

1-1-2010

2009 Annual Report to the Pieper Foundation

Alan Parks

Follow this and additional works at: <http://lux.lawrence.edu/pieper>

© Copyright is owned by the author of this document.

Recommended Citation

Parks, Alan, "2009 Annual Report to the Pieper Foundation" (2010). *Pieper Chair in Servant Leadership*. Paper 3.
<http://lux.lawrence.edu/pieper/3>

This Annual Report is brought to you for free and open access by Lux. It has been accepted for inclusion in Pieper Chair in Servant Leadership by an authorized administrator of Lux. For more information, please contact colette.brautigam@lawrence.edu.

Report to the Pieper Family Foundation.

Alan Parks
Pieper Family Professor of Servant Leadership
Lawrence University

January, 2010

Contents

- Our Third Year** **2**
- Criteria 3. and 4. Outcomes Measures** **4**
 - Data on Alumni 4
 - Measure 1: Comparison of Alumni Nationally 4
 - Measure 2: Moral Values in Personal and Professional Life 6
 - Measure 3: Ongoing Comparison of Undergraduates 7
 - Assessment of the Office for Engaged Learning 8
- Criterion 6. An Excellent Year** **9**
 - Community Partnerships 9
 - Activities 10
- Criterion 5. Breakthrough Venture** **15**
- Criterion 7. A Servant Leader** **17**
- Survey Results** **18**
 - Measure 1: Comparison of Alumni Nationally 18
 - Measure 2: Moral Values in Personal and Professional Life 21
 - Measure 3: Ongoing Comparison of Undergraduates 22

Our Third Year

A current budget is attached as a separate document.

We began our third year of engaged learning work at Lawrence University with a good deal of confidence and enthusiasm. We have established a number of community contacts, and we have a network of students and student organizations that consult with us regularly. An increasing number of faculty are taking advantage of our help and experience. We continue to work with other campus offices that support community service and outreach; our appreciation for the high quality and dedication of campus staff has only increased.

When we began the work of engaged learning, we intended to identify the characteristics of that work unique to Lawrence. Several principles have begun to emerge that seem to underly successful engaged learning projects. We do not claim any special originality regarding these principles – any one or all of them might well be practiced at many colleges – we identify them because we judge them to have been essential to whatever success we have enjoyed.

1. Flexibility

As we have supported projects that intersect the academic curriculum, there has been inevitable overlap with the work of the Lawrence University Volunteer Center. We have avoided defining a hard and fast boundary between the two offices for two reasons: 1) we wanted to promote a wide variety of projects – insistence on categorizing projects can stifle development, 2) we wanted to communicate support and enthusiasm to students who came to us with ideas, making it clear that new project types would be encouraged. We try to remember the overall goal of the work of outreach offices at Lawrence: significant and effective community service in as many forms and with as many community partners as possible.

2. A development path

We practice an informal three-step process in working with project ideas. In making first contact with a student or faculty member interested in our help, we strive to be open to just about any idea, paying special attention to the underlying motivation. We do not introduce our own project ideas and goals, and we avoid mentioning what has been done previously. In follow-up discussions, we try to make it clear what sort of support we can provide, emphasizing administrative work over financial backing, and we introduce our own suggestions in the context of emerging project goals. Our third step is to ask for a proposal in writing – definite but still somewhat informal. We rely on the proposal to segment responsibility between the various parties involved and to serve as a basis for project assessment.

3. Servant leadership

Servant leadership *begins with the impulse to serve*. From our first contact with a project idea, and all the way through implementation, we want to communicate a persistent desire to serve. Servant leadership *exercises leadership to make service more effective*. As a project develops, we look for opportunities to increase effectiveness. We have found a rather marked opportunity to provide leadership through assessment activities that take place during and after the formulation of a project. At that point, the participants have been very open to our own evaluation of their project and to suggestions for effectiveness in future versions of the project.

4. Celebration

Community service has been a strong and established part of campus life at Lawrence University for a long time. However, we have not always touted our accomplishments to the larger community – out of modesty! We are seeing the benefits of more frequent communication generally with our community partners, particularly to celebrate significant achievements in service. When community members are allowed to comment on a given project, the students involved are always surprised by the degree of appreciation expressed. We participate in several annual events that celebrate community service.

