EXAMINING TWENTY-FIRST-CENTURY SKILL ACQUISITION AS A RESULT OF DEMOCRATIC ENGAGEMENT WITHIN A SIDE-BY-SIDE COMMUNITY-BASED LEARNING COURSE

Cyndi Reed Rickards, Ed.D.

Abstract

The purpose of this study was to examine the acquisition of essential twenty-first-century skills as a result of the Side-by-Side community-based learning course format. A study of the National Student Survey of Engagement (NSSE) and a priori code analysis of student pair interviews and course presentation videos combine into a convergent mixed-methods study to examine the acquisition of twenty-first-century skills as a result of this unique learning model.

Introduction

Mission and vision statements for institutions of higher education have long reflected civic learning and democratic engagement. There is renewed dedication to such engagement as leaders articulate an interest in a civic enterprise while providing the education of community-based entrepreneurship in American students (Harkavy and Hodges 2012; Ostrander 2004). As shared in the report *A Crucible Moment: College Learning and Democracy's Future,* the conversation in higher education has shifted, moving from a focus on what students know to a focus on whether students know how to think and providing the skills needed for living and working in the twenty-first century (American Association of Colleges and Universities 2012). However, this conversation is not without debate. Liberal arts educators question the role of the provider of job skills versus the traditional role of discipline-based knowledge expert.

Technological growth and globalization have changed our economy. Our innovative and highly-connected world is "flat" and therefore requires people to navigate both technology and globalization in addition to acquiring twenty-first-century skills (Friedman 2006). The Association for American Colleges and Universities (AAC&U 2014, para. 1) provides a clear overview of twenty-first-century education:

> As we move into a turbulent century, our nation's democracy and our interdependent global community require a more informed, engaged, and socially responsible citizenry. Both educators and employers agree that personal and social responsibilities are core elements of a 21st-century education. Moreover, the AAC&U's recent survey of its members confirms that many institutions are placing more emphasis on civic education by developing innovative educational practices that advance learning outcomes essential for responsible citizenship, at home and abroad.

With technology and globalization becoming increasingly pervasive, Kenworthly and DiPadova-Stocks write, "Society is in a time of rapid change and connectedness and therefore we must graduate students who can deal productively with such uncertainty and can learn new knowledge about situations from actual people in those situations." Higher education must reconceptualize the notion of education and global citizenship as we move forward in a world where local,

regional, national, and international connectedness intersects with social, economic, and technological pressures (Kenworthly and DiPadova-Stocks, 174).

In the age of assessment, evaluation, and accreditation, educational institutions often require faculty members to clearly articulate, map, and prove their students' mastery of course content. Acedo and Hughes (2014, 503) contend that for curriculum to be transformational, course design must first define the purpose of curriculum. They stress the need for a coherent worldwide understanding of what "curriculum" is and what its intended role in education is. Only then may courses "focus on learning as the cornerstone of curriculum, before turning to the guiding principles that should guide curricula in the 21st century."

Furthermore, institutions of higher education must develop student skills that are marketable in a global twenty-first-century economy (Cobert 2005). Boyles (2012, 34) holds that:

> Within our new global economy there is an opportunity for careers to emerge that will cause existing companies to hire employees with higher-level skills in order to successfully compete. The increased demand for a highly skilled twenty-first century workforce has contributed to the rising importance of obtaining a college education. However, recent studies indicate that newly hired college graduates do not excel in these higher-level knowledge and information based skills at the level that employer's desire.

Institutions of higher education are poised to shape education, skills, civic learning, and democratic engagement collaboratively with workforce leaders and community partners.

There is limited evaluation of how twenty-first-century skills integrate into curriculum and allow for assessment. Darling-Hammond (2012, 301) explains that internationally, global curriculum, instruction, and assessment reform attempted to better prepare primary-school children for the demands of life and work associated with higher education. However, the evaluation of such efforts is limited in curriculum assessment. The Program in International Student Assessment (PISA) captures interest in such skills. Current primary-level standardized tests explicitly capture a number of twenty-first-century skills. Through assessment, educators ask what students can do with what they learned (Darling-Hammond and Adamson 2010). Such skills are increasingly emphasized in many national assessments as well as international assessments (Darling-Hammond 2012, 302). Institutions of higher education often rely upon faculty assessment autonomy and do not require such standardization.

The present study examined Drexel University's Side-By-Side community-based learning courses offered in the spring 2015 term. Side-By-Side courses have a unique community-based learning course format that brings together traditional university college students with community members in a collaborative full-term course experience. In alignment with the National Survey of Student Engagement's (NSSE's) category of a *high-impact practice* (Kuh 2008a), the Side-by-Side course format recognizes that students, the community, and the university offer a unique perspective and knowledgebase. The Side-By-Side community-based learning format addresses larger social inequalities or issues of injustice. Thus, this course format creates a space for learning with students who otherwise may not have had an opportunity to learn together.

The purpose of this study was to examine the acquisition of twenty-first-century skills within a community-based learning course, specifically, Drexel University's Side-By-Side community-based learning courses offered during the spring 2015 term. Course evaluations traditionally assess student opinion and academic course content achievement and subsequently neglect to assess whether larger university goals of twenty-first-century skills emerge. Institutional data does not represent students' abilities to transfer their understandings to real-world situations. This study uses the National Student Survey of Engagement (NSSE) survey to measure the acquisition of twenty-first-century skills in four topical modules. These modules are short sets of questions covering: (1) experiences with diverse populations, (2) transferable skills, (3) civic engagement, and (4) global perspectives. Additional qualitative data will discern unique course experiences and student perspectives.

Research that can demonstrate civic learning and twenty-first-century skill outcomes, in addition to academic learning objectives, is necessary to support future development of community-based learning courses such as Side-by-Side. Institutions of higher education are developing initiatives for increasing students' levels of local and global civic engagement. This research demonstrated that the alignment and integration of civic learning and twenty-first-century skills in Drexel University's Side-By-Side course format provided an academic opportunity to achieve course and institutional objectives. This study provided an opportunity to assess an innovative community-based learning course format not currently represented in the literature.

Side-By-Side is a community-based learning course format that is an evolution of the Inside-Out Prison Exchange Program. The Inside-Out Prison Exchange Program is an international initiative directed at transforming thinking about crime and justice. The Inside-Out Prison Exchange Program brings campus-enrolled and incarcerated students together as classmates in postsecondary courses built around dialogue, collaboration, and experiential learning. In 2010, a cohort of Drexel faculty, staff, and community partners attended an Inside-Out specialized training and agreed to pilot a shared course learning experience for disenfranchised community members and traditional undergraduate Drexel students. Side-By-Side courses recognize that all students, community members, and Drexel University faculty members offer a unique perspective and knowledge base. These courses create an educational space with students who otherwise may not have had an opportunity to learn together. This collaborative learning course format often addresses larger social inequalities or issues of injustice.

This study examined the acquisition of twenty-first-century skills within a Side-By-Side community-based learning course through both quantitative and qualitative methods. There were three research questions for this study.

Quantitative Question:

> 1. How do student twenty-first-century skills (i.e., experience with diversity, global perspectives, civic engagement, transferable skills, and course engagement), as measured by the National Survey of Student Engagement survey tool change within a Side-By-Side course during the ten-week term?

2.   How do Side-by-Side community student and Drexel student pairs describe their learning in areas of twenty-first-century skills (i.e., experience with diversity, global perspectives, civic engagement, transferable skills, and course engagement) within a Side-by-Side course?

3.   What evidence of twenty-first-century skills (i.e., experience with diversity, global perspectives, civic engagement, transferable skills, and course engagement) is demonstrated in a Side-by-Side recorded video of the final assignment course presentation during the last week of the term?

Methods

A convergent design method allowed for the analysis of twenty-first-century skills within Side-by-Side courses. This method allowed for the comparison of the quantitative data to the qualitative data. This methodology best captured the twenty-first-century skill acquisition of students within the Side-by-Side course format, as the researcher compared the two sources of data to determine if the qualitative portion supported the quantitative results.

