private</b>	
	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
Institutional mission/purpose statement drives policies supporting curricular & co-curricular community engagement	89%	10%	94%	5%
Curricular & co-curricular community engagement included in institution's strategic plans	88%	12%	93%	6%

<b>Student outcomes addressed in institution's strategic plan</b>	<b>National</b>	<b>Private</b>
Student leadership development	69%	76%
Student civic learning	60%	61%
Education for global citizenship	80%	84%
Student civic engagement	72%	76%
Service to the community (local, national, global)	83%	85%
Advocates of social issues	42%	49%
Careers for the Public good	39%	43%

<b>Student presence and voice in decision-making matters</b>	<b>National</b>	<b>Private</b>
Student(s) sit on academic committees	68%	69%
Student(s) sit on budgetary committees	40%	31%
Student(s) sit on hiring committees	62%	64%
Student(s) serve on the Board of Trustees	45%	34%
Student(s) have formal opportunities to discuss concerns with administration (e.g., Public forums, publicly known office hours)	90%	90%
Student government has autonomous control of funds/activity fees	74%	78%

<b>Community member presence and voice in decision-making matters</b>	<b>National</b>	<b>Private</b>
Community member(s) sit on academic committees	24%	18%
Community member(s) sit on budgetary committees	9%	7%
Community member(s) sit on hiring committees	28%	21%
Participate on an institution-wide community advisory board	43%	32%
Participate on a unit-specific community advisory board	66%	58%
Serve on the Board of Trustees	63%	61%
Have formal opportunities to discuss concerns with administration (e.g., Public forums, publicly known office hours)	69%	62%



As part of the Association of American Colleges and University's Liberal Education and America's Promise (LEAP) initiative, the Valid Assessment of Learning in Undergraduate Education (VALUE) project focuses the national conversation about student learning on a set of essential learning outcomes that faculty, employers, and community leaders say are critical for personal, social, career, and professional success in this century and this global environment. Respondents were asked which of the essential learning outcomes addressed in the project could be found in their institution's strategic plan.

<b>Essential Learning Outcomes addressed in institution's strategic plan</b>	<b>National</b>	<b>Private</b>
Inquiry and analysis	67%	72%
Critical thinking	86%	87%
Creative thinking	58%	62%
Written communication	73%	74%
Oral communication	70%	71%
Quantitative literacy	50%	51%
Information literacy	52%	50%
Teamwork	50%	53%
Problem solving	65%	67%
Civic knowledge and engagement, local	70%	73%
Civic knowledge and engagement, global	70%	78%
Intercultural knowledge and competence	69%	75%
Ethical reasoning	57%	68%
Foundations and skills for lifelong learning	68%	73%
Integrative learning	56%	65%

<b>Support for faculty and staff personal participation in service/volunteering activities</b>	<b>National</b>	<b>Private</b>
On site service opportunities (e.g., blood drives, food drives)	98%	99%
Opportunities to serve with students as advisors to extracurricular service groups	90%	91%
Opportunities to serve with students on service projects	89%	91%
Host campus days of service that include staff and faculty	72%	73%
Encouragement to serve on community boards	67%	73%
Public recognition of service	65%	67%
Paid time off to participate in service activities	35%	39%
Other	2%	1%

<b>Presidential involvement in service/civic engagement activities</b>	<b>National</b>	<b>Private</b>
Publicly promotes service/community engagement	87%	87%
Participates in campus service/community engagement activities	76%	74%
Provides fiscal support for community-based work	73%	78%
Serves on community board	72%	66%
Speaks to alumni and trustees on service/community engagement	68%	72%
Meets regularly with community partners/representatives	63%	57%
Solicits foundation or other support	56%	57%
Attends service/community engagement conferences	45%	40%
Writes publicly on service/community engagement (e.g., op-eds, campus publications, national newspapers)	42%	44%
Hosts service/community engagement conferences	31%	29%
Teaches a service-learning course	5%	5%
Other	3%	5%