Criteria 3. and 4. Outcomes Measures

Data on Alumni

In November we conducted a third iteration of our alumni survey on character and engagement. For the first time, we have obtained measures that relate to the effectiveness of engaged learning projects in the lives of the participants. Our survey involved two measures; in both measures we targeted characteristics mentioned in the description of the outcome objectives set by the Pieper Foundation for work done by the Pieper Chairs.

1. Graduates will be known for their moral values.
2. Graduates will enrich and lead by serving their community and profession.
3. Graduates will apply their moral values in both their professional and personal lives.
4. Graduates, according to their moral values, will serve those who are the least privileged among us.

Measure 1: Comparison of Alumni Nationally

To obtain measures that would compare Lawrence alumni to a wider group of alumni, William Skinner, Lawrence's Director of the Office for Research Administration, consulted with several sources in the institutional research community. After considering several alternatives, we decided to use the following questions from the Higher Education Data Sharing (HEDS) consortium survey.

For each of the following

- a) Indicate how important this trait is today in both your personal and professional life.
- b) Indicate the extent to which this trait was enhanced by your undergraduate experiences.
 1. Developing awareness of societal problems
 2. Placing current problems in perspective
 3. Understanding moral/ethical issues
 4. Leading and supervising tasks and groups of people

5. Relating well to people of different cultures/races
6. Function effectively as a member of a team
7. Communicating well orally
8. Understanding others

Regarding community service

1. Evaluate your level of involvement in community service while an undergraduate.
2. Evaluate the contribution of community service to your personal or professional life after graduation.

For each question, the respondent chooses a rating from four categories. For instance, for *Developing awareness of societal problems*, the possible answers are *not at all*, *a little*, *moderately*, *greatly*.

There is an established history of data from these questions among alumni from institutions similar to Lawrence. This first group gives a national measure. The questions were sent to a second group: a random sample of Lawrence alumni from three different classes. Finally, we surveyed a third group of alumni who participated in engaged learning projects when they were undergraduates. Surveying this last group begins to give us a credible measure of the effect of our work in the development of moral values and the traits of servant leadership.

We here present a narrative evaluation of the data we obtained. A distilled version of the data itself is presented in charts at the end of this report. Overall, Lawrence alumni are less likely to give the highest rating of importance to the survey categories. However, when we ask whether these traits were enhanced in college, Lawrence alumni score significantly higher than their peers in these categories:

Lead and supervise tasks and groups of people
 Relate well to people of different cultures/races
 Function effectively as a member of a team
 Communicate well orally
 Understand others

These scores reinforce our sense that campus culture is strong and diverse, and that Lawrence students have many opportunities to work with and to lead others different from themselves.

Alumni who have done engaged learning projects score significantly higher than random alumni and peer alumni in several areas. We note the 100% highest rating on the importance of leadership. The engaged learning alumni score significantly higher than random alumni and peer alumni on the role of college in enhancing these traits, and they report higher levels of community service overall. This reflects very positively on engaged learning, and it suggests that we should work hard to increase the number of students involved. Given the high level of general community service reported to the President's Higher Education Honor Roll report, there is a large number of students willing and able to provide community

service from whom engaged learning participants can be recruited to increase the impact among future alumni.

The Honor Roll data also testify to the concern for *those who are the least privileged among us*, since they record nearly 3000 hours of service to *Youth From Disadvantaged Circumstances*. This concern clearly continues with alumni as is evidenced by the service activities they list.

When we turn to the numbers of respondents who gave various traits the highest or second highest rating (out of four possible ratings), we see that the weak response of random Lawrence alumni compared to peer alumni is mitigated somewhat. The relatively high scores of engaged learning alumni is augmented.

This very preliminary data suggests that servant leadership traits can be augmented through involvement in engaged learning projects. This is supported over and over by anecdotal accounts by engaged learning project participants on the effect of those projects in their personal lives. We will continue to keep tabs on these statistics to get a clearer picture of this.

Measure 2: Moral Values in Personal and Professional Life

As we have done in the past, we asked our random sample of Lawrence alumni about the importance of various moral values in their personal lives, and we asked them about the importance of those values in their professional work. As of this year, enough students have worked on engaged learning projects to justify sampling alumni from that group, so that we can compare alumni generally to alumni who performed engaged learning projects. Here are the moral values.¹

- Altruism
- Compassion
- Cooperation
- Creativity
- Dedication
- Diligence
- Fairness
- Faith
- Humility
- Integrity
- Patience

¹This list was obtained from a word frequency count of past surveys; the past surveys asked which values are important without giving a list.