The four topical modules from the NSSE survey were used to collect a quantitative measure of twenty-first-century skills attainment within a Side-by-Side course. The survey tool is a national survey typically used to capture institutional engagement of undergraduate college students. This methodology provided a measure of change in skill level and acquisition within Side-by-Side courses.

The researcher recognized that the statistics that emerge from the NSSE tool may not adequately capture the skill acquisition that results from the high-impact community-based learning course. Therefore, two qualitative methods were employed to alternatively measure twenty-first-century skills. The inductive logic utilized within the qualitative methodology provided rich "context-bound" data in which the effectiveness of the Side-by-Side course format emerged (Creswell and Plano-Clark 2007, 30).

The two distinct qualitative methods within this study complimented the quantitative measurements. Paired student groups, one traditional Drexel student and one community student, were interviewed and asked to describe their experience within the course. Transcripts from such interviews were coded using the a priori codes or the four identified twenty-first-century skills and course engagement. Additionally, a video archive of student course presentations were analyzed and a priori coded for the twenty-first-century skills or dependent variables. Furthermore, emergent unanticipated codes that are inductive or "reflect the terms used by the [participants] themselves" were included in the qualitative analysis (Strauss 1987, 33). The researcher compared the frequency of the codes that emerged from the qualitative data with the descriptive statistics from the NSSE tool. A qualifying quantitative data methodology was employed whereby quantitative data from the NSSE questioners were factor analyzed for twenty-first-century skills and engagement. These factors then became the themes that were compared with those analyzed from the qualitative portion of the research (Creswell 2013, 35).

<div align="center">

Results

</div>

Quantitative Results

The National Survey for Student Engagement (NSSE) was repurposed for this study to measure twenty-first-century skill in three Side-by-Side courses at Drexel University. The study's survey tool was produced by merging four NSSE topical modules: (a) experience with diversity, (b) global perspectives, (c) civic engagement and (d) transferable skills. Additionally, it included NSSE's tool for measuring course engagement, which created a 70-question item survey instrument (Appendix A). The survey instrument was distributed during the first class (week 1) and the last class (week 10) of each of the three Side-by-Side courses at Drexel University: a history course, History of Philadelphia; a literature course, Philadelphia Stories; and a communication course, Public Speaking.

All university students who were enrolled in the three Side-by-Side courses at Drexel University during the 2015 spring term were eligible to participate in the quantitative portion of this research study. Of the thirty-five eligible Drexel students, twenty-nine completed pre and post surveys that resulted in an 82.9 percent response rate. Composite scores were created to measure the four skills articulated in the following research question: How do student twenty-first-century skills (i.e., experience with diversity, global perspectives, civic engagement, transferable skills) and course engagement, as measured by the National Survey of Student Engagement survey tool, change throughout a Side-by-Side course during the ten-week term? Variable labels were created for each of the four skills and course engagement. Bivariate and regression analysis were utilized to assess for differences in the four identified skills and course engagement between pre and post survey data. It is important to note that quantitative data only reflected the skill attainment of Drexel students, as community students did not participate in the survey.

Paired t-Test

A series of paired t-tests were performed to assess difference among the five composite variables. De Winter (2013, 1) concluded in his study that utilized students' paired t-tests that extremely small sample sizes are feasible with Ns (N < 5) if the within-pair correlation was high. There was not a significant difference between pre and post composite variable scores (see Tables 1 and 2).

Table 1

Composite Variable Paired Sample Statistics

		Mean	N	Std. deviation	Std. error mean
Pair 1	DP_pre	25.8400	25	5.96294	1.19259
	DP_post	26.0400	25	6.76067	1.35213
Pair 2	TS_pre	30.8800	25	4.80729	0.96146
	TS_post	31.2800	25	6.22843	1.24569

Pair 3	CE_pre	48.9600	25	6.22816	1.24563
	CE_post	49.1200	25	5.03587	1.00717
Pair 4	GP_pre	71.5600	25	7.62168	1.52434
	GP_post	73.0400	25	7.33985	1.46797
Pair 5	E_pre	41.8400	25	5.08003	1.01601
	E_post	41.7600	25	6.52099	1.30420

Table 2

Composite Variable Paired Samples T-Test

	Paired differences					t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
	Mean	Std. deviation	Std. error mean	95% confidence interval of the difference				
				Lower	Upper			
Pair 1 DP_pre—DP_post	-.20000	6.30476	1.26095	-2.80248	2.40248	-.159	24	.875
Pair 2 TS_pre—TS_post	-.40000	4.87340	.97468	-2.41164	1.61164	-.410	24	.685
Pair 3 CE_pre—CE_post	-.16000	4.68757	.93751	-2.09493	1.77493	-.171	24	.866
Pair 4 GP_pre—GP_post	-1.48000	4.63789	.92758	-3.39443	.43443	-1.596	24	.124
Pair 5 E_pre—E_post	.08000	6.10956	1.22191	-2.44190	2.60190	.065	24	.948

Significant Results for Individual Survey Items

In addition to assessing composite scores, each individual survey question item was examined with a paired t-test and analyzed for significance. Twelve individual items across course engagement and all four twenty-first-century skills had significant changes in pre to post data for self-reported skill development. Specifically, from week 1 to week 10 there was significant change in responses to twelve individual survey questions (Appendix A).

Qualitative Results

Interview Data

Paired student groups, composed of one traditional Drexel student and one community student, were qualitatively interviewed. Two student pairs from each of the three Side-by-Side courses were interviewed for a total of six paired interviews. A narrative research approach was utilized and each pair was asked to describe their learning experience by answering five semi-structured questions about their experience and perception of the Side-by-Side course.

The data collection took place at Drexel's urban education extension center located on the border of Mantua and Powelton Village, four blocks from the university's main campus. Drexel and community students were enrolled in one of three courses, each covering different disciplines: (a) History of Philadelphia (history), (b) Philadelphia Stories (literature), or (c) Techniques of Speaking (communication). Community students self-selected and registered for participation in a Side-by-Side course, and they confirm their registration seat by attending an orientation scheduled the week prior to the course.

A purposeful sampling methodology was utilized to identify student pairs. A critical case strategy was employed and the course professor referred four students—two Drexel students and two community students—to be interviewed. The professor was asked to refer students who were present and engaged in the course throughout the term. Students were informed both verbally and by written consent that their decision to participate in the interview would have no effect on their grade. Additionally, students were informed that the transcript of their interview would not be shared with their professor. Student pairs were interviewed in a quiet, private room located at the extension center, and held outside their scheduled course period.

The interviews were transcribed and analyzed in ATLAS ti using a priori codes to identify the four twenty-first-century skills and course engagement. Comments or insight referring to course engagement were also transcribed and analyzed in ATLAS ti. Emergent themes regarding course engagement and each of the four twenty-first-century skills were identified from transcription and ATLAS ti analysis. The researcher defined an utterance as the discussion of a code concept within the interview. Enumerations of the qualitative interview data results are provided in Table 3.

Table 3

Interview Code Distribution

Code	Frequency (n = utterance)
Experience with diversity	n = 46
Global perspectives	n = 3
Civic engagement	n = 26
Transferable skills	n = 25
Course engagement	n = 32

Experience with Diversity

Enumeration of the data demonstrated that the a priori code assigned to "experience with diversity" was the most pronounced (n = 46). The analysis resulted in the identification of five emergent themes: (a) age, (b) perspective, (c) two distinct groups, (d) life experience, and (e) learning to listen.

