Lingnan University

Digital Commons @ Lingnan University

OSL Book / Book Chapter / Manual 書刊 / 文章
/ 教材冊

Office of Service-Learning 服務研習處

2021

Community impact feedback questionnaire (CIFQ) : the user manual

Ka Hing LAU

Lingnan University, Hong Kong

Robin Stanley SNELL

Lingnan University, Hong Kong

Follow this and additional works at: https://commons.ln.edu.hk/osl_book

Part of the [Service Learning Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Lau, K. H., & Snell, R. S. (2021). Community impact feedback questionnaire (CIFQ) : the user manual. Hong Kong: Office of Service-Learning, Lingnan University.

This Book is brought to you for free and open access by the Office of Service-Learning 服務研習處 at Digital Commons @ Lingnan University. It has been accepted for inclusion in OSL Book / Book Chapter / Manual 書刊 / 文章 / 教材冊 by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @ Lingnan University.

Community Impact Feedback Questionnaire (CIFQ)

The User Manual

Ka Hing LAU
Robin Stanley SNELL

Office of Service-Learning
Lingnan University

LBY101, 1/F B. Y. Lam Building,
Lingnan University, Tuen Mun,
New Territories, Hong Kong.
<https://www.ln.edu.hk/osl/>

First edition
Published 2021
ISBN: 978-988-75222-1-8

Copyright © 2021 Lingnan University

This work is subject to copyright. All rights are reserved, whether the whole or part of the material is concerned, specifically those of translation, reprinting, reuse of illustrations, broadcasting, reproduction by photocopying machines or similar means, transmission or information storage and retrieval, electronic adaptation, computer software, or by similar or dissimilar methodology now known or hereafter developed.

Community Impact Feedback Questionnaire (CIFQ): The User Manual

Authors

Ka Hing LAU, Lingnan University, Hong Kong

Robin Stanley SNELL, Lingnan University, Hong Kong

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The Community Impact Feedback Questionnaire (CIFQ) results from a cross-institutional project named “Cross-institutional Capacity Building for Service-Learning in Hong Kong Higher Education Institutions (PolyU4/T&L/16-19)”, aiming at enhancing and supporting the development of service-learning as an effective pedagogical strategy under the collaboration of Lingnan University, The Hong Kong Polytechnic University, Hong Kong Baptist University, and The Education University of Hong Kong. The project was launched in 2017, and has been funded by the University Grants Committee (UGC) of the HKSAR government. The authors wish to thank the UGC for funding the project, and the above institutions for their participation and valuable input in the process.

We would also like to extend our gratitude to the following contributors:

Dr Grace NGAI, Project Leader

*Head of the Service-Learning and Leadership Office
Associate Professor of the Department of Computing
The Hong Kong Polytechnic University*

Professor Daniel SHEK, Project Co-leader

*Interim Vice President (Research and Innovation)
Associate Vice President (Undergraduate Programme)
Chair Professor of Applied Social Sciences
Li & Fung Professor in Service Leadership Education
The Hong Kong Polytechnic University
Changjiang Scholar (Changjiang Chair Professor)*

Dr Hui Xuan XU, Project Co-leader

Associate Head and Assistant Professor of the Department of Curriculum and Instruction

The Education University of Hong Kong

Dr Kevin Kin Man YUE, Project Co-leader

Honorary Director of the Centre for Innovative Service-Learning

Associate Director and Associate Professor (Teaching and Research Division) of School of Chinese Medicine

Hong Kong Baptist University

Dr Yammy Lai-yan CHAK

Teaching Fellow of the Department of Applied Social Sciences

The Hong Kong Polytechnic University

Dr Maureen Yin Lee CHAN

Senior Research Assistant of the Department of Curriculum and Instruction

The Education University of Hong Kong

Dr James Yue On KO

Associate Director of the Joseph Lau Luen Hung Charitable Trust Asia Pacific Centre for Leadership and Change

Associate Professor of the Department of Education Policy and Leadership

The Education University of Hong Kong

Dr K. P. KWAN

Professorial Project Fellow of the Service-Learning and Leadership Office

The Hong Kong Polytechnic University

Dr Dorothy WONG (for commenting on the CIFQ Chinese version)

Independent Researcher (Translation Studies)