- Self-confidence
- Supportiveness

Here is a narrative report on the results; a distilled version of the data is presented at the end of this report. Engaged learning alumni are much more likely to rate a given moral value as *Very Important* than random alumni. We note especially the high ratings given to Cooperation, Fairness, Integrity, and Supportiveness in the *professional* life. We see this as a good sign that personal values can carry over to the workplace.

Measure 3: Ongoing Comparison of Undergraduates

Lawrence often participates in the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) of first year and senior year students. In addition to receiving the results from Lawrence students, we are provided with data from a group of peer schools. We have used this data to measure community engagement and moral factors over time. The survey asks about the frequency with which students engage in various activities; the responses are numbered 1 – 4:²

1. never
2. sometimes
3. often
4. very often

Our data compares selected averages from Lawrence students with those of our peer schools over a period of three NSSE surveys – the number done since we began the work of engaged learning at Lawrence. Here is a narrative report on the results. The data itself is summarized at the end of the report.

We began using NSSE data to measure the development of moral values and servant leadership characteristics two years ago. The data we have collected since that time is essentially similar to and consistent with the data collected in in prior years. Our students are more likely to report "having had a serious conversation with students of a different race or ethnicity," about as-likely to have yet our students are less likely to have Conversations with students very different from you in religious beliefs or political opinions," and they are somewhat less likely to have "participated in activities to enhance spirituality." We also have relatively less prior involvement in community service activities. This makes the relatively high number of service hours, report in the Honor Roll report, something of a pleasant surprise. We feel that a relational basis is put into place for our students' understanding of others unlike themselves through the encouragement of interaction with diverse others. Then, in the presence of increasing numbers of volunteer and service opportunities, community service follows naturally.

²Except for a question about engaging in community service that enriched education – the answer to that question was 0 for *did not do, do not plan to* and 1 for *done*. That line of data is marked with an asterisk in the data table on p.22.

Assessment of the Office for Engaged Learning

Professor Bruce Dalgaard of St. Olaf College is Professor of Economics and Asian Studies and Executive Director of the Center for Experiential Learning. In March 2010 he will visit Lawrence University to conduct an external review of the Office of Engaged Learning. Professor Dalgaard has many years' experience supporting community outreach of all kinds at St. Olaf's, and he has been a valuable advisor for the initiation of engaged learning activities at Lawrence. He will interview students, faculty, and staff at Lawrence, and he will have access to our various written reports and to our budgeting and planning documents – with a view toward writing a comprehensive report on our activities to-date.

Criterion 6. An Excellent Year

Community Partnerships

We continue to develop and strengthen community partnerships locally and globally. In this section we list some of the organizations with which we have an ongoing relationship to convey the breadth of this aspect of our work. Specific activities and projects that involve these organizations are described in a later section.

1. The Community Foundation for the Fox Valley Region

During December 2008 we were seeking appropriate funding for the Lawrence University student intern who would work during the summer of 2009 to continue our fire safety education project with the Appleton Fire Department. In researching the Community Foundation, we became aware of a list of community goals for the Fox Valley community they use to evaluate grant applications.³ Many of Lawrence's volunteer initiatives fit very well into these goals, and so we have begun to use the goals in the development of engaged learning projects. Because of the many connections between the Community Foundation and other community partners, the use of shared goals should lead to further community collaborations.

2. Report to the Fox Valley Community

This past September 22, Lawrence President Jill Beck hosted a breakfast meeting for over 100 community representatives of business, education, philanthropy, and volunteering. I had the opportunity to speak with several participants about the ethic of servant leadership and about current engaged learning projects. I heard their suggestions for areas of need and for appropriate community contacts for future projects. Besides letting our community partners know what we are doing, we are using such forums to hear community concerns and to make contacts.

3. Appleton Fire Department

I continue to work with Fire Department Public Education Coordinator Lori Casey to further our joint work on fire safety education. A new Fire Chief, Len Vander Wyst, has recently been appointed, and we will be briefing him on this work very soon.

