

The Impact of Student Participation with DCSI on Student Learning Outcomes

Dartmouth Center for Social Impact

Joey Chong

Ray Crist

Lynda Jimenez

Kyland Narcisse

Allie Winstanley

Socy 11: Research Methods

Dartmouth College

The Dartmouth Center for Social Impact (DCSI), founded in 2015, seeks to prepare students to become transformative leaders. By placing an emphasis on experiential learning, the students who engage with the Center develop the skills to create high-impact approaches to pressing social problems. DCSI aims to support students with a goal to learn about “service, social innovation, philanthropy, socially-responsible business, and social research” (DCSI, “History”). DCSI offers a range of programs, including immersion trips, internships, local volunteer opportunities, social impact practicums, mentorship programs, as well as post-graduate opportunities in social sector careers (DCSI, “For Student”). With the goal of “preparing students for a life of purpose,” it is important for DCSI to evaluate how much students are truly learning during their time participating in DCSI programs (DCSI, “Mission and Vision”). The Center hopes that following engagement in their programs, students will take away four learning outcomes: (1) increased knowledge of a societal challenge, (2) stronger practice of integrating learning between classroom and community, (3) new sense of global and cultural competency, and (4) implement high impact responses to societal challenges. The efficacy of DCSI programs will be confirmed if students who take part in DCSI programs are able achieve these four learning outcomes that are crucial to the Center’s mission.

LITERATURE REVIEW

This study requires an understanding of student learning in relation to service learning and DCSI’s learning outcomes. With the changing discourse of experiential learning, we conceptualize learning in the context of community-based service learning as a model that best reflects the Center’s values in student learning. Furthermore, DCSI’s learning outcomes cover a wide span of learning concepts, which creates several pathways in the theoretical framework for mechanisms to facilitate learning.

Conceptualization of Learning

Community-based service learning. The Dartmouth Center for Social Impact places emphasis on students' involvement in community-based service learning. Community-based service learning (CBSL) places emphasis on allowing the stakeholders and the community members to serve as the experts rather than having students seize control and authority (Clever and Miller 2019). Advocates for CBSL recognize that community service work and education are reciprocal, enriching experiences for both the students and the agency sites (Ferrari and Worrall 2000). Through CBSL, students build a greater sense of connectedness to society and develop stronger relationships among students, school, and agency sites compared to more traditional forms of service learning (Ferrari and Worrall 2000). In effective CBSL opportunities, the student, school, and community site are all integrated into the educational process (Ferrari and Worrall 2000). Students develop the skills to create and plan courses of action in real-life situations, and schools are able to build stronger relationships to their communities (Ferrari and Worrall 2000). Experiential learning is integrated into CBSL by ensuring that students focus on “learning by doing,” and then reflecting on their experiences. Community-based service learning provides the most positive outcomes for the students, school, and agency site while avoiding the problematic nature of “service learning.”

Much of the existing research on service-based learning opportunities utilizes the term “service learning,” a sometimes broad and often ambiguous term, so it is important to clarify the types of service learning and how they compare to the Center’s programming. “Volunteerism” includes the engagement of students in activities where emphasis is placed on the service being provided, and the primary beneficiary is the service recipient (Mooney and Edwards 2001). Given that there is no explicit focus on the educational value in volunteerism, volunteering often

establishes a giver-receiver relationship as students “help” those in need (Mooney and Edwards 2001). “Community service” is similar to volunteerism in that it focuses on the service being provided, as well as the benefits of the service activities on the recipients, yet it involves more structure and student commitment, and is often required or included in extra credit opportunities for students (Furco 1996). As the community service activities become more integrated with academic coursework, and as students begin to engage in conversations about their experiences, service programs move towards service learning (Furco 1996). Service learning is distinguished from other approaches to experiential education by its intention to benefit the students involved as well the service recipients (Furco 1996). Service learning programs must include an academic context and be designed in a way such that the service component enhances student learning, and vice-versa (Furco 1996). This balance differentiates service learning from other experiential education programs. Some have criticized the original service learning paradigm for reproducing the “charitable giving” perspective of community service and volunteerism, which makes learning less effective at building civic responsibility and increases the risk of entrenching stereotypes (Billig 2000). This has spurred the development of CBSL, as defined in the preceding paragraph, which seeks to avoid these problematic power dynamics. In our remaining literature review, we will reference examples of both service learning and CBSL, with the expectation that they share many of the same academic benefits, while CBSL is more effective at targeting structural inequalities and managing community-student engagement.

