CHAPTER FIVE

A Grant and Its Impact

Early in the spring 1994 semester, working behind the scenes while the campaign to attain the 30,000 hours was still on everyone’s mind, administrators began planning for the next stage in the evolution of “service” on campus. In January, Dr. Trebon, Eilene Bertsch, and Sr. Margaret Palliser, with the assistance of Dr. Virginia Harris, the director of grants, forwarded a proposal to the Council of Independent Colleges (CIC) seeking “participation in the CIC Alliance in order to improve existing campus efforts to inculcate a spirit of service and to consider ways in which to incorporate service-learning activities” into the curriculum. The grant abstract noted that the University proposed “to undertake a campus-wide examination of key service-learning issues that are critical to the development of institutional consensus on service-learning and the appropriate next steps.”

The proposal called attention to the University’s proud record of service activities, but pointed out that “these have been individual or unit efforts aimed at inculcating a spirit of service on our campus, rather than a collaboration of the whole campus community in an understanding of the importance of service-learning to the mission of the University.” The authors noted that the school needed “to consider ways to incorporate service-learning activities both in the general educational curriculum and in several disciplinary areas.” That meant coming up with a “definition of Sacred Heart University’s role in integrating
learning and service” that blended “reflection, intellectual inquiry and analysis, and the development of citizenship and leadership.” To accomplish these goals the University proposed to appoint a task force in February 1994, “with constituents from the student body, faculty, staff, and local community service organizations,” and to hold three campus-wide forums, bringing “recognized experts in service-learning to the campus to provide their perspectives on key issues, and to guide our institution’s self-examination of service-learning issues.” Finally, the authors of the proposal wrote, “although Sacred Heart University is at an early stage in its efforts to use service to enhance learning and to foster a spirit of service, the University is committed to moving to a new plateau. Service-learning is a part of our mission and the University community has been actively seeking appropriate methods for institutionalizing an ethic of service and principled action directed at societal needs.”

To support the proposal, Cernera forwarded a letter to Dr. Allen Splete, the president of the Council of Independent Colleges. “A commitment to caring for and sharing with the community our wealth of resources,” he wrote, “is the foundation upon which Sacred Heart University was founded thirty years ago, and is the mission by which I am proud to lead the University today.” Additional support came from Trebon, who also wrote to Splete, noting that he had “served as one of those involved in the first El Salvador experience.” Trebon said, “I can speak from this personal experience of the transforming character of the project on my own perspectives and behaviors as well as the interaction among those who participated and their colleagues on their return to campus.” Trebon went on to say that the grant, if funded, would allow the school to “become a better and more informed community.” On April 1, 1994, a CIC news release named Sacred Heart University as one of thirty institutions out of 155 applicants to receive a $22,000 grant.

Before winning the CIC grant, and aware of the school’s desire to continue its institutional commitment to service and specifically its need to investigate ways to incorporate service into the academic curriculum, Bertsch traveled to Washington, D.C., in February to attend the eleventh Annual International Conference on service-learning called “Education for Real,”
sponsored by The Partnership For Service-Learning. The conference promised to consider the following: how to connect "academic study and volunteer service; how to design service-learning courses and then create a coherent curriculum from those courses; and, finally, various ways of determining if the education has, in fact, been 'for real.'" The program booklet noted that "the interest in volunteer service in, for, and with the community has continued to increase each year. Thousands of college and university undergraduate and graduate students, joined by faculty and other professionals, are giving time, intelligence, enthusiasm and skill to address human needs. And in return, through their service they have learned about the world, about similarities and differences, the nature of community, value and about themselves and their capacity to learn."

Granted, service-learning was an appealing, up-and-coming pedagogical enterprise gaining enthusiastic support across the country, but Bertsch arrived at the conference looking for answers to several questions. Did it make sense, for example, to follow the practice of Salvadoran universities and demand community service for graduation? And how could the Sacred Heart University faculty be persuaded to embrace service-learning? Would it affect faculty development negatively by sidetracking research and publication for tenure and promotion? What about the constraints on a faculty member's time, not to mention the issue of faculty autonomy in the classroom? Would the instructor's authority be jeopardized by knowledgeable on-site supervisors, or by students who after working "in the field" challenged basic concepts underpinning the courses?