4. Appleton Police Department

I am working with Police Lt. Jeff Miller on the structure of a community outreach

³These goals are listed in a comprehensive community report sponsored by the Fox Valley Workforce Development Board; the report can be found at <http://www.foxcitieslifestudy.org/>

project for Appleton police officers to make supportive community contacts via an officer visit program modeled on our program with the Fire Department.

5. Fox Valley Humane Association

Lawrence students have volunteered on and off in various ways at the local animal shelter. Humane Association staff-person Kathy Schuessler has agreed to meet with me to discuss a more regular relationship between our organizations and to help keep us in tune with the shelter's needs and priorities.

6. Appleton Area School District

Lawrence students are involved with a large number of engaged learning and volunteer projects in the District. We have a variety of contacts, and we also initiate contact with individual teachers and/or administrators as needed. We are satisfied that our growing knowledge of District personnel is sufficient to direct our efforts into the future.

7. Pragati Educational Foundation

The Pragati Educational Foundation is dedicated to providing "financial and non-financial support to [Asian Indian] students from economically weak backgrounds to enable them to receive education commensurate with their potential, and to become self-dependent."⁴ In addition to providing scholarships, the Foundation has programs that provide mentors to assist students throughout their education in personality development and career guidance. One of the members of the Foundation Board of Trustees, Mr. Vijay, is the father of a Lawrence alumna. We are working with Mr. Vijay to place Lawrence students in India for the summer to assist in English instruction and, eventually, in other projects related to the work of the Foundation.

Activities

This section becomes inevitably a laundry list of projects. We predicate that list by emphasizing how continually impressed we are by the selfless service our students provide with such great enthusiasm. They have an increasing sense of the relevance of their academic work to service.

In February 2009 our Office of Alumni Relations ran a *Life After Lawrence* seminar to allow alumni to meet with current students to discuss a variety of career and education trajectories. I chaired the Human Services Panel at this meeting, where the alumni participants were chosen from non-profit organizations. The Lawrence students present, representing every division of the college, exhibited a high level of altruism along with a strong determination in their interest in the work of providing social and charitable services. Such experiences inspire my confidence and motivate an industrious spirit in handling the day-to-day details and logistics of our work.

1. Alumni involvement

An alumni committee, Focus On Community Engagement (FOCE), has formed recently to develop and support service activities done jointly by alumni and current

⁴See <http://www.pragati-edu.org/>

students. I am in regular contact with FOCE representatives and have met with their committee twice over the last year. We have several projects in mind involving off-campus service. We would particularly like to export successful programs done in the Fox Valley to other locations – and perhaps to other colleges.

2. Pieper Chairs

The three Pieper Family Foundation Servant Leadership Chairs in Wisconsin, David Howell of the Milwaukee School of Engineering, Jeff Russell of the University of Wisconsin-Madison, and myself, met with Dick Pieper in September to discuss various aspects of our work. We are planning regular meetings to keep in touch.

3. Greenleaf Organization

I attended the Greenleaf Regional Conference on Servant Leadership in Indianapolis this past October. Among the contacts I made, some members of the College of Education at Butler University acquainted me with the practice of servant leadership in their program and curriculum. I also met Dr. Len Marrella, President of the Center for Leadership and Ethics, who gives seminars in leadership, character, ethics, and related topics. I have corresponded with Dr. Marrella about his book *In Search of Ethics*⁵ and about possible servant leadership activities at Lawrence.

4. The President's Higher Education Community Service Honor Roll

Each year we apply for this honor, submitting descriptive statistics about service among students, faculty, and staff, and reporting on a selection of individual programs. Our total service hours have more than doubled over the last three years. We will hear this spring whether we are awarded the Honor Roll designation for the fourth straight year.

5. The Fox Valley Community

(a) The Sustainable Lawrence University Garden (SLUG)

SLUG continues to serve as a focus for a variety of community projects. This fall term I worked with and supported Lawrence student Oren Jakobson to develop a program to train others in the practices of sustainable gardening. Oren's work brings together the Community Gardens Partnership of the Fox Valley and the Center for Growing Power of Milwaukee. We expect that the training program will be finalized this January.

(b) Mielke Family Foundation

Lawrence is seeking an endowed fund that will provide as-needed grants to support community service projects through the Office of Provost David Burrows. I participated in an informational interview with the Mielke Foundation for a request of \$100,000.