Learning outcomes. Student learning is conceptualized by the four outcomes that the DCSI hopes students will gain through involvement with the Center. Learning Outcome 1 (LO1) is knowledge of societal challenge, which includes understanding the context, stakeholders, positionality, and solutions of social issues. Students in a small-scale study demonstrated

increased academic learning when they were able to deconstruct their stereotypes about the subject (Wright 2000). Similarly, students have been able to demonstrate ability to reframe individualistic explanations of poverty to systems of inequality (Davidson 2009; Hollis 2002). Learning Outcome 2 (LO2) is the ability for students to integrate learning between classroom and community, and LO2 implies that students who engage with DCSI will seek courses to build upon their social impact work and apply their knowledge and reflect upon the connections between academic and social impact pursuits. Participation in service learning has been shown to instill in students' personal values, such as continued commitment to activism and a new sense of racial understanding (Astin et al. 2000). Students who participated in service learning experiences have also been able to develop deeper understandings of course content, including the application of that content to real-world situations (Simons et al. 2012). Learning Outcome 3 (LO3) is students' increased global and cultural competency—defined by DCSI as awareness of their biases and views based on their background and experiences. Students must be able to align their values to their actions and recognize the root-cause of societal challenges. Previous research has demonstrated the positive impact that service learning has on cross-cultural understanding (Eyler, Giles, and Braxton 1997; Giles and Eyler 1994). One study showed that students who interacted with patients of color at a physical therapy clinic increased their own empathetic reactions as a result of understanding their own perspectives on diversity (Simons et al. 2012). CBSL has the potential to deepen students' understanding of structural inequalities by forcing them to practice principles like cultural humility, rather than simply theorizing about them (Costigan 2020). Learning Outcome 4 (LO4) states that students will be able to develop high impact responses to societal challenges. These high impact responses should demonstrate students ability to understand the core principles for social impact and how to apply them in their

programming. Students should develop project management skills, understand how to work in teams, and employ creative thinking techniques to effectively problem solve. Research has shown that through service learning, students have been able to develop greater feelings of efficacy, thus allowing students to become social impact leaders in their communities (Cress 2003; Fritz 2002; Marullo and Edwards 2000).

Theoretical Framework

We have theorized that student learning, as defined by the Center's four learning objectives, primarily *occurs* via four theoretical mechanisms: awareness of self, awareness of community, personal development, and metacognition.

Awareness of community. Through service experiences, students are exposed to different races and cultures, facilitating learning about problems within the community (Astin and Sax 1998). By understanding the challenges faced by the wider community, students gain deeper knowledge and intimacy with the societal issue they are addressing through their service experiences or CBSL (Kalas and Raisinghani 2019). Awareness of community needs can help encourage "pivot points" from ignorance to knowledge (Wickersham et al. 2015), thus increasing knowledge of a societal challenge in LO1.

Awareness of self. Through the exposure to new experiences, students develop an awareness of their personal identities resulting in personal growth and metacognition. Students become aware of their proximity to community experiences through their engagement in CBSL (Clever and Miller 2019). The individual awareness of students' positionality and identity impacts their outlook on social circumstances, such as race logics (Becker and Paul 2015), that also prompt critical self-reflection of existing prejudices and biases. Awareness of self also

allows students to focus on how service experiences help grow themselves through metacognition (Clever and Miller 2019).

Personal growth and development. Through an increased awareness of self and community and processes of metacognition, students undergo personal growth and development that promotes connections between the classroom and community (LO2) and cultural competency (LO3). Personal growth encourages students to expand their knowledge and understanding by drawing connections to the classroom and community through cross-cultural perspectives (Giles and Eyler 1994). As students understand the nuances within the community, their perceptions of the communities they work with change in a positive direction, such as working with homeless populations (Mobley 2007).