Service-Learning: A Coherent, Values-Oriented Approach

As the conference presentations unfolded, it became clear to Bertsch that service-learning, although not readily answering all the above questions, nevertheless engaged students and faculty in new ways, while at the same time benefiting the community. Here was a coherent, values-oriented, experientially-based approach to education that, when delivered with conviction and expertise, could change students' perspectives on society (particularly
society's economically less fortunate members), on the role played by the individual in that society (hence the rallying cry "you can make a difference"), and at the same time provide an antidote to the "consumer mentality" of many students and their prevalent "what's in it for me" attitudes.

In *A Guide for Change*, a sourcebook for student writers, authors Ann Watters and Marjorie Ford list the following benefits of service-learning courses:

As students become involved in their communities, they become active rather than passive learners. While helping to identify and solve problems in their communities, they are building closer connections between their campus and their communities. Service-learning experiences provide unique opportunities to learn about our increasingly varied and changing world, to understand people and cultures that are unique, and to develop resourcefulness, a strong inner self, a clearer sense of personal identity. More than any other type of educational activity, working with others from a different culture or economic class can help you to begin to think critically about what you have, what other individuals in your community have a right to expect, and how you can contribute to your community.¹⁰

Under the guidance of the faculty member and a carefully selected on-site supervisor, the student experiences the reality of an after-school program, a soup kitchen, an adult literacy program, or other service-learning environment, then returns to the classroom and engages the instructor and other students in real-life issues, and then reflects on the meaning of those experiences. "Service-learning," I wrote in an essay, "is all about 'taking a plunge'—about making a commitment, then moving our students to a different place. It affords students the opportunity to rethink issues, to grow and mature, to be of service to others, to develop a sense of their self-worth, and to take pride in their efforts. It is education at its best."¹¹

Not only did Bertsch find the pedagogy making sense, she recognized that it tied directly into the mission statement of the University. But the question of how to sell the idea to the faculty
still proved troubling. Timing was crucial. While the spirit and excitement engendered by the 30,000 Hours project permeated the campus, the moment was right for introducing a new, ambitious undertaking. The announcement in April that Sacred Heart University was awarded a CIC grant jump-started the process.

A Service-Learning Informational Meeting

With the fall 1994 semester targeted for introducing service-learning on campus—which meant identifying faculty to teach, rethinking course contents, and rewriting syllabi—it was decided to wait until after graduation before holding an informational meeting. On June 14 a carefully worded letter from Bertsch and Palliser asked a “select group” of faculty who “had exhibited some substantial support for the El Salvador/30,000 Hours initiatives” to attend a June 21 meeting to enter into a dialogue on service-learning. “We wanted the meeting to resemble a forum/workshop for 25-30 people,” Bertsch recalled. The letter read:

Dear Colleagues,

The formal celebration of Sacred Heart University’s 30th anniversary is coming to a close, and with it the conclusion of the 30,000 Hours project.

Wishing to build on the most positive aspect of the project—service to others—and develop its relationship to the academic center of the institution, the University applied for and was awarded a grant from the Council of Independent Colleges. The grant gives us the opportunity to think about the relationship between learning and service. Moreover, it provides limited funds for faculty to experiment with, reflect upon, and design ways in which service-learning projects can be incorporated into the syllabi of credit courses.

The Council of Independent Colleges does not advocate any one approach or outcome. It invites us to examine our mission, hold firm to our academic standards, and consider an additional mode of instruction and learning . . . specifically, service-learning.
To begin the dialogue at Sacred Heart University, Dr. Cernera and Dr. Trebon will host a working luncheon on Tuesday, June 21st from 12 noon until 2:00 P.M. in the Community Room at the Campus Center. In preparation for that luncheon, we request that you read the enclosed chapter from Robert N. Bellah’s *The Good Society*.

Lunch will begin promptly at noon. At 12:30, there will be a panel discussion of some of the broader issues raised in the reading, and their relationship to the development of a service-learning component in the curriculum. By 1:15, the floor should be open to general discussion.

There is one hoped-for outcome from this initial meeting: we hope that from 4 to 6 faculty members will offer to serve as a pilot group for this project. Each participant will be requested to think through the syllabus of one course scheduled to be offered in the fall; to design and introduce a service-learning component into the syllabus of that course; and to observe and document their own responses and that of their students to the revised curriculum. Should the faculty member and students judge the learning experience to be academically sound, we will ask that the modified syllabus be shared with other faculty within one’s own department and within the University at large.