<b>Student involvement in leading community service, academic service-learning and/or civic engagement efforts on campus</b>	<b>National</b>	<b>Private</b>
Students recruit their peers	93%	97%
Students assist in staffing the offices associated with curricular and/or co-curricular engagement	84%	86%
Students assist with reflection activities	72%	80%
Students act as liaisons to community sites	72%	81%
Students serve on campus service, community engagement and/or service-learning committees	69%	69%
Students play a lead role in setting the direction of the offices associated with curricular and/or co-curricular engagement	49%	51%
Students act as guest speakers in service-learning courses	45%	42%
Students act as service-learning course assistants	44%	45%
Students recruit faculty	44%	49%
Students act as service-learning co-instructors	18%	17%
Students help to design academic service-learning courses and create syllabi	16%	17%
Other	7%	8%

<b>Institution fosters or supports student community service, academic service-learning and/or civic engagement</b>	<b>National</b>	<b>Private</b>
Designates a period of time (e.g., day of service, service week, etc.) to highlight student civic engagement and/or service activities	72%	78%
Manages liability associated with service placements	70%	73%
Provides/coordinates transportation to and from community sites	64%	80%
Considers service formally in admissions process	34%	43%
Considers service in awarding scholarships	69%	69%
Defines and identifies academic service-learning courses	72%	77%
Requires academic service-learning as part of core curriculum in at least one major	64%	65%
Offers community service/civic engagement major and/or minor	15%	15%
Offers courses on volunteerism	27%	27%
Offers courses on activism/advocacy	52%	54%
Designates academic service-learning courses in the course guide	50%	55%
Records service on student transcripts	29%	33%
Gives extra credit for co-curricular community engagement	41%	45%
Requires service for graduation	12%	11%
Gives awards to students for service	77%	80%
Offers mini-grants to students for service-related initiatives	41%	49%
Provides funding (e.g., scholarships, grants, fellowships, education awards, etc.) for curricular and/or co-curricular community engagement	68%	74%
Hosts and/or funds Public dialogues on current issues	80%	82%
Provides physical space/communication mechanisms for peaceful student protest	58%	62%
Provides space for student political organizations on campus	66%	72%
Other	3%	3%

<b>Average federal work study funds dedicated to community service</b>	<b>National</b>	<b>Private</b>
Average (based on 360 responses)	15%	12%

<b>Institution matches the Segal AmeriCorps Education Award</b>	<b>National</b>	<b>Private</b>
Yes	6%	7%
No	94%	88%

<b>Community service, academic service-learning and/or civic engagement programs offered</b>	<b>National</b>	<b>Private</b>
One-day service projects	89%	90%
Nonprofit internships/practicum	84%	89%
Discipline-based service-learning courses	81%	80%
Service clubs	77%	77%
Alternative service breaks	72%	85%
International service opportunities	72%	81%
First-year experience service opportunities	63%	75%
Residence hall-based service	59%	66%
Government internships	58%	61%
Freshman year orientation to service	55%	68%
Fraternities/Sororities	55%	51%
Capstone service courses	54%	53%
Alumni service projects	43%	54%
Learning communities concerning service and engagement	45%	44%
Summer service programs	40%	45%
Graduate school service	30%	34%
Inter-campus service programs	37%	38%

<b>Institutional support for faculty involvement in community engagement and teaching academic service-learning courses</b>	<b>National</b>	<b>Private</b>
Provides faculty development workshops/fellowships	77%	77%
Provides materials to assist faculty in reflection and assessment	76%	77%
Provides curriculum models and sample syllabi	72%	72%
Encourages and supports faculty financially to attend and present at service-learning conferences	68%	70%
Rewards service-learning and community-based research in tenure and review	65%	61%
Gives awards for faculty	56%	55%
Provides faculty with grants to support curriculum redesign	54%	59%
Provides service-learning and community orientation during faculty orientation	46%	46%
Search and recruitment policies encourage hiring of faculty with expertise in and commitment to community engagement	41%	38%
Allows sabbaticals for service-learning research, scholarship and program development	36%	33%
A faculty governance committee has responsibilities for community engagement	22%	23%

### Campus-Community Partnerships

<b>Community partner involvement in student learning and engagement activities</b>	<b>National</b>	<b>Private</b>
Come into classes as speakers	93%	92%
Provide feedback on the development/maintenance of community service/volunteering/community engagement programs	82%	83%
Provide reflection on site in community setting	76%	78%
Act as uncompensated co-instructors	54%	52%
Participate in the design and delivery of community-based courses	44%	45%
Serve on campus committees that determine learning goals and/or engagement activities	37%	31%
Assist in creating syllabi and/or designing courses	32%	32%
Act as compensated co-instructors	27%	29%
Other	2%	1%