Metacognition. Through reflective components in programming, students express feelings of self-efficacy to address societal challenges through metacognition. Metacognition is “the ability to reflect upon, understand, and control one’s learning” (Schraw and Dennison 1994). As part of metacognition, reflection is extremely powerful as a means of connecting the service experience to academic course material (Astin et al. 2000) in addition to improving critical thinking skills and higher order reasoning (Ash, Clayton, and Atkinson 2005). Ultimately, metacognition and reflection encourage service and civic engagement while also increasing feelings of self-efficacy to make an impact in the community (Batchelder and Root 2002).

RESEARCH QUESTION

This proposal attempts to address the question, “Does student involvement with DCSI increase students’ (1) knowledge of societal challenges, (2) ability to integrate their learning between classroom and community, (3) global and cultural competency, and (4) skills for

responding to social challenges?” Our research question focuses on the relationship between student involvement and the learning outcomes rather than the intervening variables.

Consequently, the research instrument and methodology incorporates aspects of the theoretical framework outlined in Appendix C, but this proposal does not measure the theoretical mechanisms. Rather, preliminary qualitative inquiries through in-depth interviews confirmed the various pathways and variables within the proposed theoretical framework. When considering the relationship between two variables, we hypothesize that student involvement will increase each learning outcomes:

H1: Student involvement with DCSI increases students’ knowledge of societal challenges.

H2: Student involvement with DCSI increases students’ ability to integrate their learning between classroom and community.

H3: Student involvement with DCSI increases students’ global and cultural competency.

H4: Student involvement with DCSI increases students’ skills to create high impact responses to societal challenges.

METHODS

This study aims to use quantitative methods to address DCSI’s learning outcomes. The study will be conducted in the form of a web-based survey in which students will be self-assessing their experiences with DCSI. It would be best if DCSI sent out this web-survey to the participants as soon as they end their involvement with programs in order for them to be reflective about their experiences and recall information with ease. It is worth acknowledging that programs vary in their duration and end date.

Advantages and disadvantages. The data collected is meant to help assess where DCSI is succeeding and places in which the programs could improve to better facilitate student learning. The data may be presented to stakeholders, informative for resource distribution, and useful for enacting changes in programming. Collecting quantitative data helps to synthesize results more clearly than utilizing qualitative methods, which would take extra time to interpret. Conducting this study through a web-based survey will save DCSI resources. Performing in depth-interviews, experiments, or other methods would require additional time, money, and staff. Utilizing a web-based survey poses disadvantages such as lower response rates and the inability to clarify any confusing statements. Participants may be less inclined to complete the entirety of a web-survey compared to if there were an interviewer present to guide them through the statements. Low response rates of web-based surveys could be mitigated by offering incentives like gift cards. The inability to address confusing statements remains, so we recommend small groups of people take the preliminary survey as a trial. This process could help improve the survey draft and eliminate as many errors as possible. Fortunately, this step has been performed on a sample of five students to improve the flow of questions, and clarify terminology of the previous version. The updated survey is attached in Appendix B.

Variables. As stated in previous sections, the independent variable of the study is student involvement with DCSI and the dependent variables are knowledge of social issues, ability to integrate learning, global and cultural competency, and the development of skills needed to respond to social issues. The independent variable is most simple to assess and verify because DCSI has a list tracking which students are involved in the different programs. Some questions that address this variable ask about termly and weekly involvement. The Center provided a list of indicators for each of the dependent variables (learning outcomes). These indicators were

transformed into simplified statements for the survey. Participants are meant to report their agreement with such statements along a scale. For example, statements for LO1 assessed exposure to new situations and awareness. The operationalization of these variables is quite unique to DCSI as other sets of studies from the literature review do not observe the same combination of learning outcomes. Only a few statements were pulled directly from other sources without alteration. See Appendix B for more on the operationalization of specific dependent variables.