(c) Conkey's bookstore

Conkey's, a community icon for over 100 years, recently went out of business. A discussion group consisting of myself, other Lawrence faculty, and community members has formed to discuss the possibility of renting the former Conkey's

⁵published by DC Press in 2009

building, adjacent to the Lawrence campus, to support leadership development through entrepreneurship activities among Lawrence students.

(d) Pet Therapy

This fall, Visiting Assistant Professor of Psychology Julie Konik approached me about having some of her upper level students trained in pet therapy,⁶ so that they might participate in helping needy children. Kathy Schuessler, of the Fox Valley Humane Association, has a great deal of experience in various types of pet therapy and will serve to advise our efforts.

(e) Consulting for building projects

Professor of Anthropology Peter Peregrine is occasionally asked to consult on the remodeling or demolition of buildings that have historical significance. Peter and I are in the process of discussing how anthropology students might be involved in such research and/or consulting.

(f) Fire Safety Education Internship

During the summer of 2009 Beth Hoffman worked under the supervision of the Appleton Fire Department's Public Education Coordinator, Lori Casey, to design, implement, and assess a home visit fire safety program. Beth developed educational materials and a visit script, she recruited families to visit, and she developed follow-up and assessment materials. She conducted the visits with families of a variety of cultural backgrounds. She determined how such an outreach program could be conducted in the future by Fire Department personnel, and she estimated the necessary time and support needed.

Besides working with two Battalion Chiefs as advisors, Beth cultivated a number of community contacts both to inform them of her work and to recruit families to be visited. Included in these contacts: community members involved in the Neighborhood Watch, staff at the YMCA who work with needy families, the Hispanic Ministries Coordinator at St. Therese Catholic Church. In addition, Beth and I had several contacts with the Hispanic Interagency Council and the Hmong American Partnership.

Beth wrote and/or edited a variety of materials to communicate safe practices, and she translated several of these into Spanish.

To assess the program, Beth used two vehicles: a brief survey completed at the end of the visit and a follow-up mailing asking for further suggestions and commentary. Residents were asked to rate six aspects of the visit on a 1-5 scale (1=poor, 5=excellent). The average rating by all residents on all aspects was 4.84. On a follow-up survey, residents were asked if they had implemented suggested changes: the average for this question was 4.64, indicating a high degree of compliance.

The visits were appreciated greatly by the participants. An effective visit that covers a medium-size house can be done by two people in 30-40 minutes.

6. Appleton Area School District

⁶Pet therapy is directed at people; it involves the use of animal pets.

- (a) Foreign Language Instruction Program (FLIP)
Five Lawrence students of Spanish and Russian are working with a third grade teacher to coordinate language and culture lessons with the World Social Studies curriculum that involves Mexico and Russia.
- (b) Confidence and Determination in Youth (CADY)
This Lawrence student organization continues to design activities designed to provide college-like experiences to elementary and middle school students. Last October's College Day gave students in the 9th and 10th grades a sample of college classes and the opportunity to discuss their educational plans with current college students. CADY is planning grade school events similar to those in past years that have been exceptionally well received. I serve as an advisor to CADY and meet with their representatives regularly to help with planning and funding.
- (c) ArtsBridge
President Jill Beck offered a dance class during the fall term. Some of the students in this course will continue as ArtsBridge⁷ scholars, bringing an integrated dance/social studies curriculum to over 100 children during the months February-May. Because of her busy travel schedule during this time, President Beck has asked me to mentor and advise this group of ArtsBridge scholars.

7. The World

- (a) Teaching English in Bangalore, India
I helped support and supervise JB Sivanich, a Lawrence student who spent the summer of 2009 in Bangalore, teaching English at an orphanage school connected with the Pragati Foundation. JB pioneered a program which we hope will run in subsequent summers, accelerating the English language learning of young teens.
- (b) Sierra Leone
Professor of Government Dena Skran is spending December in Sierra Leone with eight Lawrence students. I have helped with the planning and funding of this work. Dena raises scholarship money through the KidsGive program,⁸ and her group is conducting a survey of the living conditions of the children currently receiving scholarships. The survey is part of a longer term plan to serve the educational and social needs of the children there. In addition, Lawrence student Will Meadows will conduct a nutritional survey that could serve as the basis for a larger academic project that he plans to complete. As Sierra Leone has very high rates of malnutrition, conducting this survey could both aid our student in his academic career and potential help the undernourished of Sierra Leone.
- (c) Haiti Video Project
Lawrence students Carolyn Armstrong and Stephen Anunson are creating a documentary to explain the work of Professor of Music Janet Anthony and her students who travel to Haiti each year to teach music. The documentary will be used to

⁷See <http://www.artsbridgeonline.com/> for a description of the ArtsBridge program of integrating the arts and the grade school curriculum.