The first emergent theme, age, was a widespread aspect of the course (n = 16). Throughout the interviews both community and university students overtly commented on the value of a multi-

generational class. A community student enrolled in the communication course stated, "It's a lot of diversity. There's a great difference in ages. Most of the students here are old enough to be my children, and I love it" (Communication course). There were different reasons why age was a significant experience of diversity theme within the three courses. At points students articulated the unique perspectives of other generations. Additionally, each generation was described as offering unique skills to the course. For example, during an interview, a senior community student commented about a time her phone rang during the Side-by-Side class. Embarrassed for disrupting the presentation, the older woman was relieved when a university student leaned over and taught her how to silence her phone. The community student recounted the event and said:

> When I came in, I saw a lot of Drexel students, and the age gap, but I learned from them. Certain things on the computer, just like when my phone went off, I was trying to hit it. She just reached over and touched it, and that was it. You learn you don't have to be nervous and pound on things. You learn from them. They are more computer-savvy. (Communication course)

Drexel students also articulated the importance of the older generations' contribution to the course. Overwhelmingly, university students in all three courses described the worth of their elder colleagues' stories and how they enhanced the course content and learning. A Drexel student enrolled in the literature course explained:

> People are typically similar age ranges and think like that so opinions were pretty similar I would say in my undergraduate career. So now that there's people of various ages it's like a melting pot of thoughts and this is magical in itself. (Literature course)

The theme of perspective emerged as the second theme within the experience with diversity–coded data (n = 14). Experience with diversity appears to have provided multiple perspectives throughout each of the three courses. Both community and university students reported having valued the opinions and viewpoints that were different from their own. Moreover, different perspectives that arose from the experience of diversity appeared to have had a formidable impact on students' education. A university student enrolled in the communication course commented:

It's completely different because of the collaborative nature and because of the diversity of the makeup of the class. I get a lot of different perspectives. I'm very used to hearing the same things from different people in all of my courses because we've all been learning the same curriculum. This [Side-by-Side course] is a really unique experience for me to hear normal people who don't study criminal justice . . . their opinion on these matters. I think it's really important for me to take with me as I continue to remember that there's more than just the opinions being expressed in my [traditional] classes. (Communication course)

Overall, the respondents described the diverse perspective of the Side-by-Side as something that enhances the course content, providing an alternative form of knowledge and largely enriching the course experience.

The third theme that emerged from the experience with diversity–coded data was a distinction between two groups of students: student and community (n = 10). Student pairs who were interviewed recognized the value of diversity; nonetheless, they often still referred to the class in

terms of those two distinct groups. It is important to note that both the Drexel students and community students share the same physical space in West Philadelphia encompassing the university. There is a history of tension between the university and the residents that has created a culture of "them" and "us." This theme was evident when student interview pairs described their learning in the Side-by-Side course, referring to one another as "groups" and very clearly articulating a need for the two diverse groups to come together. A community student commented, "It's a lot more getting to know who your classmates are because there is a need to have the community interact with the students" (Communication course). Furthermore, when a Drexel student was asked if there is anything else the researcher should know about the course format, he explained:

> I think the relationships have become strained there [in the West Philadelphia neighborhoods of Mantua and Powelton Village], and I think it's a really tough dynamic and balance that you have to strike between the community and the campus. The more you get engagement between the two it's really important. (History course). Students' experience with the "other group" appears to not only have enriched the course content, but also suggests that it created a space for the two often oppositional groups to come together as one community.

The fourth emergent theme, life experience, appeared to be interwoven with the multi-generational composition of the course (n = 5). Drexel students especially articulated the value of mature classmates' life experiences and the effect it had on course content. Just as community students learned skills from the university students, Drexel students gained tremendous insight from the life stories of their colleagues. This insight was often described as a valuable, or more valuable, form of academic content. A student explained the importance of a diverse classroom:

> We're in this society that kind of is prejudice and favored academic learning, like book learning. I think that . . . even if somebody who's obviously on that track, wants a PhD and stuff like that. I feel like there are other kinds of [*inaudible*] other kinds of learning and I feel like this is the kind of course where you can get that from other people and people who maybe aren't "educated" in that kind of standard way can also take a class like this and contribute and be speaking and be equals instead of being looked down on. I think that was really cool. (Literature course)

The final emergent theme, learning to listen, was not a pervasive theme within this code; however, the three utterances expressed nearly verbatim the theme's title and are therefore worth mentioning (n = 3). Students clearly articulated that their experience with diversity in the course taught them to listen. Listening to diverse opinions and verbal fluencies appears to have been an unintended outcome of the course format. A community student explained:

> Well, you learn to listen. Your parents would teach you to listen, but then you're in class and you're with other people and the teacher is telling you to listen. [The Side-by-Side course is] altogether different; you learn to listen and you learn from each other. (Communication course)

One university student described learning to listen to students with diverse abilities as a skill, stating, "You learn to listen to two different types of people, where one would be more difficult to listen to, and you have to pay closer attention to. I learned a lot" (Communication course).

Emergent themes and the analysis of the data revealed that experience with diversity was an integral aspect of the course (n = 46). Five emergent themes were identified and analyzed to enhance the context of course engagement within the interview data.

Overall, experience with diversity appears to be a powerful aspect of the Side-by-Side course as demonstrated by its greatest prevalence in the code enumeration (n = 46). Five emergent themes enhance the context of the experience of diversity. Remarkably, in the context of experience with diversity, issues of race and class were not mentioned in any of the six paired interviews. It should be noted that the Drexel students and community students enrolled in the courses were racially and economically diverse (Figure 1). University and community students appear to have valued the opportunity to learn with multiple generations of learners and people with different life experiences and perspectives. Furthermore, the course experience with diversity appeared to address a historic tension within a shared physical space between community groups of longtime residents and transient students in their shared space.

Figure 1. Picture of literature course students and faculty member

Global Perspectives

Global perspectives were not significantly reflected within the paired student interviews (n = 3). There was brief mention of different worldviews in the paired interviews; however; this did not emerge as noteworthy theme.

Civic Engagement

There were twenty-six utterances (n = 26) coded as "civic engagement" within the interviews. From this data, five emergent themes were identified and analyzed: (a) engaged with civic structures and leaders, (b) enhanced course content and academic information, (c) new perspective of city, (d) motivated to become civically engaged, and (e) course format as outreach effort.

In the first emergent theme, students described themselves physically in the community, engaging with civic structures (n = 9). Students in all three courses described the task of interviewing local civic leaders and visiting historical landmarks. After participating in a walking history tour of Philadelphia, a Drexel student commented:

> The field trips we took I think were really nice, getting out of the classroom. I know Mother Bethel Church, I probably would have just walked past it like it's just another church [without] historic significance, but you get in there and see the story and see people connect with that, just that and I think the oral history project, and then seeing how we all took different paths with that, and we all kind of brought it together to give a really good history of the city. I liked that part. (History course)

Furthermore, in the second emergent theme, students described how civic engagement enhanced the course content (n = 6). The experience with community leaders or the immersion in the city enriched the academic content. For example, a communication student stated:

City Hall meetings we were encouraged to attend. That was getting me engaged in the politics of the city. I was able to focus on different things than I normally would in order to promote my knowledge of public speaking. (Communication course)

The third emergent theme from the civic engagement data revealed a new perspective of the city (n = 5). Drexel and community students both described seeing their community differently as a result of the course's civic engagement. Students from all three courses explained that many aspects of their community were overlooked prior to their course experience. One student commented on how much he learned about the city in which he has lived for the past five years:

. . . but even more important for me, starting to see things in Philadelphia differently like certain things that are called a certain way. [*Inaudible*] . . . learning about the murals, a little bit of background. Now when I walk through the city and I'm with my friends I can tell them, "Oh, do you know when that mural was painted?" Or, "Oh do you know that Du Bois lived right there? Or had his office right there?" Seeing Philadelphia and knowing more about it from the things we read but also from when we had our walking tours. Those things combined for me. (History course)

Moreover, in regard to the fourth emergent theme, community and Drexel students described feeling motivated to become civically engaged after the course experience (n = 4). A community student explained that her previous participation in an urban farming Side-by-Side course two years ago motivated her to maintain a garden plot in her community. Building upon her first Side-by-Side course, the student discussed her garden in the context of how she will incorporate her new knowledge of the city into her community. A Drexel communication course student explained how they were encouraged to attend public community meetings to observe public speaking styles.