Causality. To establish causal inference, one must have association, direction of influence, and elimination of rival explanations. The study can establish the association between involvement in DCSI programs and improved learning outcomes. There is support from theories that suggest exposure can lead to different types of awareness. Ideally, the study would aim at establishing causality, but may be unable to address all of the potential mediators to truly eliminate rival explanations. One factor to keep in consideration are the academic disciplines that the students are interested in pursuing. It is possible that students are enrolled in non-SIP courses where they obtain knowledge that enhances skills similar to those of DCSI's learning outcomes. Other factors of interest are socioeconomic status and personal experiences. There is a concern that students with prior volunteer experience or those personally affected by social issues may self-select into programs that aid others. There are demographic and academic discipline questions included in the survey that allow for DCSI to observe whether such patterns may exist. One potential mediator of interest is metacognition. As mentioned in the literature review, the role of reflection is imperative for personal growth and development. Taking time to sort through concepts and issues that arise for the DCSI participants can lead to them making the necessary

connections that improve learning outcomes. Thus, it is suggested that there be reflective tasks throughout the span of a student's involvement in the programs.

Logical approach. This study uses a deductive approach. DCSI provided a list of four broad learning outcomes with very specific goals under those subgroups. This set of goals informed the research process and the development of the literature review. These theories have provided enough information to predict that student involvement in programs similar to DCSI's should improve learning outcomes rather than diminish the student's skills and learning.

Sampling. The participants of this study will be Dartmouth undergraduate students who are currently or have been previously involved in DCSI's programs. This study will utilize non-probability convenience sampling to save DCSI from investing resources into randomly selecting a sample. The participants will come from DCSI's database of student participation, which will provide a congruent population and sampling frame. One of the requirements is that participants must have participated in at least one program that excludes short term programming like Breaking the Mold. DCSI will utilize broadband (i.e. Listserv) and localized (i.e. specific program rosters) distribution methods to approach students. We recommend contacting students weekly until a satisfactory number of responses or three instances of contact. This study is cross-sectional because DCSI will contact students to complete this survey at the end of their program, which may be the end of the school year for some and at the end of the term for others. Participants of programs with ambiguous timelines will be asked to fill out this survey at least once at the end of the academic year.

Generalizability. This study is only generalizable to Dartmouth undergraduate students who self-select themselves into community-based service learning programs. The definition of experiential learning is broad, and its subsections are often labeled differently by different

institutions. As this is the case, we cannot generalize beyond Dartmouth's campus. However, DCSI seeks to assess its own effects on Dartmouth students, so the lack of generalizability is a non-issue for DCSI's purposes. It is a strength to have clearly defined our usage of CBSL, as we can add to the building literature of experiential learning subsections as transparently as possible.

Reliability. Although this study does not allow for test-retest reliability, we measure reliability through internal consistency. Specifically, each learning outcome is measured by at least 4 indicators or statements, which can then be calculated for correlation among the results with a statistical index like Cronbach's alpha. However, it is important to note that the consistency must be calculated by the individual items for each outcome/variable.

Validity. Our dependent variables were operationalized in association with DCSI's constructs, and our literature review supports our conceptualization. Thus, there is construct validity. In terms of content validity, the existing literature and our preliminary qualitative research correlates to the mediator pathways in our conceptual model as valid representations of our dependent variables. The survey questions pertaining to awareness, growth, and metacognition yield a holistic approach to addressing our dependent variables and grant us content validity. In addition, interviews pertaining to student involvement with DCSI resulted in the same information that our survey questions address. This suggests further content validity. The survey itself suggests face validity. Finally, most of our questions were crafted to reflect DCSI's desired indicators, but a few questions intentionally mirror other survey materials (Schraw and Dennison 1994; Moely et al. 2002). Those surveys had confirmed validity within their articles and are being used to give criterion validity to our survey.

Research instrument. The research instrument used is a web survey that should not take longer than 10 minutes to complete. The survey asks respondents to provide personal and

demographic information, then transitions to statements that ask for responses on an agreeability scale from strongly disagree to strongly agree.