⁸See <http://www.kidsgive.com/kidsgive.html>

raise money for future trips and to report on this beneficent work to the Fox Valley community.

8. Leadership Development

(a) Alumni contacts

We are developing a network of alumni who are good role-models of servant leadership and who are eager to interact with our students to impart a high standard of ethics. For instance, Harry Kraemer, the current President of the Lawrence University Board of Trustees, is Clinical Professor of Management and Strategy at the Kellogg School of Management. Harry came to Kellogg after serving as CEO of Baxter Healthcare, and he has extensive business experience. In 2008, Harry was given a prestigious award voted by the graduating members of the MBA program at Kellogg.⁹ Harry is cited as “an advocate of team-oriented servant leadership.” He came to Lawrence to give a talk on values-based leadership in November of this year. A follow-up dinner with Lawrence students furnished an opportunity for Harry to lead a discussion of ethics and of the efficacy of servant leadership.

(b) Lawrence Scholars of Business

This program, initiated last year, prepares a select number of Lawrence students for prestigious internships in the financial sector. A team of Lawrence faculty and alumni contacts are involved in a series of courses, projects, and opportunities to develop ethical leadership ability that will be attractive to major financial institutions. I serve on this team as an advisor with an interest in ethics and personnel management.

(c) Undergraduate Servant Leadership Conference

Next October, a servant leadership conference for undergraduates will be held at MSOE, organized for the most part by students at Marquette University. I have identified Lawrence students who are interested in promoting this conference and in participating in it. Our students are *Posse Scholars*, who come to Lawrence from New York City under joint sponsorship between Lawrence University and the Posse Foundation. The Foundation “identifies, recruits, and trains student leaders from public high schools to form multi-cultural teams” at various colleges.¹⁰ These are students “with extraordinary academic and leadership potential who may be overlooked by traditional college selection processes.” We are excited about the possibility that these students will interact with students from other Wisconsin colleges.

⁹The award is described at http://www.kellogg.northwestern.edu/News_Articles/2008/profofyear2008.aspx

¹⁰See <http://www.possefoundation.org/>

Criterion 5. Breakthrough Venture

Last March, Lawrence student JB Sivanich brought to our attention the possibility of working with the Pragati Educational Foundation of India. Mr. Vijay, the father of one of JB's friends, serves on the Pragati Board of Trustees and was interested in having a student spend the summer teaching English to middle-school students at an orphanage school in Bangalore. With financial and supervisory support from both the Lawrence Volunteer Center and the Office for Engaged Learning, JB spent ten weeks in Bangalore on this project.

There are several types of schools in India; some teach in the local language, some in English. The latter lie on a more natural path to college, since students who learn in their local language are much more limited in their options for higher education and higher technical training. JB taught two classes of seventeen students, helping them to improve their English skills so that they might be able eventually to switch from instruction in the local language, Kannada, to instruction primarily in English.

JB overcame several formidable obstacles in accomplishing his summer work. First, the standard texts used by the Indian students derive their instructional material from Western news sources, whose vocabulary tends to be idiosyncratic and advanced. Effective texts for the students that introduce vocabulary carefully and at the right level would have to be identified or produced. Second, the traditional method of instruction involves copying a given English text over and over without discussing the contextual meaning of words, without distinguishing idioms from grammatical usage, and without having the students obtain their own understanding of the text. Third, JB was the only white person the students had ever seen, and he saw no other white person during his entire stay. Thus, the culture shock was deep and persistent.

Despite these obstacles, there were factors working in favor of progress. The students were bright, strongly motivated, friendly, and cheerful. More than one expressed appreciation for the fact that JB did not inflict corporal punishment! In terms of the culture, the relative level of poverty actually made it easy for JB to stay within a very modest budget for food and transportation. JB benefited from having had a prior overseas experience in a similarly under-developed culture, and he maintained habits of personal discipline that kept him on the level.