The final emergent theme within the coded civic-engagement data revealed that in interviews students identified the course structure as an outreach effort (n = 12). Community students articulated that historically the university has not been viewed as a good neighbor, but that participation in the Side-by-Side course allowed longtime residents and university students the

opportunity to converse, share, and learn together. Community students described the Side-by-Side course as a civic engagement outreach effort to residents. A Mantua senior citizen enrolled in the literature course discussed how isolated he had felt from the university for much of his life, explaining:

> I think that I really appreciate Drexel University for reaching out to the community and bringing this type program to the floor, because when I was a kid I actually lived within a block and a half of Drexel University's football field and the university at that particular time in the forties and fifties was distant. Now there's things to the outreach program, the Side-by-Side things are different. (Literature course)

Moreover, Drexel students described "getting to know their neighbors" as a result of the course format. Drexel students very often live in the Mantua and Powelton Village neighborhoods, yet never interact with their nonstudent neighbors. One Drexel student commented that the course allowed her to engage with her surroundings:

> I find a lot of times when you're at universities you get trapped in a bubble, and it's just a way to break that bubble and actually get engaged with the community that's actually around the campus. (History course)

Emergent themes and the analysis of the data revealed that civic engagement was generally reported as an integral aspect of the course. Both community and Drexel students explained that civic engagement was a unique aspect of the Side-by-Side format, with engagement opportunities built into the course structure, either as assignments or as part of in-class instruction.

Civic engagement was described as both a feature and a result of the course format. This occurred in two ways. First, despite sharing a physical location and neighborhood, community and Drexel students reported that they traditionally have not intentionally interacted in a meaningful way and that the process of learning together led both student groups to engage with people whom they previously had not encountered. Second, both types of students credit the practices of active learning and leaving the classroom with introducing them to civic structures that both enhanced their learning and introduced them to people and places in the city they had otherwise not known existed.

Transferable Skills

The interview data was coded using the a priori code for transferable skills (n = 25). There were four emergent themes that appeared from the paired interview data: (a) critical thinking, (b) workplace skills, (c) analytical inquiry, and (d) verbal fluency.

The first emergent theme, critical thinking, was not a recurrent utterance (n = 2). This enumeration may directly reflect a student's conscious identification of critical thinking; therefore; one may infer that this skill often goes unrecognized by students and consequently is not represented in the self-reported interview data. Those students who did communicate that they utilized critical thinking attributed it to the course format. One community student stated, "The collaborative nature allows for critical thinking, which is awesome and great because you get to analyze things differently too" (Communication course).

Student pairs often described emergent theme two, workplace skill, in terms of learning to listen (n = 5). Learning to listen to others is arguably a skill that is useful in the workplace. It is particularly the experience with diversity that appears to have taught students the skill of active listening.

The third emergent theme, analytical inquiry, was described as a result of both the course format and assignments (n = 5). Students described higher-order, analytical learning as required to complete the course requirements. A senior Drexel student in the history class was asked how he would describe the Side-by-Side course to someone and he answered:

I think it is a lot less regurgitation information or facts or like memorization. I think, because I'm a science major and a lot of the science courses are just, "You have these terms. Memorize them," and everything, but a lot of this was connecting themes and ideas, and looking kind of like the overall bigger picture. (History course)

Drexel students reported that the analytical inquiry they experienced in this course format was unique in their undergraduate experience. Furthermore, the community students who were interviewed also reported that the need for such analysis was different from their experience in education. A community student in his eighties described his learning within the Side-by-Side course:

> For instance, when I was in school there was no such thing, to my knowledge, as a response paper. If there were a response paper being utilized, I never came to contact with it. Basically, just drumming up your footnotes and your bibliography. (Literature course)

Overwhelmingly, the data demonstrated the connection between the course assignments and the need for students to analyze the academic content.

Verbal fluency was the final theme that emerged from the interview data (n = 5). Interview data from the three courses demonstrated the need to verbalize one's learning and engagement as a necessary component of the course. Given that all three courses fell under distinct academic disciplines, the researcher may conjecture that verbal fluency is a result of the course format rather than the academic content. When asked, "What did you learn this term in your Side-by-Side course?" a community student eagerly responded:

> I learned the power of words. I learned the power of telling your story. That's always been on the back of my mind as kind of like my mission for this year, but reading so many different words from so many different people and stories. Hearing firsthand from people in the classroom . . . I learned the power of speaking. (Literature course)

It is important to note that the community student paused during this comment to compose herself. She was visibly touched by the experience of verbal agency that the course provided to her. The university students described the need to be verbally fluent as an alternative to writing and regurgitating information. One student shared that learning within a Side-by-Side class "was much more about the discussion and the developments and what we wanted to learn as a group than needing to know, 'Oh I need to know this for my paper, I need to know this for my

midterm'" (History course). The university and community students described verbal fluency in different ways. Community students who were interviewed described the opportunity to speak and be heard, while Drexel students described the value of discussing information.

Course Engagement

"Course engagement" was used as an a priori code to analyze the interview data. While course engagement is not included as a twenty-first-century skill, it is necessary to measure it because it is a dependent variable. Thirty-two utterances were coded as "course engagement" within the interview data, and three themes emerged: (a) collaboration, (b) immersion or interaction, and (c) comfort.

Overwhelmingly, students described that both the collaborative nature of the course and its format allowed for course engagement. This was a clear emergent theme with thirteen utterances identified according to the course engagement code (n = 13). Students described the course as nonhierarchical; the professor was not the sole possessor of knowledge or power and therefore collaboration was possible. A student in the literature class commented:

> You know undergraduate classes that are discussion based, if you like, it feels like the professor was kind of in charge so I feel like this class is so much more. . . . There was much more quality because it is people coming together and having free discussion about stuff and I feel like in some ways it was a lot more conducive to learning because there's just so many more people to potentially be learning from on the same level. (Literature course)

None of the students described the course as a didactic learning environment whereby the professor was the authority. Moreover, students described the course structure as one that encouraged collaboration.

Students were very specific in the paired student interviews and shared that the course structure allowed for collaboration that both student groups valued equally. Both Drexel and community students were empowered with agency and voice. In describing the course format, a history student stated, "It's a format where there's buy-in for both groups because we're getting something out of it" (History course). It is important to note that many of the comments about collaboration were directly linked to the students' comfort level as described in the overview of this topic's second theme. It appears as if the intense collaborative environment could not have been possible without the students feeling so comfortable in the course. A literature student remarked, "I think that it was a great course, a lot of interaction, sharing of opinions and the work definitely had to be done, but it was in a relaxed atmosphere [with] a great instructor" (Literature course).

Drexel students and community students shared that the course expanded their notion of collaboration and that the course itself became a community. The student pairs conversed about course events and activities, referencing shared discussions and activities. The course engagement was portrayed as a collective action rather than a dynamic in which students individually collaborated with the material or the professor. A history student clearly articulated his connection to course engagement: "I think people should know how much more you become

involved and engaged with the class, and you become like [*inaudible*] like a little community or something, like all the jokes and everything. It was a lot of fun" (History course).

The second emergent theme identified by the course engagement code was the importance of feeling comfortable (n = 9). Throughout the interviews, both community and Drexel students commented on the feeling of comfort and its effect on their engagement. At times students clearly articulated that the course structure created a sense of comfort. During one paired interview a university student turned to her community student colleague and commented, "Having more of the adult figures in the class makes it really comfortable. You guys, you always talk, so it's just like being at home for me" (Communication course). Students used the word "comfortable" throughout all six interviews. Both types of students reported that comfort allowed for engagement. This was reportedly a very valuable aspect of the course. A communication student stated, "As the class went on, we all just started knowing each other and we got a lot more comfortable with each other. I think that was the most positive experience, was getting comfortable with everyone" (Communication course). The freedom to feel comfortable within the class was reported to enable the student to more deeply engage in the course and its instructional content than they would in a traditional classroom. A community student enrolled in the history class contrasted her Side-by-Side course experience with getting her undergraduate degree: "I felt like because this was a more relaxed environment, it was an opportunity for me to have fun and just learn" (History course). Throughout the six interviews there were nine utterances that explicitly stated that the experience of comfort allowed the student to engage in the course learning.