Analysis and interpretation. DCSI will analyze the survey data to inform programming. First, it's possible that the most informative survey responses will be from those who completed a program for the first time. The survey is interested in the attainment of the dependent variables, so the most noticeable change is likely from new DCSI members. Any low measure of (strongly disagree to neutral) of the body of statements is indicative of unsuccessful development of the relevant dependent variable. To analyze agreeability, we recommend calculating a composite score for each variable by averaging the responses. Consequently, scores that are 3.0 or greater demonstrate high measures of agreeability. Responses that show higher student agreeability of the indicators suggest DCSI's success in fostering the targeted learning outcomes. See Appendix B for delineation of the mechanisms and variables addressed in each question. Programs with higher overall agreeability of statements result in higher acquisition of the dependent variables. As our conceptual model shows, certain mediators are linked to dependent variables. Higher agreeability of mediator statements shows attainment of the pathways that lead to the development of the dependent variables. This is important for instances where a dependent variable hasn't been fully attained, but the respondent may show that they have progressed on the path towards its attainment. This data can be used as evidence of DCSI's effectiveness to potential grant sources or may be used for internal assessment.

Strengths and weaknesses. This study demonstrates several strengths, such as its cost, contextual implementation, and use of pre-existing resources. This research design is a low cost implementation of a singular survey rather than a pre-post survey. While a pre-post survey may more effectively capture the change in respondents form pre-program to post-program,

self-reporting is not entirely unreliable either. We have structured this survey to be taken close to the conclusion of a given program to allow for the most accurate self-reporting possible. A singular survey saves money on analytical staff salary, and administering an online survey via link does not require staff to distribute and collect it. In terms of context, Dartmouth already has a culture of completing surveys for study or learning purposes, so the relevant population is predisposed to the research instrument. Finally, the emails of possible respondents are already collected by DCSI, so acquiring a survey population does not require additional selection.

This study does have some weaknesses. Student self-assessment does not allow the direct observation of student behavior to verify the survey responses. Another weakness is that this is a cross-sectional study. Furthermore, causality cannot be conclusively determined because of the inability to control for extraneous factors. Finally, non-response bias is a concern. Certain programs may be more likely to complete the survey than others. To mitigate this, DCSI should equally encourage survey completion across programs and reach out to programs that haven't sent back as many responses.

ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS

Our research design has been developed to adhere with the principles laid forth in the Belmont Report, including respect for persons, beneficence, and justice.

Respect for persons. Respect for persons requires providing individuals with adequate information about the research in an accessible format. To that end, we have placed a detailed consent form at the beginning of the survey, informing the subject about possible risks and benefits, as well as with contact information. We sought to keep the text brief and clearly spaced in the form to make it more available and accessible to participants. Voluntariness is essential to informed consent, so we emphasize that filling out the survey has no impact on students'

standing with the Center. Once the survey is complete, the participant is prompted with the contact information once more if they have any questions about their data usage.

Beneficence. In keeping with the principle of beneficence, our survey presents minimal risk to the individual. Most of the survey's questions are personal in nature and generally inspire positive reflection; however, individuals with a negative experience or self-image may react poorly to these questions, so they are informed in advance of the survey's focus. Because this survey is being conducted by DCSI, which has existing relationships with study participants, anonymity is essential for limiting the risk of identifying a participant. Due to this concern, we recommend not collecting demographic data for small programs where this information could be sufficient to identify individuals. The potential benefits to the participants are limited due to the large amount of time it takes to enact institutional change due to feedback, but individuals may be incentivized with rewards such as raffles—a decision we are leaving up to the Center.

Justice. The third guiding principle of the Belmont Report, justice, states that the burdens of research should be equitably distributed among those who have benefited or stand to benefit from it. Given that our study sources students who have presumably benefited from DCSI, we feel confident that the survey population meets this criteria.

FEASIBILITY AND SIGNIFICANCE

Feasibility. During background research with our community partner, we learned that while DCSI has a larger staff than some organizations partnering with SOCY 11, the staff is small relative to the sheer amount of programming they plan each year. Our proposed design needed to be manageable for an individual to organize in a relatively short amount of time. The DCSI prides themselves on being a metric-oriented organization, so we felt comfortable using higher-level research terminology and proposing data manipulation. We felt an online survey

was an appropriate tool based on DCSI's resource limitations and experience managing online surveys, allowing DCSI to easily implement or adapt the tool we have devised.