Dr Lu YU

Associate Head of the Department of Applied Social Sciences

The Hong Kong Polytechnic University

FOREWORD

Dr Grace NGAI

*Head of the Service-Learning and Leadership Office
Associate Professor of the Department of Computing
The Hong Kong Polytechnic University*

Service-learning is an impactful and popular experiential pedagogy at the higher education and secondary school level, in Hong Kong and worldwide. By nature, as a pedagogy that brings students out of the classroom to serve communities in need, service-learning relies on the collaboration of a diversity of stakeholders, including students, instructors, community partners, and the educational institutions. The philosophy behind service-learning is that as students learn, they contribute to the community. The community thus plays a part in the students' education and gains benefits in return.

Most previous research in service-learning has focused on its benefits for students' developmental outcomes. There is relatively little research on the impact of service-learning on the community partners or the served community. Part of the reason is that while there exist many ready-to-use instruments that measure different aspects of student learning, community impacts are harder to measure.

We hope that the Community Impact Feedback Questionnaire (CIFQ) will help to fill this evaluation and research gap. The CIFQ is designed to capture the impact of service-learning on the community partners and service recipients, from the community partner's perspective. It assesses the impact on the community partners from three aspects: furthering their mission, augmenting their resources, and acquiring knowledge, insights, ideas and techniques. It also includes items that measure the extent to which the service project benefitted the service recipients, and items that cover overall impact, retention and recommendation, through which we hope to obtain a holistic picture with key performance indicators.

This user manual provides a detailed explanation of how the CIFQ can be

deployed in the field. For convenience, a Chinese version of the CIFQ is also included in the Appendices. We hope that the Chinese version will encourage our community partners to engage in community impact evaluation together, and that the inputs they contribute can be translated into good practices that will further the field of service-learning and bring deeper and more sustainable impact to the community.

The development of the CIFQ was funded by the University Grants Council as part of the project "Cross-institutional Capacity Building for Service-Learning in Hong Kong Higher Education Institutions" (PolyU4/T&L/16-19), which aims at enhancing and supporting the development of service-learning as an effective pedagogical strategy. This project is a cross-institutional effort involving The Hong Kong Polytechnic University, Lingnan University, Hong Kong Baptist University, and The Education University of Hong Kong. In particular, the development of the CIFQ is the result of a collective effort from the above universities, in partnership with experienced community organizations, and involved a rigorous development and validation process. In this sense, the CIFQ marks another milestone in the history of service-learning development in Hong Kong, whereby educational institutions and community organizations collaborate to further the state of the art in service-learning, for the betterment of all stakeholders.

I invite schools involved in service-learning and their community partners to adopt the CIFQ, and to share your results with the research and practice community, for the benefit of all. Finally, I would like to thank all the colleagues, fellow researchers, and community partners who participated in the development of the CIFQ.

February 2021
Hung Hom, Hong Kong

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Overview	1
Literature Review	2-6
The development of service-learning in Hong Kong	3
Community impact arising from service-learning	4-6
How the CIFQ was Developed	7-9
Conceptual framework	8
Empirical evidence through a qualitative study	9
How the CIFQ was Validated	10-12
Definitions of the Types of Community Impact Measured by the CIFQ	13-15
Administering the CIFQ	16-17
Administration	17
Chinese translation of the CIFQ	17
References	18-20
Appendices	21-26
Community Impact Feedback Questionnaire	22-23
CIFQ Chinese version	24-25
Access for those with special needs or a disability	26

OVERVIEW

Service-learning is an experiential pedagogy designed to benefit all stakeholders, comprising students, educational institutions, instructors, and perhaps more importantly, community partner organizations (CPOs) and the community as a whole. Through serving the community via the CPO, students consolidate their knowledge and skills while applying these in real-life situations. Effective service-learning, therefore, should demonstrate community impact as a result.

However, the community impacts arising from service-learning have not been well demonstrated in past research. One reason for this has been the lack of an effective, standardized tool for measuring the impacts. To address this problem, Lingnan University, in collaboration with The Hong Kong Polytechnic University, Hong Kong Baptist University, and The Education University of Hong Kong, consolidated relevant research findings into a conceptual framework about the community impact of service-learning, from which the Community Impact Feedback Questionnaire (CIFQ) has been developed.