The third emergent theme from course engagement–coded data was the value of being immersed or interacting with the material (n = 8). According to interview responses, immersing in the course was possible because the professor was not viewed as the sole provider of knowledge, and the students did not identify as merely recipients of knowledge. The ability to interact with the course material appeared to have increased students' course engagement and content attainment. A history student explained:

> I have to say, what I really liked is the fact that they gave us a walking tour, and he made the story alive. It's not just reading the printed textbook or the material he gave us, it's absorbing it and actually putting yourself in another time and being able to understand the mentality of the people then verse how you would think now. Stuff like that made history alive. (History course)

Within the interview pairs, Drexel students stressed that the experience of interacting with the course material and content was atypical in their undergraduate career.

Emergent themes and the analysis of the data revealed that course engagement was generally reported as an integral aspect of the course. Overall, course engagement received a high enumeration of codes (n = 32). Three emergent themes were identified and analyzed to enhance the context of course engagement within the interview data.

Video Data

During the last week of the term, the final class of each Side-by-Side course (communication, history, and literature) was recorded with a video camera. The recoding captured student groups presenting their course final project, and it was analyzed by observing the physical environment, behavior, interaction between faculty and students, student relationships, and course content. The video was coded in ATLAS ti using a priori codes of the four twenty-first-century skills and course engagement.

The researcher defined an utterance as the discussion or demonstration of a code concept within the video recording. Each code was enumerated and analyzed for emergent themes (see Table 4). Code co-occurrence and c-coefficients were utilized to analyze the strength of relationships, as illustrated in Table 5. The c-coefficient was not used in the interview data because interpreting such a coefficient is only meaningful with a sizable data set and not for an interview study with fewer than ten respondents (ATLAS.ti for Mac—User Manual, 20).

It is important to note that two of the three courses specifically addressed the city of Philadelphia—the history course, History of Philadelphia, and the literature course, Philadelphia Stories—therefore, the course content pertained to local civic issues. The course content and design of the final projects in the history and literature courses asked students to become immersed in the community, interviewing local civic leaders and visiting historic civic sites. The communication course, Public Speaking, addressed issues of social justice and speech. In this course, students chose issues of local or national importance to discuss in a town hall–style presentation.

Table 4

Video Code Distribution

Code	Frequency (n = utterance)
Experience with diversity	n = 68
Civic engagement	n = 84
Global perspectives	n = 18
Transferable skills	n = 84
Course engagement	n = 90

Experience with Diversity

Experience with diversity, as measured by coded utterances, was a theme observed throughout the recordings of the three courses (n = 68). Four themes emerged from the video data coded for experience with diversity: (a) student gained diverse life experience, (b) multigenerational diversity, (c) personal impact from an experience of diversity, and (d) value of heterogeneous student group in the final presentation.

The first emergent theme, student gained diverse life experience, was a widespread theme which arose largely as a result of the final project (n = 40). Utterances were coded under this theme for instances in class presentations when students attributed meeting with people or visiting places

with bringing a diverse experience or perspective to their project. Many students interviewed people from very diverse backgrounds or visited places that provided a different experience and perspective. For example, in the history course a group detailed the result of visiting a local Philadelphia school and interviewing stakeholders. The presenters described the experience of metal detectors and recounted the conversation surrounding school gun violence (History course). In another presentation, a community student born and raised in the Mantua section of Philadelphia explained that he gained a new perspective as a result of his interviews and research on the city's Mural Arts Program for his final project. He stated, "During my research I learned things I never knew after living here since the forties. I thought that I knew everything about the Bottom" (Mantua is often referred to by residents as the "Black Bottom") (Literature course). Throughout all three course videos, students articulated how traveling to new places and meeting with diverse people for their projects provided them not only with an experience of diversity but also offered a new perspective on the course content.

The second theme, multi-generational diversity, was identified when a student articulated the value of age diversity in the final course presentation (n = 27). The researcher did not presume the age of the presenters or interviewees. Furthermore, there was not an assumption that age was a value; rather, this code emerged as a result of students underscoring a multi-generational experience. Two students in the history class detailed their final project experience interviewing men who had worked on the Philadelphia railroad lines. A student stated, "What touched us the most with these interviews was realizing how connected people are to the railroads. All three people that we interviewed [were fourth-generation railroad workers] are retired but still so interested in the railroads" (History course). Additionally, a student presented on the gentrification of the Powelton and Mantua communities and the change they have experienced. She interviewed residents who have lived in the area between thirty and sixty years (History course). During a communication final project, a student attributed her decades in the workforce with providing her a valuable perspective on the presentation content. Her project partners were unable to offer a longitudinal perspective and deferred to her authority as someone with diverse experience (Communication course).

The third emergent theme, personal impact from an experience with diversity, was identified when a student articulated the effect of a diverse experience (n = 14). In a communication final presentation, the student described how her work with youth living in a homeless shelter influenced her perspective on the course content. She brought her experience with this different group of people and applied it to her speech on education policy (Communication course). Throughout a final presentation on personal Philadelphia stories, a community and Drexel student discussed how their very different experiences have affected their "story." The two students referred to their differences to demonstrate the final project objective (Literature course).

The final emergent theme, value of heterogeneous student group in the final presentation, was identified if the student group self-identified as diverse (n = 10). The researcher avoided biases or stereotypes about diversity and did not project this theme on a group; rather, an utterance was coded if a student group articulated the value of its diversity. For example, a final presentation in the literature course was composed of two longtime Mantua residents and two Drexel students. The group discussed its history and experience with the neighborhood and the effect on the course presentation (Literature course).

Experience with diversity was represented throughout the video recordings. Emergent themes included (a) student gained diverse life experience, (b) multi-generational diversity, (c) personal

impact from an experience of diversity, and (d) value of heterogeneous student group in the final presentation. C-coefficients were highest for course engagement.

Global Perspectives

The global perspectives code was minimally observed throughout video recordings of the three courses (n = 18). Three themes emerged from the video data coded for global perspectives: (a) comparative international content, (b) personal perspective, and (c) experience with global learning.

The first emergent theme, comparative international content, was the most prevalent (n = 10). Students used facts, mass media, legislation, and statistics to compare international social phenomena and explore intercultural understanding of the course content. The majority of these utterances were observed in the communication course. In a final course presentation in the communication course, the students' public speaking project covered gun control in the United States. Students utilized international cases of gun violence to explore the issue (Communication course). One student utilized international artifacts to demonstrate a global perspective.

The second emergent theme was personal perspective (n = 6). Students utilized their personal perspective or international experience to present the course content. For example, a Drexel student from Korea explained that he had completed his education in grades K through 8 in Asia. In his evaluation of the American urban school crisis, he discussed his experience of Korean school culture and compared it to Philadelphia schools (Communication course).

The final emergent theme was experience with global learning (n = 2). Both utterances were coded in response to the final project student interviews, conducted with someone who had immigrated to the United States. The nationality of the interviewee was significant as it provided a global perspective to the course content. For example, as part of an oral history final project that explored the Philadelphia school crisis, students interviewed a woman who emigrated from the Dominican Republic. The woman explained that she left her native land with her younger sister to provide her a better education (History course). The caregiver's story was utilized in the final project to represent an alternative global perspective to the city's school system.

Overall, global perspectives were observed the least in the video data. Three emergent themes were observed. Code co-occurrences were not significant and therefore do not suggest a strong relationship with other codes.

Civic Engagement

The civic engagement code was observed throughout the video recordings of the three courses (n = 84). Three themes emerged from the video data coded for civic engagement: (a) engaged with local or national issues, (b) community-to-classroom, and (c) personal experience with topic.