Planning beyond that point needs to be discussed and formulated from within. For those who are willing to serve in the pilot group, a stipend of $500 will be made available immediately, to be used at the faculty member’s discretion in the cause of modifying the syllabus.

We are eager to meet with you on the 21st, and to participate in a dialogue that could have significant consequences for what our students learn and are able to do.\(^{13}\)

In a move calculated to signal the extent of the University’s commitment to service-learning, both the President and the Academic Vice-President hosted the event, a point that clearly
registered in the minds of the attending faculty. To further mark administrative support for the program, the Assistant Academic Vice-President and the Vice-President for Mission and Planning made a pitch at the meeting: Bertsch introducing the CIC project and its service-learning component; and Dodge, along with Reid, offering reflections under the heading “Education: Technical and Moral.”

Alluding to the meeting in a later talk to a journalism class, Bertsch remembered saying to the faculty, “Look, we’re going to put something on the table. Who is willing to take a risk to redesign a curriculum, a course, a way of teaching, a way of thinking, to bring the community in to what is a very tight dyad?” Opening up the dyad, she said “You bring in a third partner, a community who defines for you what it needs, and then you work your curriculum and your teaching relationship to make it a partnership.” Then she asked, “Who would be willing to take that risk?” 14 Later Bertsch said of the meeting that “the whole thing was geared to open it up, let everyone know what the project was about, and then ask for volunteers to jump on board.” She added, “We needed to see who would be willing to take that chance because we knew it meant changing what people did, the way in which they did it, and with whom they did it.” 15

To conclude the meeting, Palliser handed out a document entitled “Tasks of the Service-Learning Task Force, 1994-95,” charging that group to “review the available literature on service-learning and learn from experts in the field” and to share the information with the University community. 16 Specifically, the task force was to seek answers to the following questions:

How can community service and work activities be integrated with or linked to the academic program at the University? How do service experiences relate to the institution’s mission? How can our faculty be encouraged to embrace a spirit of service as an important purpose of education? In what ways can experiences that provide service be linked with course content? How can guidelines be developed for faculty who want to integrate community service into their courses? How can the work-of
faculty in the area of service-learning be recognized in the evaluation of applications for promotion and tenure? When is academic credit for service appropriate? How can broad-gauged programs on leadership or ethics and values provide opportunities to reflect on service in volunteer and work experiences? In what ways do service experiences enhance the academic process?

The document handed out at the meeting also stipulated that two campus-wide forums would be held—in the fall of 1994 and the spring of 1995—to serve as “follow up focus sessions involving faculty, students, and staff to examine further the issues raised at these forums.” Lastly, the document charged the task force to “produce a campus census report on the questions which will include a discussion of recommended steps.” This report, “the document concluded, “will serve as a guideline for linking community service, teaching, and research on campus, and will provide specific recommendations for institutionalizing service-learning activities into our curriculum and co-curricular activities.”

The response to the June 21 meeting was gratifying. With some anxiety, and little background in service-learning, five faculty (Claire Marrone, Marian Calabrese, Nicole Cauvin, John Roney, and Lauren Kempton) signed on to try their hands at something different in the fall. In Marrone’s “Women’s Autobiography” course, for example, students interviewed “women from different cultures and backgrounds.” In a memo to Bertsch, Marrone explained that “each student shall choose one woman and interview her about her life. Students should select someone who, in their estimation, has not had the opportunity to express her life in any formal fashion and who would benefit from doing so, or someone who has undergone an experience from which others could learn.” In a Medieval History course, to cite another innovative project, Roney offered his students an optional service-learning component working “with a local sixth grade class doing a medieval history unit. They did presentations on knights, peasants, women, etc.” Featured in a Spectrum profile that lauded his many efforts on and off campus, Roney said, “I try to help
students see the discovery in education." In Calabrese's popular Oral Interpretation of Literature course students worked in teams in a nearby after-school program producing a talent show and teaching drama, reading, and poetry. The Social Psychology course, taught by Cauvin, saw students placed in agencies and schools analyzing group interactions. And in Kempton's Multi-Cultural Education course, students worked as a group with Habitat for Humanity.