The primary objective of the CIFQ is to serve as a standardized and reliable assessment tool for measuring the extent to which a service-learning project is perceived to have various kinds of community impact. The CIFQ is also designed to capture community impacts from the service recipients' perspective, via the CPO as the service recipients' proxy.

This manual explains the process of how the CIFQ was developed and validated. It also explains how the CIFQ should be administered and scored, and how its results can be interpreted. We envisage that if the CIFQ can be widely adopted, a more complete and reliable data set regarding community impacts arising from service-learning can be obtained. A fuller picture of the community impacts arising from service-learning can help inform how to further advance this experiential learning methodology, and how to derive further benefits for CPOs and the wider community.

LITERATURE REVIEW

THE DEVELOPMENT OF SERVICE-LEARNING IN HONG KONG

The history of service-learning in Hong Kong's tertiary education sector began when Chung Chi College of the Chinese University of Hong Kong first adopted service-learning as a form of volunteering or social services in 1995 (Ma, 2018). A decade later, Lingnan University established the first Office of Service-Learning in 2006 to integrate service-learning in their undergraduate curriculum (Ma & Chan, 2013).

Since then, service-learning has developed rapidly, in the supportive context of the educational reforms by the HKSAR government, through which developing students into responsible citizens was emphasized (for details, see Snell & Lau, 2020).

Nowadays, service-learning has already been adopted by all government-funded universities in Hong Kong, as well as by some private universities, such as the Hang Seng University of Hong Kong. Furthermore, Lingnan University and The Hong Kong Polytechnic University have even made completion of a service-learning course an undergraduate graduation requirement (see Shek et al., 2015; Lau & Snell, 2020a).

The growth of service-learning in Hong Kong has been reflected in a multitude of service-learning projects. For example, in academic year 2019/20, Lingnan University alone organized 60 service-learning projects, involving more than 700 students undertaking a total of more than 37,000 service hours, serving over 5,300 beneficiaries in the community.

COMMUNITY IMPACT ARISING FROM SERVICE-LEARNING

Given that service-learning is operating on a large scale, one might imagine that its community impacts should have been extensively researched and demonstrated. On the contrary, the community impacts of service-learning have largely gone unstudied. This lack of attention may reflect that academics have prioritized student development, and that there appears to have been no prior standardized and reliable measurement tool (for details, see Cruz & Giles, 2000; Farahmandpour & Shodjaee-Zrudlo, 2015; Lau & Snell, 2020). As a step toward filling this gap, we reviewed the relevant literature documenting the community impacts arising from service-learning, and consolidated them into a conceptual framework, applicable to Hong Kong.

Some papers depicting the community impacts arising from service-learning were identified. The first one is by Driscoll et al. (1996), which developed a case study model for measuring the community impact of service-learning on community partner organizations. They identified ten areas of potential impact for a CPO. The first area concerned the impact on the nature of the CPO's partnership with the university. The second concerned the CPO's involvement with the community. The third was about the perceived capacity of the CPO to serve clients. The fourth involved economic benefits for the CPO and/or the community. The fifth concerned social benefits for the CPO and/or the community. The sixth concerned new insights about the CPO's operations/activities. The seventh concerned awareness of the university within the community. The eighth concerned establishment of ongoing community relationships involving the CPO. The ninth entailed identification of prospective employees for the CPO. The tenth concerned the level of satisfaction by the CPO with the interaction with the partner university.

Subsequently, Clarke (2003) created a 3-Is model for non-profit organizations, by focusing on the dynamic nature of the community impact of service initiatives and specific service-learning programs. The three Is in the model are: a) the Initiators of the service; b) the community service Initiative; and c) the community Impact of the service, including the results achieved for the community through the service-learning projects, from the perspectives of the community partners

and the university.

Around the same time, Gelmon (2003) developed a theoretical framework, addressing the community impacts of service learning, from the perspective of the CPO. Their framework subsumes seven types of community impact. These comprise: a) capacity to fulfil organizational mission; b) economic benefits, c) social benefits, d) nature of the community-university partnership, e) nature of the community-university interaction, f) satisfaction with the partnership, and g) sustainability of the partnership.