The first emergent theme, engagement with local and national issues, was pervasive (n = 72). Students used facts, statistics, and political quotes and compared legislation to support their engagement with a local issue. For example, during a speech about minimum wage, a community

student detailed a recent press conference in which a legislator explained a bill he proposed. The student supported his speech, delivered as part of his final project, by synthesizing the political information to support his perspective on wage justice (Communication course).

The second emergent theme, community-to-classroom, was represented throughout the videos (n = 29). Students explained how they traveled to the community to engage with a civic leader or civic structure to gather information for the final project. For example, students in the history course interviewed a local Mantua-based music producer who during the 1970s supported local African American musicians in West Philadelphia. The students observed that the music producer and his studio are located two blocks from their student housing. In the course video, the Drexel student explained that he also is involved in music and that he had no idea about the history of music in Mantua and the influence this producer had over the industry and city (History course). Students also interviewed urban elementary-school parents, administrators, and students to learn about the education crisis in Philadelphia (History course). Yet another one group interviewed retired Conrail workers to learn about deindustrialization and rail lines in the city. The student presenters commented that the man they interviewed was a third-generation railroad worker. In the video, a Drexel student stated, "Through my oral history project I learned how important industry was and how [the man he interviewed] called the railroad the 'arsenal of democracy.' I can finally see what Philadelphia was prior to when I came here" (History course). A history course group also brought information about gentrification and the influence of institutions of higher education from three Philadelphia universities back to the classroom. The students interviewed institutional administrators and alumni to support their project (History course). In the history course there were eighteen utterances thematically coded as community-to-classroom. Students immersed themselves with civic leaders to complete their oral history project.

Students in the literature course were charged with analyzing Philadelphia stories by interviewing local authors they had read over the term or engaging in local art instillations. There were eleven utterances coded as community-to-classroom in the literature course. One group of community students reported traveling several times to a local art installation, *Before I Die . . .* by Candy Change. The installation was sponsored by Drexel University and therefore the students were able to attend both the artist's lecture and a workshop the artist held in the community (Communication course). The students recounted that they visited the installation several times and reported the influence the installation had on the surrounding community. In Figure 2, community students are pictured with the artist at the site of the art installation.

Figure 2. Literature course community students and artist at community art installation

The theme of personal experience with the topic was less notable within the civic engagement code (n = 4) but still worth reporting. For example, a community literature student connected her personal civic engagement to her final presentation as she recounted participating in public protest over school budgets (Literature course). Moreover, a community student described how while riding the bus he was inspired by the murals and the people they portrayed. He connected this personal experience with his choice to cover the Philadelphia Mural Arts Program for his final project (Literature course).

Civic engagement was represented throughout the video. Emergent themes included engagement with local issues, a community-to-classroom experience, and personal experience with the final project topic. C-coefficients were highest for transferable skills, experience with diversity, and course engagement.

Transferable Skills

The transferable skill code was observed throughout the video recordings of the three courses (n = 84). Four themes emerged from the video data coded for civic engagement: (a) integrative learning, (b) verbal fluency, (c) analytical inquiry, and (d) reflective learning.

The first emergent theme, integrative learning, was observed throughout all three courses; however, it was most pronounced in the literature and history courses (n = 38). This theme was coded when an utterance demonstrated multiple sources of information or experiences assimilated into the student learning. Throughout the literature and history courses, students incorporated

their interviews and experience in the community into their final project. Students very often used the narratives from the interviewees to enhance or supplement traditional academic content. For example, in the history course, a student utilized information from the interview of a longtime resident with the course knowledge presented in the text to inform the class about the history of Philadelphia (History course). Another history student integrated interviews with Philadelphia school administrators, caregivers, and alumni with statistics and policy to present information on the Philadelphia school system (History course).

The second emergent theme, verbal fluency, was identified if the student presentation was determined to be high quality (n = 30). Given the nature of the final presentation, all students were observed with some level of verbal fluency within the video data. This theme was coded as such only if the quality of the presentation was deemed an exemplary oral presentation useful in the workplace.

The third emergent theme, analytical inquiry, was particularly prevalent throughout the literature and history courses (n = 18). It is important to note that the assignments in these two courses directed students to engage with multiple sources of information to contribute to a multidimensional analysis for the final project. For example, a history student group utilized interviews of administrators and alumni, examinations of webpage content, and historical data to analyze the history of higher education in Philadelphia (History course). Two students enrolled in the literature course presented on a local community art installation for their final project. The students utilized the physical presence of the art, attended a lecture and workshop by the artist, and referred to the artist biography to analyze their project (Literature course).

The final emergent theme, reflective learning, was also observed extensively throughout the literature and history courses (n = 18). Again, it is important to note that the assignments in these two courses directed students to engage with their community. In a history final presentation, a student commented, "a conversation he had with the person he interviewed reshaped the course topic" (History course). Throughout the final presentation videos, students are observed reflecting on their experience outside of the classroom and the effect such experience had on their overall learning. A literature course student recounted her experience of visiting a local community art installation for her final project. The student engaged with a person also visiting the art and learned that they attended the same high school. The student was observed in the video reflecting on this experience and connecting it to the purpose of the community art installation (Literature course). There were several powerful examples of students' self-reflective learning.

The transferable skill code was observed throughout the video recordings of the three courses (n = 84). The course's final assignment appeared to have an influence on the distribution of the four emergent themes: (a) integrative learning, (b) verbal fluency, (c) analytical inquiry, and (d) reflective learning. The transferable skill code had the strongest relationship with the experience with diversity and civic engagement codes.

Course Engagement

The course engagement code was observed throughout the video recordings of the three courses (n = 90). Four themes emerged from the video data coded for course engagement: (a) student-to-student dialogue, (b) student-faculty interaction, (c) quality and supportive environment, and (d) learning with peers outside of the classroom.

The first emergent theme, student-to-student dialogue (n = 72), was identified by observing student behavior. The theme was characterized by interactions beyond a traditional question-and-answer transaction. Students engaged with their colleagues by asking them to expand on their opinions about the final project topic. Students in the audience quoted sections of their colleagues' presentation and asked for clarifying information. Moreover, students either presenting or sitting in the audience conversed in depth about the topic.

The second emergent theme, student-faculty interaction (n = 12), was identified by observing behavior and the physical space of the classroom. For example, in the communication course, the faculty member set up the classroom seats in a semi-circle in which she positioned herself as an active participant, sitting among the students, instead of standing in the front of the classroom. This intentional physical positioning suggested that the faculty member was not exerting authority over her students; rather, throughout the video she is observed acting as an equal, facilitating conversations with her students in a collegial manner (Figure 3).

Figure 3. Communication professor speaking with students during course break

At the end of a history presentation, the faculty member teaching the course commented that he "tweeted out" the information that students had presented. He remarked that he learned something new and the tweet was "getting a lot of attention" (History course). The literature course also fostered several meaningful interactions between the professor and her students. The room was arranged in two semi-circles. The faculty member did not position herself in the front of the class; rather, she was observed at several points sitting on the floor to advance the student presenter slides. Throughout the student presentations, the faculty member is also observed engaging with

individual students as well as the class as a group. At the end of the course, the faculty member asks the researcher to take a class photo so they may remember the course experience.

The third emergent theme, quality and supportive environment (n = 18), was observed more in the video recordings of the Communication and Literature courses. The literature and communication faculty are both female and both attended Side-by-Side training workshops. The history faculty member is male and had not received any formal training on Side-by-Side. Behavioral and physical observations were utilized in establishing this theme. For example, students and faculty in the communication course were observed still wearing nametags in the final week of the course. This may suggest the culture of the larger classroom in which importance is placed on calling one another by name (Communication and Literature courses). Throughout the literature course video, the faculty member is observed asking students, "What can I do to help?" (Literature course). This created a warm and comfortable classroom environment. The faculty member also provided refreshments for the students. When she announced that the refreshments were available, students erupted in cheer. She was observed passing around cookies while student groups prepared for their presentation.