JB was starting a program from the ground; even so, Mr. Vijay and the students JB taught judged his work to be very successful. We see JB as having pioneered what we hope will be a longer term relationship with Indian students supported by the Pragati Foundation. We are planning to have a second Lawrence student spend the summer of 2010 in Bangalore, working at the same school and advancing the development of an effective program accelerating English language learning. JB's experience will serve as a model for what can be

accomplished and to guide us in developing instructional materials for next summer. We are looking for a student with prior overseas experience, who has studied linguistics or English as a Second Language. We greatly appreciate and will continue to benefit from Mr. Vijay's knowledge of both American and Indian culture and his enthusiastic support of these efforts.

Beyond India, Professor Skran's experiences in Sierra Leone suggest the great need for curriculum development in the schools of developing nations. We are thinking of ways that Lawrence students can use expertise gained in their major subjects to help with such development. Our contact with Mr. Vijay has suggested ways to provide local support for this kind of work.

Criterion 7. A Servant Leader

From the beginning of our engaged learning efforts, we have postulated that servant leadership is an actual part of Lawrence culture, although it has not been overtly enunciated until the inauguration of the Pieper Chair. While many Lawrence students exhibit the characteristics of a servant leader, we mention JB Sivanich as an exceptional example.

We have described JB's work at an orphanage school in Bangalore, India. JB went to India motivated by the desire to serve and willing to undergo personal sacrifice to accomplish that service. The Volunteer Center and the Office for Engaged Learning were able to pay for JB's airfare to India and back, but JB paid for his own living expenses, local transportation, and instructional materials. He received no material compensation for his work, and of course he did not earn the money he would have earned at a typical summer job had he stayed in the United States. He addressed circumstances of privation with a cheerful spirit.

JB took a leadership role among the students with whom he worked, with a view to transferring to them an independence in their own learning. He was able to explain aspects of his own upbringing that his Indian students could understand and relate to. He took a leadership role upon returning to Lawrence in disseminating information about the Pragati Foundation and in beginning to recruit next summer's student teacher.

Other students and student organizations furnish examples of a similar nature. For instance, several of our athletic teams have adopted service projects. Team sports provide a natural context for leadership development. We are hoping to be more directly involved in the future with this work.

Survey Results

Measure 1: Comparison of Alumni Nationally

We have three sample groups:

peers: the HEDS peer group of schools similar to Lawrence University

LU: randomly selected Lawrence alumni from the classes 1999, 2004, 2006

OEL: Lawrence alumni who participated in engaged learning projects during their undergraduate career

We begin with tables showing, for each survey question, the percent of each sample group who responded with the highest of the four possible ratings. In other words, we show the percentage most enthusiastic about each area listed. Our first table involves the given traits considered as part of the respondent's *personal life*.

	Personal life: highest rating		
	peers	LU	OEL
Develop awareness of societal problems	54.2	31.9	25.0
Place current problems in perspective	61.6	37.2	50.0
Understand moral/ethical issues	65.3	55.8	25.0
Lead and supervise tasks and groups of people	57.4	25.7	100.0
Relate well to people of different cultures/races	66.6	61.1	75.0
Function effectively as a member of a team	76.8	55.8	100.0
Communicate well orally	85.7	75.2	100.0
Understand others	80.1	78.8	100.0

Our next table involves the degree to which the given trait *was enhanced by the respondent's undergraduate education*.

Enhanced in college: highest rating			
	peers	LU	OEL
Develop awareness of societal problems	53.5	40.7	75.0
Place current problems in perspective	50.0	44.2	50.0
Understand moral/ethical issues	51.2	46.9	75.0
Lead and supervise tasks and groups of people	30.9	38.9	100.0
Relate well to people of different cultures/races	40.9	52.2	100.0
Function effectively as a member of a team	41.2	53.1	75.0
Communicate well orally	50.0	67.3	100.0
Understand others	52.0	61.9	75.0

Our next table involves community service.