<b>Community partner organization types</b>	<b>National</b>	<b>Private</b>
Non-profit/community-based organizations	97%	99%
K-12 schools	96%	97%
Faith-based organizations	78%	87%
Government	75%	71%
International community or organization	72%	74%
Other higher education institutions	70%	64%
For-profit businesses	69%	63%
Other	4%	3%

<b>Institution engagement with alumni in community service or civic engagement activities</b>	<b>National</b>	<b>Private</b>
Invites alumni to serve as speakers or mentors to current students	71%	80%
Recognizes alumni for service in publications	62%	68%
Communicates service opportunities to alumni	57%	67%
Cultivates alumni donors to support service activities	48%	56%
Gives awards to alumni for service	45%	52%
Coordinates day of service or service weekend activities for alumni	39%	50%
N/A	15%	4%

<b>Programs offered to alumni entering Public Service careers</b>	<b>National</b>	<b>Private</b>
Informational program on public service careers	49%	64%
Network of alumni in public service careers	37%	52%
Student loan deferment	9%	10%
Student loan forgiveness	5%	5%
N/A	45%	29%

### Assessment

	<b>National</b>		<b>Private</b>	
	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
The institution has defined the characteristics of high quality partnerships	33%	67%	34%	66%
There's a process in place for determining that partnerships are of high quality	31%	69%	33%	62%

<b>The institution or its units (departments or schools) have mechanisms to record community engagement</b>	<b>National</b>	<b>Private</b>
Yes, the institution has mechanisms	12%	15%
Units within the institution have mechanisms	49%	50%
Both the institution and units have mechanisms	31%	31%
Neither the institution nor units have mechanisms	7%	4%

<b>The institution or its units (departments or schools) have mechanisms for systematic assessment of community perceptions of the institution's engagement with the community</b>	<b>National</b>	<b>Private</b>
Yes, the institution has mechanisms	9%	9%
Units within the institution have mechanisms	42%	45%
Both the institution and units have mechanisms	17%	13%
Neither the institution nor units have mechanisms	32%	33%

<b>The institution or its units (departments or schools) have mechanisms for systematic assessment of the impact on the community of community engagement efforts</b>	<b>National</b>	<b>Private</b>
Yes, the institution has mechanisms	6%	7%
Units within the institution have mechanisms	40%	41%
Both the institution and units have mechanisms	13%	10%
Neither the institution nor units have mechanisms	41%	42%

<b>The institution or its units (departments or schools) have mechanisms for systematic assessment of the impact on student learning of community engagement efforts</b>	<b>National</b>	<b>Private</b>
Yes, the institution has mechanisms	11%	13%
Units within the institution have mechanisms	49%	50%
Both the institution and units have mechanisms	21%	23%
Neither the institution nor units have mechanisms	19%	15%

### Campus Compact Membership

<b>Satisfaction with Campus Compact service and resources</b>	<b>National</b>	<b>Private</b>	<b>Satisfaction with your institution's membership in your state/regional Campus Compact</b>
Very satisfied	57%	34%	45%
Somewhat satisfied	31%	34%	29%
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	10%	24%	14%
Somewhat dissatisfied	2%	6%	7%
Very dissatisfied	0%	1%	2%

### Survey Information

<b>How the institution will use the information gathered</b>	<b>National</b>	<b>Private</b>
Share with relevant contacts on campus	82%	80%
Use to inform strategic planning for community engagement office	65%	67%
Share with the president or chancellor	58%	53%
Use to complete the application for President's Higher Education Community Service Honor Roll	56%	58%
Use to inform strategic planning for the institution	48%	46%
Share with relevant contacts in the community	42%	36%
Use to complete the application for the elective Carnegie Community Engagement Classification	29%	31%
Use to inform accreditation	28%	26%
Share with current and/or prospective donors	26%	27%
Share with prospective students	25%	26%
Share with alumni	24%	25%
Share with institutional governing board	20%	20%



45 Temple Place  
Boston, MA 02111  
Tel: 617.357.1881  
www.compact.org



Treetop Commons, LLC  
www.treetopcommons.com  
Cloud-based software that empowers community engagement