A Coordinator Comes Aboard

After the start of the fall semester, the University, with financial backing from the CIC grant, hired as its new Coordinator of Service-Learning a former high school teacher, American Field Service advisor, community grassroots activist, and past president of the Bridgeport Chapter of Habitat for Humanity. Phyllis Machledt, with extensive experience in the community, immediately added new meaning, energy, and commitment to the notion of service at the University. "All my life I've believed in hands-on learning," she said, recalling her interview for the position. "The whole concept of service-learning is something that I deeply believed in as a form of pedagogy," she added. "I liked the fact that the University had been to El Salvador. I think people had had their eyes opened in El Salvador, but I kept hearing, 'but we have to work in our own backyard.' So that interested me."

When Machledt came aboard in mid-September, some of the first service-learning offerings already had started and, as to be expected with the launching of a new program, she discovered courses with their share of strengths and weaknesses. "It was a little difficult," Machledt recalled, "because some of them had already decided on what they were going to do." And, she added, "at least in my mind some of their projects were going to be very difficult to do in the light of the community."

But in spite of a few early misgivings, the first semester of service-learning courses on campus proved successful. In a March 1995 report on service-learning, Machledt wrote:

In written evaluations from the first semester courses, most students indicated that SL [service-learning] made the
course more interesting and would recommend it to someone else. A student in “Woman’s Autobiography” said of her SL experience interviewing a formerly homeless woman that it “helped me begin to analyze myself and my life’s triumphs and failures.” A student who had previously volunteered a lot in her hometown wrote “By having to think and write about the observation, I learned more than just going (to the homeless shelter).” Clearly students who had a short SL project (one 6-hour interactive observation) were less affected by the experience than those who were in long term or weekly SL programs. The logistics of SL programs, such as finding a time for a group to meet or not having an agency return a call, caused some frustrations. However, the feedback so far has been overwhelmingly positive. Students said, “I learn best with ‘hands-on’ experiences combined with research,” and “I applied things that I learned in class to the real world.” Another said that it reduced her fear of what a homeless shelter was like. Several of the students in the weekly program signed up for SL courses second semester or continued to volunteer in the program. ²⁴

Commenting on “attitude” in her report, Machledt wrote, “There does seem to be new interest and commitment in community service at SHU. . . . Many of the staff and faculty members continue to be excellent role models, volunteering hours of their time to worthy projects. Service-Learning has led more of the students to get involved in the local community and understand firsthand some of the problems. It has empowered them to do something about those problems. They also seem to see more relevance in their course material. The Service-Learning Program at Sacred Heart has made a difference!” ²⁵

The Task Force Tackles the Issues

While the initial service-learning courses attracted their share of attention from the administration and faculty—because they
represented an investment of time and energy, and because they were thought to be the forerunners of a new mode of instructional delivery more directly related to the school's mission statement—a task force began in earnest to contend with several issues. According to Machledt’s March 1995 report, the group had met six times since June of the previous year, tackling such topics as “a definition of service-learning, goals and guidelines for SL projects, evaluations of current courses and programs, how best to integrate SL with necessary course content, how to evaluate the SL component,” and finally, “the question of liability in SL projects.”

That same task force, now called the “Service-Learning Steering Committee,” published the following set of guidelines governing student involvement in SL programs:

1. Wherever possible, students should have direct interaction with clients in the SL program.
2. Every reasonable precaution should be taken to place the students in secure programs with good, effective community leadership. Orientations should stress safety measures and strategies appropriate to the SL project.
3. Ideally, SL projects should expose students to contemporary issues facing American citizens, such as health, housing, the environment, education, immigration, crime, diversity, economic development, etc.
4. SL projects should emphasize student leadership and cooperation as much as possible, especially in areas of commitment and responsibility. Team or group projects should be encouraged where feasible.
5. SL projects should introduce students to possible career options.
6. SL placements should take in account student talents and interests.

At the same time, while the steering committee worked on developing service-learning guidelines, Machledt set up a series of informational workshops. In October, community group
representatives were invited to share their perspectives on the program, and at a January meeting representatives from Alpha Home, Habitat for Humanity, Mercy Learning Center, and Youth Rebuild “talked about the economic and social situations of their clients, ‘realistic expectations, and sensible safety strategies.’” As an outgrowth of the site representatives’ ideas, people from three agencies (the Bridgeport School System, Alpha Home, and Mercy Learning Center) were invited to join the committee because, as Machledt noted in her report, “It is crucial that the community agencies be asked to define their own needs and not just be reacting to the academic needs of the university.” Machledt further pointed out, “The members have also helped make the faculty aware of the necessary ‘trivia,’ such as differences in school calendars, problems of transportation, and appropriate means of communication, which can create complications in SL programs if not ironed out in the beginning.”