Significance. As demonstrated in our literature review, there is a wealth of research regarding the impacts of service learning, yet much of this research uses overly broad and outdated definitions of service learning. Far less research exists which assesses the effectiveness of community-based service learning programs such as DCSI's programming. Additionally, it is more common to encounter studies that target specific student outcomes after service learning; individual studies rarely assess all four of the outcomes the DCSI has identified as essential to effective student learning. By conducting this survey, we hope to provide evidence that community-based service learning programs provide similar or greater benefits to students compared to traditional service learning programs. Furthermore, conducting this research will allow us to determine if learning outcomes within the Dartmouth population mirror trends found elsewhere. Finally, our research will allow the DCSI to more effectively engage with potential grant-issuers as well as other departments of the college, by giving it quantitative evidence with which to demonstrate its legitimacy as an essential component of a liberal arts education.

CONCLUSION

This study provides an opportunity for DCSI to collect data to inform the impact of its programs on student learning outcomes. Through careful consideration of DCSI's goals and resources, the study and survey can be used to quantify DCSI's role in student learning, which in turn can provide meaningful statistics to its staff, students, and various community stakeholders. The research and literature presented in this paper demonstrate the effectiveness of the research instrument. However, we encourage the Center to continue improving the survey as DCSI begins to administer the survey to its students. Ultimately, this research proposal provides the

preliminary framework to measure DCSI's impact on student learning as the Center continues to build on the research presented in this paper.

REFERENCES

- Ash, Sarah L., Patti H. Clayton, and Maxine P. Atkinson. 2005. "Integrating Reflection and Assessment to Capture and Improve Student Learning." *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning* 11(2):49-60.
- Astin, Alexander W., and Linda J. Sax. 1998. "How Undergraduates Are Affected by Service Participation." *Journal of College Student Development* 39(3):251-63.
- Astin, Alexander W., Lori J. Vogelgesang, Elaine K. Ikeda, and Jennifer A. Yee. 2000. "How Service Learning Affects Students." *Higher Education* 144.
- Batchelder, Thomas H., and Susan Root. 1994. "Effects of an Undergraduate Program to Integrate Academic Learning and Service: Cognitive, Prosocial Cognitive, and Identity Outcomes." *Journal of Adolescence* 17(4):341-55.
- Becker, Sarah, and Crystal Paul. 2015. "'It Didn't Seem Like Race Mattered': Exploring the Implications of Service-learning Pedagogy for Reproducing or Challenging Color-blind Racism." *Teaching Sociology* 43(3).
- Billig, Shelley H. 2000. "The Effects of Service Learning." *Service Learning, General* 42.
- Clever, Molly, and Karen Miller. 2019. "'I Understand What They're Going through': How Socioeconomic Background Shapes the Student Service-learning Experience." *Teaching Sociology* 47(3):204-18.
- Costigan, Catherine L. 2020. "Adopting Community-Based Research Principles to Enhance Student Learning." *Canadian Psychology*, 61(2):111-17.
- Cress, Christine. 2003. "Making Community-Based Learning Meaningful: Faculty Efforts to Increase Student Civic Engagement Skills." *Transformations: The Journal of Inclusive Scholarship and Pedagogy* 14(2):87-100.

- Dartmouth Center for Social Impact. "For Students." Retrieved February 16, 2021
(<https://students.dartmouth.edu/social-impact/programs-initiatives/students>).
- Dartmouth Center for Social Impact. "History." Retrieved February 16, 2021
(<https://students.dartmouth.edu/social-impact/about/history>).
- Dartmouth Center for Social Impact. "Mission and Vision." Retrieved February 16, 2021
(<https://students.dartmouth.edu/social-impact/about/mission-and-vision>).
- Davidson, Theresa C. 2009. "Attributions for Poverty among College Students: The Impact of Service-learning and Religiosity." *College Student Journal* 43(1):136-44.
- Eyler, Janet, Dwight E. Giles, and John Braxton. 1997. "The Impact of Service-Learning on College Students." *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning* 4:5-15.
- Ferrari, Joseph R., and Laurie Worrall. 2000. "Assessments by Community Agencies: How 'the Other Side' Sees Service-Learning." *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning* 7:35-40.
- Fritz, Jan Marie. 2002. "A Little Bit of Sugar: Integrated Service-Learning Courses." *Sociological Practice* 4:67-77.
- Furco, Andrew. 1996. "Service-Learning: A Balanced Approach to Experiential Education." *American Journal of Educational Research* 5(10):1065-79.
- Giles, Dwight E., Jr. and Janet Eyler. 1994. "The Impact of a College Community Service Laboratory on Students' Personal, Social and Cognitive Outcomes." *Journal of Adolescence* 17:327-39.
- Hollis, Shirley A. 2002. "Capturing the Experience: Transforming Community Service into Service Learning." *Teaching Sociology* 30(2):200-13.