Table 1 summarizes the community impacts suggested by the above literature, and some common themes emerge as below. First, the nature of the community-university partnership. Second, the sustainability of the community-university partnership. Third, satisfaction with the community-university partnership. Fourth, perceived impact on the capacity of the CPO. Fifth, degree of assistance in furthering the mission and values of the CPO. Sixth, extent of increase in awareness of the role of the university. The last three of these directly concern impacts on the CPO and the community.

The above literature review indicated that two more domains of potential community impact can be included in our model. First, CPOs and the community can benefit from knowledge transfer from a partner university, given the latter's role as a knowledge powerhouse. Second, CPOs may be better able to identify prospective employees through interacting with students during service-learning projects.

No	Driscoll et al. (1996)	Survey Items of Clarke (2003)	Gelmon (2003)
01	Nature of partnership	Improved relationships with university	Nature of community-university partnership and interaction
02	Involvement with community	Community participated in goals/ Project helped the community meet goals	
03		Project had a goal to serve the community	
04	Perceived capacity to serve clients	Community gained access to resources	Capacity to fulfil organizational mission
05	Economic benefits	Community was served/ Project gave something of value	Economic benefits
06	Social benefits	Community was served/ Project gave something of value	Social benefits
07		Helped me (a service recipient) become active	
08		Helped residents (service recipients) with control	
09	New insights about operations/ activities		
10		Project worked well	
11	Awareness of the university	University was a source of help/ clear idea why the university was involved	
12	Establishment of ongoing relationships	Community/ university partnership improved	Sustainability of the partnership
13	Identification of prospective employees for the CPO		
14	Satisfaction with the university interaction		Satisfaction with the partnership
15		Community satisfied	
16		Desired additional student projects	

Table 1. Domains of Community Impact from the CPO's Perspective
Source: Lau & Snell (2020).

HOW THE CIFQ WAS DEVELOPED

CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

Based on the literature review in the previous section, a conceptual framework was developed to capture the major domains of community impact arising from service-learning.

Figure 1 represents the conceptual framework, which comprises two major components: CPOs and end-beneficiaries who receive direct or indirect service through service-learning projects. For CPOs, there are three major domains of community impact. The first is increased capacity level. The second is furtherance of goals and values. The third is knowledge or insights gained.

For the end-beneficiaries, two major impact domains, namely needs fulfillment and enhancement of quality of life, were defined. In addition to being a direct beneficiary of service-learning, CPOs may also serve as an intermediary in conveying community impacts to end-beneficiaries. For details, please refer to Lau & Snell (2020).

Figure 1. The Conceptual Framework of Community Impacts Arising from Service-Learning
Source: Lau & Snell (2020).

EMPIRICAL EVIDENCE THROUGH A QUALITATIVE STUDY

The above conceptual framework was confirmed by a qualitative study that was based on semi-structured interviews with partner organization representatives (PORs) of 13 local and global CPOs. Besides confirming the framework, the study provided additional insights, given next.

Positive community impacts for the CPOs reported in the qualitative study included: a) achieving project goals to further the CPO's mission; b) augmenting the resources of the CPO; and c) gaining by the CPO of new knowledge, insights, ideas, and techniques. Furthermore, the positive community impacts for the end-beneficiaries, as reported in the qualitative study, matched with the concept of needs fulfillment and enhancement of quality of life in the framework in Figure 1, given above. However, some negative community impacts were also identified, reflecting occasions when service-learning had been mismanaged. These adverse impacts included: a) compromised or absent contributions to CPOs; b) extra workload deemed unexpected and undesirable for CPOs; c) perceived waste of resources by CPOs. For details, please refer to Lau et al. (2020).

The results of the qualitative study reported in the previous section, along with the earlier literature review, informed the construction of a draft Community Impact Feedback Questionnaire (CIFQ), designed to measure the community impacts arising from service-learning, from the CPO's perspective. The CIFQ is designed as a self-reporting questionnaire for collecting the opinions of PORs of their CPOs about the three major types of potentially positive community impact, by using rating questions of a Likert scale.

HOW THE CIFQ WAS VALIDATED

A draft CIFQ was created for validation purposes. As stated above, the CIFQ comprises mainly Likert-scale items. The first 16 items covered the three major types of potential community impact. These were: a) achieving project goals to further the CPO's mission; b) augmenting the resources of the CPO; and c) the CPO's gaining of new knowledge, insights, ideas, and techniques. Two more items, addressing end-beneficiaries' needs fulfillment and quality of life enhancement were included. Another two negatively framed items were developed to capture what might happen for CPOs if a service-learning project were to be mismanaged. Finally, four items of overall assessment were added.