The fourth emergent theme, learning with peers outside of the classroom (n = 33), was observed the most in the history and literature courses. The history course final project required students to collect oral histories of people engaged with the city. The literature course final project provided options for students to engage with people and places in the community. This theme was categorized by students' explanations of meeting with class colleagues outside of the required course time to gather class information. Throughout the course video, students are observed describing interviews of people for their project. Also, students brought back photos of them engaged with their peers in museums, art installations, murals, and schools.

Course engagement was represented throughout the video. Emergent themes included engagement with student-to-student dialogue, student-faculty interaction, quality and supportive environment, and learning outside of the classroom with peers. C-coefficients were highest for experience with diversity.

Integrated Data and twenty-first-Century Skills

The two research methods allowed for course engagement and the four skills to be measured and contextualized.

Experience with Diversity

Regarding the first skill, experience with diversity, one survey question registered responses showing significant change: "To what extent have events or activities at your institution emphasized perspectives on societal differences (economic, ethnic, political, religious, etc.)?" Experience outside of the traditional classroom and the opportunity to engage with diverse activities were also reflected in the qualitative data. Throughout the interviews, students spoke about the value that comes from both life experience and exposure to diverse experiences. Additionally, in the video data the experience with diversity code had a high co-occurrence with both civic engagement and course engagement, signifying that participatory activities increased experience with diversity. The three data sources suggested that not only did students become

more aware of experience with diversity on their campus, but also that civic engagement and course engagement may have increased the experience with diversity skill as a result of the Side-by-Side course format.

Global Perspectives

The second skill, global perspectives, generated the largest contrast between the qualitative and quantitative data types. There were survey responses showing significant change from the beginning to the end of the course for five survey questions concerning global perspective. This was the largest observed change in any of the skills measured. The questions receiving responses that showed significant change were the following: How much do you agree or disagree with the following statements? (a) When I notice cultural differences, my culture tends to have the better approach; (b) I am informed of current issues that impact international relations; (c) I know how to analyze the basic characteristics of a culture; (d) I put the needs of others above my own personal wants; (e) Volunteering is not an important priority in my life. This code was not prominent in the qualitative data; however, both Drexel and community students' desire to be engaged in the world was prevalent and was reflected in the civic engagement code. Students described and demonstrated in the interview and video data the importance and value of engagement in society. Moreover, the ubiquitous opportunities to experience diversity offered in the course may have influenced students' perceptions of their own culture.

Civic Engagement

The third skill, civic engagement, was observed throughout both the quantitative and qualitative data. Responses to four individual questions indicated significant change from the pre to post survey administration. Those questions, divided into two parts, were the following: "Rate your ability to (a) lead a group where people from different backgrounds feel welcomed and included; and (b) contribute to the well-being of your community; whether course related or not, about how often have you organized others to (c) work on local or campus issues and (d) to work on state, national, or global issues?"

The qualitative data demonstrated both the Drexel and community students' ability to lead a diverse group in a welcoming and inclusive manner. In all six of the paired interviews, the Drexel and community students spoke casually and comfortably. Students did not interrupt; rather, they engaged in a respectful conversation. Often one student would answer a question and the other would validate the response and contribute an anecdote to support the claim of their colleague.

The video data visually demonstrated Drexel and community students working together on their final projects. Although it was not possible to distinguish between a Drexel and community student, all groups appeared to be multigenerational and racially and ethnically diverse. Moreover, all group members appeared to contribute to the project and were respected for their input. For example, in the literature course a self-identified Drexel student explains how his community student colleague introduced the group to a historic civic leader for their project (Literature course). The dialogue is respectful, light, and appeared to be friendly.

The second civic engagement survey question in this series asked students about their ability to contribute to the well-being of their community. This code and theme were represented

throughout the interview data. For example, Drexel students reported with overwhelming frequency that the Side-by-Side course format allowed them to "get to know" their non-Drexel neighbors. They explained that this was an enormous personal and community benefit. The community students also said the course was "good for the community," and, remarkably, they described it as a university outreach effort. Both Drexel and community students stated that their participation in the course contributed to the local community. The video data recorded students addressing issues in the local community. Particularly in the history course, students worked together to research, interview, and visit civic structures and leaders who have contributed to the Philadelphia community.

The final two civic engagement questions in this series asked students about how often they have organized others to work on local or national issues. This theme of local engagement was also represented in the qualitative data. Drexel and community students described in their interviews the value of being civically engaged and involved in the local community. The video data's most prevalent theme was the engagement of local and national issues. Both the quantitative and the qualitative data reflected the civic engagement skill.

Transferable Skills

There was a significant change in response regarding one transferable skill survey question: "Whether course related or not, about how often have you made a speech to a group?" All three courses required students to give an oral presentation for the final project and therefore the answer to the survey question was expected to mention at least some experience with speaking to a group. This skill was disproportionally represented in the qualitative data and was not extensively coded within the interview data; however, transferable skills were reflected throughout the video data. Students may not have recognized that the requirements for the course were also transferable skills. This supposition may explain why, when asked in either the survey or interview, students did not identify such skills, and conversely students were observed in the video demonstrating transferable skills throughout their final project presentations.

Course Engagement

One course engagement question generated responses showing significant change from the pre to post survey: "To what extent have courses allowed you to learn effectively on your own, so you can identify, research, and complete a given task?" The quantitative results were inconsistent with the qualitative findings. Throughout the interviews both Drexel and community students' explanations reflected the definitions and aspects of engagement also defined by the survey instrument. Additionally, students are observed throughout the video engaged in the course as defined by the survey instrument.

Implications

There are several implications from the results of this research. Implications include curricular scaffolding for civic learning, increased opportunities to participate in a high-impact practice, community outreach and democratic engagement and evidence of skills to be listed on a nontraditional transcript.

Implications for Curriculum Design & Instruction

Participation in a Side-By-Side course appeared to have fostered 21st-centruy skills. Those students who completed their required *Foundations in Civic Engagement*, course may have had a foundation in which to build upon during the Side-By-Side course. This finding might suggest that an introduction to civic concepts provided students with the mental model in which to expand and apply the unique course format and content within the Side-By-Side course. These findings suggest that a foundational course provided a scaffold for future civic learning and democratic engagement.

Implications for Program

Additionally, the Side-By-Side course format is categorized as a high-impact practice. Research demonstrated that participation in such practices might increase student retention (Kuh, 2008). Student retention is a ubiquitous issue for institutions of higher education and therefore providing multiple opportunities to engage in such high-impact practices is recommended.

The interviews showed that students were able to clearly identify the civic value of the course format in addition to the academic content. Throughout the interviews Drexel students commented that this course experience should be "required for all students." Moreover, community students suggested that more neighbors participated in the course as it provided an opportunity to positively engage with the Drexel students. Urban universities often struggle with the tension between university students and neighbors cohabitating. Side-By-Side may provide a shared space for learning that encourages dialogue and reflects a model of urban extension center education.

Qualitative data demonstrated the valuable engagement between Drexel students and their community colleagues. The interview transcripts are peppered with students articulating the value of learning together. The Side-By-Side course format was defined as something other than merely an instructional model: Community students identified Side-By-Side as an outreach effort from the university and Drexel students described it as an opportunity to be engaged with their neighbors in a new and unique way. It is important to note that the university does not define the Side-By-Side course format as an outreach effort rather; it is a unique instructional model.