Early in the spring 1995 semester, with the SL courses increasing to eleven offerings, the steering committee hosted an open forum called “Service-Learning: How It Works” featuring students, faculty, and site representatives sharing their experiences from the fall semester. Of special interest was input from agency representatives, who stressed the following:

1. the importance of commitment, especially in tutoring.
2. either a regular weekly commitment over the entire semester or
3. an intensive commitment over a shorter period of time.
4. the importance of regular communication.
5. having a clear idea of the academic objectives of the course and any deadlines, preferably in writing.
6. the need to complete a project, rather than leaving the agency with extra work to finish it.
7. the need to do “exit” counseling with tutors and tutees before the end of the semester or year.

Part of the problem underlying service-learning courses, apart from the above issues raised by the agency representatives,
stemmed from the way faculty ordinarily teach. Even if the faculty member no longer relied on the outdated lecture method and had incorporated the methodology of collaborative learning, the fact remained that faculty were unused to sharing authority in their courses. But service-learning relies on a different teaching dynamic: a four-way process involving student, faculty member, on-site supervisor, and the coordinator of service-learning, with each person shouldering part of the responsibility for the learning. If the faculty member, for whatever reason, failed to take class time to process the students’ on-site experiences, or failed to keep in touch regularly with the students’ on-site supervisors or, for that matter, with the Coordinator of Service-Learning, the support structure for accountability and optimum learning was jeopardized.

To help maximize the students’ learning experience in a more efficiently run program, agency personnel advised more emphasis on commitment and communication—on all levels. As Machledt pointed out, “Partly because of the input from the community, most courses in the second semester were designed collaboratively between the professors, the community agencies, and the service-learning coordinator. Some ideas for the SL projects came from the agencies, and some were initiated by the faculty. It seems that the more dialogue and initial planning there was, the better the implementation of the SL project.”

On the other hand, it should be pointed out that involvement in service-learning—especially taking into account the atmosphere created by the El Salvador experiences and the 30,000 Hours project—became more than simply teaching or taking a course. Any commitment to the poor—whether the poor be defined as disadvantaged Bridgeport students, young unwed mothers, the disenfranchised frequenting area soup kitchens, the mentally ill, the addicts, the homeless—was viewed by many on campus, not only as important and serious, but as a moral and civic responsibility that moved far beyond the boundaries of a normal class. “How do we help our students develop and become ‘compassionate of heart?’” Dodge asked. “One of the first things that comes to me is the experience that we provide them in service-learning when they come face to face with other people,
and people that are in need, especially the poor. I don’t know if you can become truly compassionate if you have been deprived of that kind of experience. And to really be service-learning, it has to be in the inner city, or with the poor wherever they are.”

While the second group of service-learning courses were in mid-semester, Machledt concluded her March 1995 report by pointing out:

The real issue for deliberation and action next year is how to institutionalize service-learning so that every student has an opportunity for an experience before graduating. These issues obviously cannot be resolved overnight, but are important to the long-term success of the Service-Learning program.

Service-Learning will continue to grow at SHU as long as the faculty finds that it enhances learning, students gain from their service experiences in the community, and the community finds its needs are being met. The enthusiasm thus far by all three partners bodes well for the future of active collaboration between Sacred Heart University and the community.4

Although not yet a University-funded staff member (the position funded by the CIC grant would terminate June 30), Machledt had more than proven her worth not only to the service-learning program, but to the whole notion of volunteerism on campus. Making sure she remained on campus with a funded staff line became a major goal for administrators closest to the program.35

The National Institute on Service-Learning

To further investigate the potential of service-learning and to gauge the University’s progress in the program thus far, a team of faculty, staff, and administrators traveled to St. Charles, Illinois, to attend the National Institute on Learning and Service held from May 31 to June 3.36 President Bill Clinton, in a letter of greetings to delegates, set the tone for the conference. “Service is at the heart of our hopes for a stronger America,” he wrote. “Across the
country, people are working together to solve problems in their communities and to teach young people the lessons of good citizenship.” Then referring specifically to the work of the conference, the President added, “CIC’s ‘Serving to Learn, Learning to Serve’ initiative is an important part of this national effort, developing programs that will make service-learning an integral part of the educational experience.” Clinton closed his remarks by thanking the delegates for supporting his AmeriCorps program, and for bringing “community service into the classroom and curriculum.”