The draft 24-item CIFQ was then subjected to peer validation by employing the Delphi technique, which is commonly used with issues and items that are subject to controversy and where there is limited prior research. The Delphi technique collates ideas generated from members of a Validation Panel made up of knowledgeable practitioners through two to three rounds of anonymous idea consolidation (Iqbal & Papon-Young, 2009). These knowledgeable panelists' responses were reviewed by a Questionnaire Development (QD) Panel for the CIFQ. The QD Panel, comprising members with expertise in the delivery of service-learning, decided on modifications to the draft CIFQ based on the responses of the Validation Panel.

On the Validation Panel, there were 16 knowledgeable members, comprising local community-facing practitioners with experience of supporting service-learning within a university, and/or of supporting service-learning as PORs of CPOs. The Delphi study involved three rounds. The validity of the three major community impact types included in the CIFQ was confirmed. However, a number of modifications to items in the draft CIFQ were requested.

First, the Validation Panel indicated that the two items indicating negative community impacts should be removed, because they were perceived as unlikely and inapplicable. The QD Panel concurred. Second, the item of recruiting talent for the CPO was dropped because the Validation Panel could not reach agreement about its relevance. Third, the item for overall satisfaction was dropped on the grounds that it was not directly related to community impact. Fourth, the wording and content of some items were revised, in order to better specify the impact that they intend to measure. Fifth, the option of "N/A" (not

applicable) was created for most items.

Finally, a commentary section with two open-ended questions was recommended by the QD Panel, for comments that are not amenable for capturing through other items. The first of these questions asks for general comments, while the second asks for suggestions about how to make service-learning more useful in the future.

Following the Delphi study, the draft CIFQ was modified into a 22-item version. The first 15 items cover the three major community impact types, followed by two items covering impacts for direct service recipients, and then three items covering overall assessments (comprising generally positive impacts, retention of services, and recommendations). At the end of the questionnaire, there is a commentary section with two items. Please refer to Appendices for the finalized CIFQ, and to the article by Lau and Snell (2021) for the details of this validation exercise.

DEFINITIONS OF THE TYPES OF COMMUNITY IMPACT MEASURED BY THE CIFQ

This chapter provides the definitions of the three major types of community impact for CPOs arising from service learning, as reference points for service-learning practitioners and researchers. In addition, the impact areas addressed by the items pertaining to service recipients and to overall assessment are defined.

Community Impact		
No	Type/ Item Description	Definition
For CPOs (Items 1 to 15)		
1-5	Achieving project goals to further the CPO's mission	The extent to which a service-learning project has been able to assist the CPO in advancing their mission by providing tangible outputs, enhancing service quality, promoting organizational image, and building a larger client base.
6-10	Augmenting resources of the CPOs	The extent to which a service-learning project has been able to assist the CPO by generating financial resources, providing human resources, building organizational networks, improving work culture, and generally joining forces with the CPO.
11-15	Acquiring knowledge, insights, ideas and techniques	The extent to which a service-learning project has been able to provide inspiration and advice for improving the CPO's operation and development, such as by reviewing usual work practices, enhancing techniques, and providing new knowledge and experience.
For Service Recipients (Items 16 & 17)		
16	Bringing benefits to service recipients	The extent to which a service-learning project has been able to bring benefits to service recipients so that their needs have been fulfilled, as perceived by the CPO.
17	Improving the well-being of service-recipients	The extent to which a service-learning project has been able to ultimately improve the well-being of service-recipients, as perceived by the CPO.
Overall Assessment (Items 18 to 20)		
18	Creating positive impact for my organization	Overall, the extent to which a service-learning project has been able to create positive impacts, as perceived by the CPO.
19	Encouraging CPOs to continue partnering in service-learning	The extent to which the CPO would like to engage in service-learning again in the future based on their involvement in the service-learning project this time.