Implications for Future Research

The workforce has clearly articulated the need to graduate students with 21st-century skills. Evaluation of such skills in institutions of higher education is limited within traditional course evaluations. It is suggested that the NSSE based instrument developed for study be further revised and utilized in an array of experiences such as community-based learning courses, study abroad, co-operative and intern experiences. Demonstration of such skills may be helpful in supporting the movement towards nontraditional transcripts as institutions recognize that they must support their students in our competitive global economy. The Lumina Foundation, NASPA and the American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers (AACRAO) have partnered to explore how to collect, document and distribute information about student learning and "competencies," including what is gleaned outside of the traditional academic classroom. Kevin Kruger, the president of NASPA stated, "The outcomes of a college experience are more

than a degree" (Fain, 2015, para. 4). The revised NSSE tool may be utilized to capture such "competencies" or 21st-centruy skills. Furthermore, the Side-By-Side course format may provide students with the opportunity to foster such skills.

Conclusion

The findings from this research confirm and the extend knowledge in the field of civic learning and democratic engagement. The framework for this research was grounded in the literature and included the history of civic learning in higher education, experiential learning theories and high-impact practice as well as student learning outcomes within a community-based learning course. Eyler (2002) describes service-learning as ideally suited to achieve both personal and academic goals for students and broader goals of civic engagement and social justice for communities. The results of this research not only supported Eyler's notion but also, suggested that the Side-by-Side course format may in fact increase both course engagement and twenty-first-century skills.

Overall, the study showed no measurable or observable differences in the Drexel and community student skill acquisition. These results are consistent with the course pedagogy. The Side-by-Side course format is designed to create an egalitarian learning environment that accentuates an individual's value and contribution. The results suggested that both student types, albeit very diverse, shared a common learning proficiency with similar outcomes and experiences.

The twenty-first-century workforce has rapidly evolved and institutions of higher education institutions are charged with graduating students prepared to excel in a world where diverse people collaborate and co-create new knowledge. This task requires students to have not only the academic foundation of their field, but also the skills to work as good citizens within a diverse global economy while adapting to fast-pace changes in knowledge. The Side-by-Side course format by design has two known components: (a) it democratically engages students, and (b) it qualifies as a high-impact practice. This research sought to explore if it also provides a pedagogy in which twenty-first-century skills may emerge. Overwhelmingly, these skills were observed in the qualitative data. While the NSSE survey instrument did not show an increase in composite skill acquisition, this study may serve as a pilot for future research. An adapted instrument has the potential to evaluate such skill attainment and provide valuable information to institutions seeking to document such student learning.

In 1862 President Lincoln signed the Morrill Act and established the first Land Grant Institution. Not only did this act charge leaders to provide education to students, but it also instructed educators to prepare the nation's youth to be civically engaged. One hundred and fifty years later, the world has changed and it is imperative that students have additional skills to succeed in the workforce as global citizens. The Side-by-Side course format provides a structure in which students are democratically engaged and may acquire the twenty-first-century skills required to be successful in our ever-changing global economy.

Appendix A: Statistically Significant Individual NSSE Questions

1. Question DP_1: To what extent have events or activities offered at your institution emphasized perspectives on societal differences (economic, ethnic, political, religious, etc.)?

2. Question GP_1: How much do you agree or disagree with the following statements? When I notice cultural differences, my culture tends to have the better approach.

3. Question GP_6: How much do you agree or disagree with the following statements? I am informed of current issues that impact international relations.

4. Question GP_12: How much do you agree or disagree with the following statements? I know how to analyze the basic characteristics of a culture.

5. Question GP_13: How much do you agree or disagree with the following statements? I put the needs of others above my own personal wants.

6. Question GP_18: How much do you agree or disagree with the following statements? Volunteering is not an important priority in my life.

7. Question CE_3: Lead a group where people from different backgrounds feel welcomed and included.

8. Question CE_4: Contribute to the well-being of your community.

9. Question CE_13: Whether course related or not, about how often have you organized others to work on local or campus issues?

10. Question CE_14: Whether course related or not, about how often have you organized others to work on state, national, or global issues?

12. Question TS_2: Whether course related or not, about how often have you made a speech to a group?

13. Question E_13: To what extent have courses allowed you to learn effectively on your own, so you can identify, research, and complete a given task?

Reference:

Association of American Colleges & Universities, A Crucible Moment: College Learning & Democracy's Future, 2012.

Acedo, C., & Hughes, C. (2014). Principles for learning and competences in the 21st-century curriculum. *PROSPECTS, 44*(4), 503-525. doi: 10.1007/s11125-014-9330-1

Astin, Alexander W., and Linda J. Sax. "How undergraduates are affected by service participation." *Service Participation* 39, no. 3 (1998): 251.

Binkley, Marilyn, Ola Erstad, Joan Herman, Senta Raizen, Martin Ripley, May Miller-Ricci, and Mike Rumble. "Defining twenty-first century skills." In *Assessment and teaching of 21st century skills*, pp. 17-66. Springer Netherlands, 2012.

Boyles, T. (2012). 21st century knowledge, skills, abilities and entrepreneurial competencies: A model for undergraduate entrepreneurship education. *Journal of Entrepreneurship Education, 15.* 42-57. Retrieved from http://www.highbeam.com/doc/1P3-2750823971.html.

Brownell, J. E., & Swaner, L. E. (2009). High-impact practices: Applying the learning outcomes literature to the development of successful campus programs. *Peer Review, 11*(2), 26-30.

Colbert, R. A. (2005). 21st century jobs: Identifying the challenges in Baltimore County, Maryland. *Economic Development Journal, 4*(4), 15-34.

Conway, James M., Elise L. Amel, and Daniel P. Gerwien. "Teaching and learning in the social context: A meta-analysis of service learning's effects on academic, personal, social, and citizenship outcomes." *Teaching of Psychology* 36, no. 4 (2009): 233-245.

Cresswell, J. W. (2013). *Qualitative inquiry & research design: Choosing among five approaches* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.

Cresswell, J. W. (2013). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.

Creswell, J. W., & Plano Clark, V. L. (2007). *Designing and conducting mixed methods research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Darling-Hammond, L., & Adamson, F. (2010). Beyond basic skills: The role of performance assessment in achieving 21st century standards of learning. Stanford, CA: Stanford University, Stanford Center for Opportunity Policy in Education. Retrieved from http://stanford.io/17MOb8A

Darling-Hammond, L. (2012). *Powerful teacher education: Lessons from exemplary programs*. John Wiley & Sons.

Finley, A. (2011). Civic learning and democratic engagements: A review of the literature on civic engagement in post-secondary education. *Unpublished paper. Accessed March, 12*, 2012.

Friedman, T. L. (2006). *The world is flat [updated and expanded]: A brief history of the twenty-first century*. Macmillan.

Eyler, J. (2002). Reflection: Linking service and learning—linking students and communities. *Journal of Social Issues, 58*(3), 517-534. Retrieved from http://www.servicelearning.msstate.edu/files/Eyler%20Reflection%20Linking%20Service%20and%20Learning.pdf

Eyler, J.S. & Giles, D.E. (1999) *Where's the learning in service learning?* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass

Itin, C. M. (1999). Reasserting the philosophy of experiential education as a vehicle for change in the 21st century. *Journal of Experiential Education, 22*(2), 9198. doi:10.1177/105382599902200206

Kenworthy, A. L., & DiPadova-Stocks, L. N. (2010). Charging forward into the unscripted future: following the script of interconnected action. *International journal of organizational analysis*, *18*(2), 173-180.

Kuh, G. D. (2008). *High-impact educational practices: what they are, who has access to them, and why they matter.* Washington, D.C.: AAC&U

Moely, Barbara E., Megan McFarland, Devi Miron, Sterett Mercer, and Vincent Ilustre. "Changes in college students' attitudes and intentions for civic involvement as a function of service-learning experiences." *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning* 9, no. 1 (2002).
Strauss, A. L. (1987). *Qualitative analysis for social scientists*. Cambridge University Press.

Tashakkori, A., & Teddlie, C. (1998). *Mixed methodology: Combining qualitative and quantitative approaches*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Onwuegbuzie, Anthony J., and Nancy L. Leech. "On becoming a pragmatic researcher: The importance of combining quantitative and qualitative research methodologies." *International Journal of Social Research Methodology* 8, no. 5 (2005): 375-387.