CIC President Allen Splete pointed out that “the work we do here together—seeking ways to link learning and service—is important, timely, and directly relevant to the missions of independent colleges and universities as they serve students, and more broadly, the whole of society.” Splete added, “Our efforts focus on meaningful curricular change. We believe that service-learning is central to our well-being as a society, and that its sustainability can result only when faculty embrace its legitimacy as part of the undergraduate learning experience.” Referring to the special composition of the delegates, Splete said, “The institute is designed for institutional teams, since we hope that each participating institution will make actual improvements upon return to campus. We think that teams of individuals are the most effective means not only of developing sound ideas but also of implementing them.”

Four members of the University team made presentations or participated on panels at the conference. Pilar Munday of the Modern Foreign Languages Department hosted a group of faculty to talk about service-learning issues in the teaching of Spanish; community agency representative Beverly Salzman, the executive director of Alpha Home, helped lead a panel discussion on the community perspective in service-learning; Eileen Bertsch served as a panelist discussing how colleges could interest faculty in service-learning and then support them in their initial work; and Phyllis Machledt co-hosted a session called “Strategies for Helping Students Succeed in Service-Learning Placement: Nuts and Bolts.”

The conference “Preliminary Planning Worksheet” allowed the team to identify several issues that demanded special attention.
After recounting the University’s commitment thus far to service-learning, several areas for growth were mentioned, including the need for the administration to persevere in its commitment to SL, and the need to find ways to recognize faculty (caught in the “publish or perish” atmosphere surrounding tenure and promotion) and students involved in the program. Also with regard to leadership and implementation of the SL program, the team recommended that faculty should assume a greater role, and “students could assume leadership positions for on-going service projects, such as the tutoring program.” Finally there was the need “to see meaningful service integrated and stratified throughout all aspects of the University.” Not only should every student “have a service experience” while at the University, community people should be integrated into the classroom as speakers and panelists as well.40

In retrospect, the national conference arrived at an opportune time for the SL program at Sacred Heart University. With the program already in operation for a full academic year, the team was able to share experiences with colleagues from across the country, listen to how others tried to cope creatively with SL issues, and re-energize itself with a renewed sense of the program’s significance. Even more to the point, the conference allowed the team the space and time to think creatively. In his conference greeting, Splete had hoped “that each participating institution will make actual improvements upon return to campus,” and that was exactly what happened. On the return trip to campus, as members of the team sought answers to several questions—particularly the issue of how to engage more faculty in service-learning—suddenly an idea surfaced. Why not build on the El Salvador experience by hosting a weekend “urban plunge” for faculty and staff in the Park City? With Machledt’s contacts among Bridgeport officials and grassroots organizations, and building on the experience of the El Salvador scheduling, the thinking was to bring faculty and staff into the city to listen to the voices of the people, opening the possibility for developing “connections” between the University and the needs of organizations and agencies. If the University could lend a hand by sharing its expertise in a specific area, or if a student service-learning placement could be identified—so much the better. And so “Operation Bridgeport” was born.
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The Final CIC Report

Apart from the “Operation Bridgeport” program, which held its first weekend in the Park City early in the fall of 1995, several other promising initiatives were identified in Machledt’s “Final CIC Grant Report,” dated November 22 of that year. “A Spring Break service-learning work camp in El Salvador for Spanish, social work, history, and anthropology has been approved,” she reported. Also an “Urban Institute” with related courses, programs, films, and speakers, etc. has been proposed.” Still another initiative was “a community service work camp” for “interested incoming freshmen, to be held in August 1996, before school starts.”41 All these initiatives form the basis for the final chapters in this story of service at the University.

Closing her report, Machledt noted that the grant “was truly the impetus for allowing service-learning to have a reasonable ‘trial’ on campus,” and that not only did students seem “more motivated in their service-learning courses,” but there was also “an increased awareness of and involvement in community service among students in co-curricular activities.” Finally, Machledt said, “integrating service with learning has been the keystone of the initiative to involve all areas of Sacred Heart in its mission,” specifically noting the line in the mission statement that reads, “All members of the University community are encouraged strongly to participate in the wider community through service to others.” Machledt then pointed out that the “CIC grant enabled Sacred Heart University to take a big step forward toward fulfilling this mission.”42