Community Impact		
No	Type/ Item Description	Definition/Item Objective
20	Recommending collaboration in service-learning to other community organizations	The extent to which the CPO would recommend service-learning to other organizations based on their experience of involvement in the service-learning project this time.
Commentary Section (Items 21 & 22)		
21	Changes to make the service-learning project more useful in the future	Opinions regarding room for improvement in the future
22	Other comments	Other comments that the above items cannot capture

ADMINISTERING THE CIFQ

ADMINISTRATION

The CIFQ has been developed as a feedback questionnaire for completion by PORs of CPOs about a service-learning project that they have partnered in. The CIFQ is not envisaged to be a tool with measures of psychometric properties, such as validity and reliability, that would lend themselves to sophisticated statistical analysis. Nor has the peer validation with the Delphi technique, which was based on a small sample, endorsed the likelihood of such validity or reliability. Therefore, it is not recommended that the scores of items under the same community impact type are aggregated for comparison at category levels.

Nonetheless, we encourage PORs of CPOs to compare scores at the item level across the service-learning projects that they have been involved in and even against where other CPOs have been partners. The creation of a centralized database, which aims to provide benchmarks for such comparisons is underway.

Regarding the timing of administration, PORs of CPOs are encouraged to complete the CIFQ immediately after their service-learning projects have finished, such that they can recall the associated experiences and perceptions.

We suggest that upon completion of the CIFQ by PORs of CPOs, there could be discussions between them and university-based service-learning practitioners and researchers about low scoring items, e.g., those scoring 5 or below, in order to ascertain why the scores are low. Such issues could be further investigated through follow-up interviews or focus groups. Moreover, PORs of CPOs and service-learning researchers are also encouraged to pay special attention to the scores obtained for the impacts at the end-beneficiary level.

CHINESE TRANSLATION OF THE CIFQ

Owing to concerns that many PORs of CPOs in Hong Kong, as well as the wider Greater China region, prefer answering questionnaires in Chinese, the research team has provided a Chinese CIFQ, which follows the original English version in the Appendices. The Chinese version has undergone a rigorous translation and validation process, involving back-translation and professional translation by two professors with expertise in questionnaire translation.

REFERENCES

- Clarke, M. M. (2003). Finding the community in service-learning research: The 3-"I" model. In S. H. Billing & J. Eyler (Eds.), *Deconstructing service-learning: Research exploring context, participation, and impacts* (pp. 125-146). Greenwich, Conn: Information Age Publishing.
- Cruz, N., & Giles, D. E., Jr. (2000). Where's the community in service learning research? *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 7(1), 28-34.
- Driscoll, A., Holland, B., Gelmon, S., & Kerrigan, S. (1996). An assessment model for service-learning: Comprehensive case studies of impact on faculty, students, community, and institution. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 3, 66-71.
- Farahmandpour, H., & Shodjaee-Zrudlo, I. (2015) Redefining Service-Learning for the Purpose of Social Change within Education. In Bola Delano-Oriaran, Marguerite W. Penick-Parks, & Suzanne Fondrie (Eds.) *The SAGE sourcebook of service-learning and civic engagement*, Chapter 7. CA: SAGE. doi:10.4135/9781483346625.n13.
- Gelmon, S. B. (2003). Assessment as a means of building service-learning partnerships. In B. Jacoby et al. (Eds.). *Building partnerships for service-learning* (pp. 42-64). San Francisco: Wiley.
- Iqbal, S. & Papon-Young, L. (2009). The Delphi method. *Psychologist*, 22, 598-601.
- Lau, K. H., Chan, M. Y. L., Snell, R. S., & Yeung, C. L. S. (2020). *An exploratory study of the community impacts of service-learning*. Submitted for Publication.
- Lau, K. H., & Snell, R. S. (2020). *Assessing community impact after service-learning: A conceptual framework*. 6th International Conference on Higher Education Advances (HEAD'20). doi:10.4995/head20.2020.10969.
- Lau, K. H., & Snell, R. S. (2020a). *Service-Learning Outcomes Measurement Scale (S-LOMS): The user manual*. Hong Kong: Office of Service-Learning, Lingnan University. doi: 10.14793/9789887522201.
- Lau, K. H., & Snell, R. S. (2021). *The development of the Community Impact Feedback Questionnaire for service-learning: A Delphi study*. Submitted for Publication.
- Ma, C. (2018). Service-learning development in higher education in Hong Kong. In T. W. Lim, & W. X. Li (Eds.), *Studying Hong Kong: 20 Years of Political, Economic and Social Developments*, pp 43-61. New Jersey: World Scientific. doi:10.1142/9789813223554_0004.