Community service: highest rating			
	peers	LU	OEL
Evaluate your level of involvement in community service while an undergraduate.	13.1	9.7	25.0
Evaluate the contribution of community service to your personal or professional life after graduation.	21.4	15.0	50.0

We repeat the previous three tables, recording the percentage of respondents who gave one of the highest two ratings. The three sample groups are the same.

Personal life: highest two ratings

	peers	LU	OEL
Develop awareness of societal problems	87.0	77.9	100.0
Place current problems in perspective	90.0	87.6	100.0
Understand moral/ethical issues	92.5	91.2	100.0
Lead and supervise tasks and groups of people	87.0	51.4	100.0
Relate well to people of different cultures/races	92.0	86.8	100.0
Function effectively as a member of a team	94.4	87.7	100.0
Communicate well orally	99.0	92.9	100.0
Understand others	97.6	95.6	100.0

Enhanced in college: highest two ratings

	peers	LU	OEL
Develop awareness of societal problems	85.8	76.1	100.0
Place current problems in perspective	84.1	77.8	100.0
Understand moral/ethical issues	88.5	84.1	100.0
Lead and supervise tasks and groups of people	67.6	68.1	100.0
Relate well to people of different cultures/races	73.1	77.0	100.0
Function effectively as a member of a team	84.2	78.8	100.0
Communicate well orally	85.7	94.7	100.0
Understand others	90.1	95.5	100.0

Community service: highest two ratings

	peers	LU	OEL
Evaluate your level of involvement in community service while an undergraduate.	37.8	54.8	100.0
Evaluate the contribution of community service to your personal or professional life after graduation.	54.0	47.7	100.0

Measure 2: Moral Values in Personal and Professional Life

A list of moral values was given to the two alumni samples as in the previous survey: (1) random alumni, (2) selected alumni who had been involved in engaged learning projects as undergraduates.

First, these groups were asked about the values in their *Personal Lives*. Here are the percentages for each value that responded that that value was *very important* – the highest rating.

Very Important – personally		
	LU	OEL
Altruism	33	50
Compassion	68.8	75
Cooperation	56	100
Creativity	47.7	75
Dedication	67.9	50
Diligence	56.9	50
Fairness	54.1	75
Faith	22	25
Humility	40.4	75
Integrity	82.6	75
Patience	57.8	75
Self-confidence	64.2	75
Supportiveness	59.6	75

Next, the same groups were asked about the same values in their *Professional Lives*. Again we list the percentages responding *Very Important*.

Very Important – professionally		
	LU	OEL
Altruism	31.2	50
Compassion	54.1	50
Cooperation	73.4	100
Creativity	50.5	75
Dedication	64.2	75
Diligence	74.3	75
Fairness	54.1	100
Faith	15.6	25
Humility	30.3	25
Integrity	82.6	100
Patience	67	50
Self-confidence	70.6	75
Supportiveness	53.2	100

Measure 3: Ongoing Comparison of Undergraduates

Here is the table comparing Lawrence students with peer students over a period of three NSSE surveys. Each line of the table corresponds to a particular NSSE question. This data extends comparisons we were able to make two years ago.

<i>Activity</i>	<i>LU06</i>	<i>Peers06</i>	<i>LU07</i>	<i>Peers07</i>	<i>LU08</i>	<i>Peers08</i>
Participated in a community based project	1.32	1.65	1.33	1.41	1.44	1.52
Had serious conversations with a students of a different race or ethnicity	2.89	2.76	2.86	2.82	3.01	2.93
Conversations with students very different from you in religious beliefs or political opinions	2.95	2.97	3.09	2.99	3.04	3.04
Participated in activities to enhance your spirituality	1.82	2.03	1.8	1.9	1.87	1.82
Tried better to understand someone's views by imagining how an issue looks from his or her perspective	2.9	2.95	2.93	2.88	2.98	2.98
*Engaged in community service or volunteer work that enriched my education	0.4	0.5	0.29	0.45	0.4	0.45
My school encourages contact among students from different economic, racial, or ethnic backgrounds	2.74	2.83	2.83	2.82	2.86	2.95
I have grown in understanding people of other racial and ethnic backgrounds	2.56	2.7	2.63	2.65	2.68	2.81
I have contributed to the welfare of my community	2.39	2.64	2.45	2.57	2.56	2.69
I have developed a deepened sense of spirituality	1.76	2.07	1.84	1.87	1.73	1.96