- Kalas, Pam, and Latika Raisinghani. 2019. "Assessing the Impact of Community-Based Experiential Learning: The Case of Biology 1000 Students." *International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education* 31(2):261-73.
- Marullo, Sam and Bob Edwards. 2000. "From Charity to Justice: The Potential of University Community Collaboration for Social Change." *American Behavioral Scientist* 43:895-912.
- Mobley, Catherine. 2007. "Breaking Ground: Engaging Undergraduates in Social Change through Service Learning." *Teaching Sociology* 35:125-37.
- Moely, Barbara E., Sterett H. Mercer, Vincent Ilustre, Devi Miron, and Megan McFarland. 2002. "Psychometric Properties and Correlates of the Civic Attitudes and Skills Questionnaire (CASQ): A Measure of Students' Attitudes Related to Service-Learning." *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning* 8:15-26.
- Mooney, Linda A., and Bob Edwards. 2001. "Experiential Learning in Sociology: Service Learning and Other Community-Based Learning Initiatives." *Teaching Sociology* 29(2):181-94.
- Schraw, Gregory, and Rayne Sperling Dennison. 1994. "Assessing Metacognitive Awareness." *Contemporary Education Psychology* 19:460-75.
- Simons, Lori, Lawrence Fehr, Nancy Blank, Heather Connell, Denise Georganas, David Fernandez, and Verda Peterson. 2012. "Lessons Learned from Experiential Learning: What Do Students Learn from a Practicum/Internship?" *International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education* 24(3):325-34.
- Wickersham, Carol, Charles Westerberg, Karen Jones, and Margaret Cress. 2015. "Pivot Points:

Direct Measures of the Content and Process of Community-based Learning.” *Teaching Sociology* 44(1):17-27.

Wright, Mary C. 2000. “Getting More out of Less: the Benefits of Short-term Experiential Learning in Undergraduate Sociology Courses.” *Teaching Sociology* 28(2):116-26.

APPENDIX A: INFORMED CONSENT FOR SURVEY PARTICIPANT

You have been asked to fill out a voluntary survey on your experience with the Dartmouth Center for Social Impact. Whether you fill this out will not impact your status with the Center in any way.

If you complete the survey, your responses will be used to assess how Dartmouth's social-impact programming meets students' needs. The survey will ask questions that relate to your personal abilities and experience with the Center. The survey takes approximately 10 minutes to complete.

PERSONAL GAIN

There is no monetary compensation involved for taking this survey and you are not likely to benefit personally from taking it; however, the results of this survey may improve programming for future students.

CONFIDENTIALITY

All of your responses are confidential. No information related to your name or NetID will be recorded. We may ask for demographic data to ensure the Center is meeting all students' needs equally. These questions are optional.

QUESTIONS

If you have any further questions regarding this survey, you may direct them to Tracy Dustin-Eichler, at Tracy.L.Dustin-Eichler@Dartmouth.edu.

CONSENT

If you choose to continue, your consent to these policies is assumed. Please be aware that you are free to stop the survey at any time.

APPENDIX B: SURVEY QUESTIONS

Note from authors: This survey has been programmed into Google Forms as part of the study. For access as a collaborator to the file, please email joseph.h.chong.22@dartmouth.edu.

I. STUDENT INVOLVEMENT

Instructions: Please complete this survey for only one program. If you have participated in more than one DCSI program, please complete this survey separately for each program.