- Ma, C. H. K., & Chan, A. C. M. (2013). A Hong Kong university first: Establishing service-learning as an academic credit-bearing subject. *Gateways: International Journal of Community Research and Engagement*, 6, 178–198. doi:10.5130/ijcre.v6i1.3286.
- Shek, D. T. L., Yu, L., Wu, F. K. Y., & Chai, W. Y. (2015). General university requirements at Hong Kong Polytechnic University: Evaluation findings based on student focus groups. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 40(8), 1017-1031. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2014.960362>.
- Snell, R. S. & Lau, K. H. (2020). The development of a service-learning outcomes measurement scale (S-LOMS). *Metropolitan Universities*, 31 (1), 44-77. doi: 10.18060/23258.

APPENDICES

Acquiring knowledge, insights, ideas and technique

To what extent has the service-learning project...	Very Little	To Some Extent	Very Much	N/A
11 inspired us with new ideas, insights and/or strategies	☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☐ 6 ☐ 7 ☐ 8 ☐ 9 ☐ 10 ☐ 88			
12 stimulated my organization to review our usual work practices	☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☐ 6 ☐ 7 ☐ 8 ☐ 9 ☐ 10 ☐ 88			
13 transferred new knowledge from university to my organization	☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☐ 6 ☐ 7 ☐ 8 ☐ 9 ☐ 10 ☐ 88			
14 enabled us to gain new experience	☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☐ 6 ☐ 7 ☐ 8 ☐ 9 ☐ 10 ☐ 88			
15 helped enhance our work techniques	☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☐ 6 ☐ 7 ☐ 8 ☐ 9 ☐ 10 ☐ 88			

Impact for service recipients (if the service-learning project had not involved any service recipients, please skip it)

To what extent has the service-learning project...	Very Little	To Some Extent	Very Much	N/A
16 brought benefits to service recipients	☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☐ 6 ☐ 7 ☐ 8 ☐ 9 ☐ 10 ☐ 88			
17 improved the well-being of service-recipients	☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☐ 6 ☐ 7 ☐ 8 ☐ 9 ☐ 10 ☐ 88			

Overall assessment (1= strongly disagree, 10= strongly agree)

	Strongly Disagree	Strongly Agree
18 Overall, the service-learning project created positive impact for my organization	☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☐ 6 ☐ 7 ☐ 8 ☐ 9 ☐ 10	
19 Overall, the service-learning project made us want to continue partnering in service-learning in the future	☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☐ 6 ☐ 7 ☐ 8 ☐ 9 ☐ 10	
20 I will recommend collaboration in service-learning to other community organizations	☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☐ 6 ☐ 7 ☐ 8 ☐ 9 ☐ 10	

Commentary Section:

21. What changes could be made, if any, to make the service-learning project more useful in the future?

22. Any other comments, please specify:

請選擇適合的分數（1分：很多）以顯示你對這次服務學習項目並不適用，請選擇「不適用」選項。

實現項目目標以進一步履行機構使命

於多大程度上這次服務學習項目...		有些										很大 不適用	
01	促進了我的機構履行機構的使命	☐ 1	☐ 2	☐ 3	☐ 4	☐ 5	☐ 6	☐ 7	☐ 8	☐ 9	☐ 10	☐ 88	
02	為我的機構提供了有用的成果（如出版書刊、開辦課程、新服務等）	☐ 1	☐ 2	☐ 3	☐ 4	☐ 5	☐ 6	☐ 7	☐ 8	☐ 9	☐ 10	☐ 88	
03	提升了我的機構的服務質素	☐ 1	☐ 2	☐ 3	☐ 4	☐ 5	☐ 6	☐ 7	☐ 8	☐ 9	☐ 10	☐ 88	
04	幫助推廣我的機構的形象	☐ 1	☐ 2	☐ 3	☐ 4	☐ 5	☐ 6	☐ 7	☐ 8	☐ 9	☐ 10	☐ 88	
05	令我的機構能服務更多受眾	☐ 1	☐ 2	☐ 3	☐ 4	☐ 5	☐ 6	☐ 7	☐ 8	☐ 9	☐ 10	☐ 88	

增加機構的資源

於多大程度上這次服務學習項目...	很小	有些	很大	不適用
06 為我的機構創造了經濟效益（如增加儲備、額外收入）	☐ 1	☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☐ 6	☐ 7 ☐ 8 ☐ 9	☐ 10
07 為我的機構提供了額外的人力資源	☐ 1	☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☐ 6	☐ 7 ☐ 8 ☐ 9	☐ 10
08 值得我的機構的投入參與	☐ 1	☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☐ 6	☐ 7 ☐ 8 ☐ 9	☐ 10
09 幫助我的機構推廣正面的工作文化	☐ 1	☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☐ 6	☐ 7 ☐ 8 ☐ 9	☐ 10
10 擴闊了我的機構的網絡	☐ 1	☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☐ 6	☐ 7 ☐ 8 ☐ 9	☐ 10

獲得新知識、洞見、意念及技術

於多大程度上這次服務學習項目...					有些					很大 不適用				
					很小									
11	以新意念、洞見及/或策略啟迪我的機構				☐ 1	☐ 2	☐ 3	☐ 4	☐ 5	☐ 6	☐ 7	☐ 8	☐ 9	☐ 10
12	促使我的機構檢討其固有的工作方式				☐ 1	☐ 2	☐ 3	☐ 4	☐ 5	☐ 6	☐ 7	☐ 8	☐ 9	☐ 10
13	將大學裡的知識轉移至我的機構				☐ 1	☐ 2	☐ 3	☐ 4	☐ 5	☐ 6	☐ 7	☐ 8	☐ 9	☐ 10
14	令我們獲得嶄新經驗				☐ 1	☐ 2	☐ 3	☐ 4	☐ 5	☐ 6	☐ 7	☐ 8	☐ 9	☐ 10
15	幫助提升我們的工作技能				☐ 1	☐ 2	☐ 3	☐ 4	☐ 5	☐ 6	☐ 7	☐ 8	☐ 9	☐ 10

對服務對象的影響（若該服務學習項目並無涉及任何服務對象，請略過此部份）

於多大程度上這次服務學習項目...					很小					有些					很大				
16	為服務對象帶來益處				☐ 1	☐ 2	☐ 3	☐ 4	☐ 5	☐ 6	☐ 7	☐ 8	☐ 9	☐ 10					
17	改善了服務對象的福祉				☐ 1	☐ 2	☐ 3	☐ 4	☐ 5	☐ 6	☐ 7	☐ 8	☐ 9	☐ 10					

整體評價（1分：非常不同意，10分：非常同意）

非常不同意										非常同意										
18	整體而言，這次服務學習項目對我的機構帶來正面影響																			
	□ 1	□ 2	□ 3	□ 4	□ 5	□ 6	□ 7	□ 8	□ 9	□ 10										
19	整體而言，這次服務學習項目令我們想繼續成為未來的服務學習項目的合作夥伴																			
	□ 1	□ 2	□ 3	□ 4	□ 5	□ 6	□ 7	□ 8	□ 9	□ 10										
20	我會推薦服務學習合作項目予其他社區機構																			
	□ 1	□ 2	□ 3	□ 4	□ 5	□ 6	□ 7	□ 8	□ 9	□ 10										

評論部份：

21. 如服務學習項目可有增補之處使之更加有用，有何建議？

22. 其他意見，請註明：

ACCESS FOR THOSE WITH SPECIAL NEEDS OR A DISABILITY

Administrators of the CIFQ should ensure that all those (i.e., PORs or CPOs), who wish to provide their responses are able to do so. Some standard administration procedures may be unsuitable for those with special needs or a disability. For example, some individuals may not have access to a computer or electronic device for answering the CIFQ, while some with a visual disability may be unable to read the printed questionnaire. There may also be language barriers. Processes of administration may need to be adapted to accommodate such individuals.

Possible measures for widening accessibility include providing an interpreter for those who cannot understand the language medium adopted for the CIFQ, and offering braille copies of the questionnaire for those who are visually impaired. CPOs should note that the issues mentioned here are not exhaustive. It is recommended they seek professional advice and information on operation.