- Which DCSI program are you completing this survey for?
 - Immersion Trips
 - Internships and Fellowships
 - Foundations in Social Impact First-Year Program
 - Student Employee for DCSI
 - Youth Education & Mentoring
 - Social Impact Practicum (SIPs)
 - Other: _____
- How much time did you spend weekly for this program?
 - Less than 1 hour
 - 1-4 hours
 - 5-9 hours
 - 10-14 hours
 - 15-24 hours
 - 25-34 hours
 - 35 hours or more
- How many terms have you been involved in this program?
 - [User responds using slider, with options ranging from “1” to “9 or more”]

II. DEMOGRAPHIC QUESTIONS

The Center would like to collect some personal demographic data in order to ensure students from different backgrounds equally benefit from community-driven experiential learning. These questions are completely optional.

- Which of the following best describes your gender identity?
 - Woman
 - Man
 - Non-binary
 - An identity/gender not listed here

- Which of the following best describes your ethnic or racial identity? [select all that apply]
 - Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander
 - Middle Eastern or North African
 - African American or Black
 - Caucasian or White
 - Hispanic or Latinx
 - Asian
 - Multiracial or biracial
 - An identity/ethnicity not listed here
- Which of the following best describes your academic focus?
 - Social Sciences
 - Sciences/Engineering
 - Humanities/Arts
 - Interdisciplinary Programs
 - Other

III. THEORETICAL MECHANISMS/MEDIATORS

- To what extent do you agree or disagree with each of the following statements?

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly agree
My participation with DCSI exposed me to new experiences and people. <i>(Exposure to new experiences)</i>	1	2	3	4	5
I am more aware of the challenges faced by the community I served. <i>(Awareness of community)</i>	1	2	3	4	5
I am more aware of my positionality and privilege in society. <i>(Awareness of self)</i>	1	2	3	4	5
I can make a social impact in my career. <i>(Personal growth and development)</i>	1	2	3	4	5
I ask myself if I have considered all options after I solve a problem. <i>(Metacognition)</i>	1	2	3	4	5
My participation with DCSI shifted my personal understanding of societal challenges. <i>(Personal growth and development)</i>	1	2	3	4	5

III. LEARNING OUTCOMES

- Outcome 1: To what extent do you agree or disagree with each of the following statements?

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly agree
I have learned new information about a social problem.	1	2	3	4	5
I can recognize the different stakeholders involved in a social problem.	1	2	3	4	5
I understand more about the importance of context when approaching social problems.	1	2	3	4	5
I understand how power, resources and privilege disparities impact social problems.	1	2	3	4	5

- Outcome 2: To what extent do you agree or disagree with each of the following statements?

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly agree
I seek courses to inform my social impact work.	1	2	3	4	5
I use news and media to help understand social issues	1	2	3	4	5
I can make connections between my academics and social impact pursuits	1	2	3	4	5
I am aware of where to find information on social challenges.					

- Outcome 3: To what extent do you agree or disagree with each of the following statements?

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly agree
I can explain a way in which structural inequality affects a community unlike my own.	1	2	3	4	5
When interacting with cultures unlike my own, I am conscious of existing power dynamics.	1	2	3	4	5
I seek out historical context when faced with addressing a new social problem.	1	2	3	4	5
I find working in a group with people from many backgrounds challenging.	1	2	3	4	5

- Outcome 4: To what extent do you agree or disagree with each of the following statements?

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly agree
I can work cooperatively with a group of people. (Moely et al. 2002)	1	2	3	4	5
I understand the value of adaptability/flexibility in social impact work	1	2	3	4	5
I have project management skills (such as delegation, accountability, execution)	1	2	3	4	5
I can negotiate through conflict while maintaining a positive attitude	1	2	3	4	5

IV. CONFIRMATION MESSAGE

Your response has been recorded!

Please remember that if you have any concerns about this survey or your response, or additional questions, you may direct them to Tracy Dustin-Eichler, at Tracy.L.Dustin-Eichler@Dartmouth.edu.

APPENDIX C: CONCEPTUAL MODEL

